

**2025-26 SESSION**

**SENATE  
THIRD READING PACKET**

**MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2026**



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES  
651-4171

## SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Monday, April 27, 2026.

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
	<a href="#">SB 917</a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 922</a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 930</a>	Reyes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 932</a>	Hurtado	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 941</a>	Padilla	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 949</a>	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 969</a>	Reyes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 971</a>	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 977</a>	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 990</a>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1002</a>	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1036</a>	Grayson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1038</a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1048</a>	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1058</a>	McNerney	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1099</a>	Reyes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1106</a>	Cabaldon	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1111</a>	Ashby	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1143</a>	Caballero	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1154</a>	Reyes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1159</a>	Cabaldon	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1170</a>	Durazo	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
	<a href="#">SB 1173</a>	Caballero	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1175</a>	Rubio	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1177</a>	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1211</a>	Gonzalez	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1229</a>	Allen	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1234</a>	Alvarado-Gil	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1273</a>	Cabaldon	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1274</a>	Archuleta	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
	<a href="#">SB 1285</a>	Durazo	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1288</a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1307</a>	Jones	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1311</a>	Wahab	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1347</a>	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1369</a>	Reyes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1408</a>	Arreguín	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1416</a>	Wahab	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1417</a>	Pérez	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#">SB 1418</a>	Cervantes	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
	<a href="#">SB 1429</a>	Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
	<a href="#">SB 1430</a>	Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	<a href="#">SB 1437</a>	Committee on Revenue and Taxation	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

\* Analysis pending

<b><u>Note</u></b>	<b><u>Measure</u></b>	<b><u>Author</u></b>	<b><u>Location</u></b>
+	<a href="#"><u>SB 1438</u></a>	Committee on Local Government	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 84</u></a>	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 113</u></a>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 116</u></a>	Alvarado-Gil	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 123</u></a>	Umberg	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 128</u></a>	Pérez	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 129</u></a>	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 130</u></a>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 131</u></a>	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 136</u></a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 142</u></a>	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 143</u></a>	Umberg	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 144</u></a>	Seyarto	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 145</u></a>	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 146</u></a>	Laird	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 148</u></a>	Padilla	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 151</u></a>	Umberg	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 153</u></a>	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 154</u></a>	Umberg	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 156</u></a>	Dahle	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 157</u></a>	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SCR 161</u></a>	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SJR 7</u></a>	Cervantes	Unfinished Business
	<a href="#"><u>SJR 13</u></a>	Padilla	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 67</u></a>	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 68</u></a>	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 86</u></a>	Gonzalez	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 94</u></a>	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 95</u></a>	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 96</u></a>	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 97</u></a>	Wahab	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>SR 101</u></a>	Ashby	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>ACR 141</u></a>	Ta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>ACR 152</u></a>	Davies	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>ACR 160</u></a>	Sharp-Collins	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	<a href="#"><u>ACR 161</u></a>	Addis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

\* Analysis pending

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 917  
Author: Laird (D)  
Amended: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Alcoholic beverages: certified farmers' market sales permit

**SOURCE:** California Association of Winegrape Growers  
Family Winemakers of California

---

**DIGEST:** This bill makes various changes to provisions in the Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Act that currently authorizes a licensed winegrower to conduct limited instructional tastings at a certified farmers' market (CFM). This bill (1) deletes the requirement that wine sold by the winegrower is produced entirely from grapes or other agricultural products grown by the winegrower; (2) increases the number of licensees allowed to conduct an instructional tasting from one to three licensees.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Department of ABC and grants it exclusive authority to administer the provisions of the ABC Act in accordance with laws enacted by the Legislature. This involves licensing individuals and businesses associated

with the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic beverages in this state and the collection of license fees.

- 2) Provides that CFMs are California agricultural product point-of-sale locations that are registered under the provisions of the California Food and Agriculture Code and the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA).
- 3) Authorizes the Department of ABC to issue a CFM sales permit that authorizes a licensed winegrower to sell wine produced and bottled by the winegrower at certified farmers' market locations. Additionally, the CFM sales permit allows the licensed winegrower to conduct a limited instructional wine tasting event by the licensee at a CFM.
- 4) Provides that only one licensee may conduct an instructional tasting event during the operational hours of a CFM.
- 5) Requires, at all times during an instructional tasting event, the event to be separated from the remainder of the market by a wall, rope, cord, chain, fence, or other permanent or temporary barrier.
- 6) Prohibits the licensed winegrower from pouring more than three ounces of wine per person per day and from selling more than 5,000 gallons of wine annually pursuant to all CFM market sales permits held by any single winegrower.
- 7) Requires the licensed winegrower to report total CFM wine sales to the Department of ABC on an annual basis.
- 8) Establishes the Responsible Beverage Service (RBS) Training Program that requires the Department of ABC to develop, implement, and administer a curriculum for servers of alcohol and their managers, as specified. Alcohol servers are required to successfully complete an RBS training course offered or authorized by the Department of ABC.

This bill:

- 1) Deletes the requirement that wine sold by the winegrower according to a CFM sales permit is produced entirely from grapes or other agricultural products grown by the winegrower.

- 2) Increases the number of licensees allowed to conduct an instructional tasting event during a CFM to three.
- 3) Clarifies that instructional tastings under a CFM sales permit are subject to RBS requirements.

## **Background**

*Author's Statement.* According to the author's office, "Senate Bill 917 strengthens the California wine industry – which has faced significant challenges in recent years – by expanding opportunities for winemakers to connect with consumers at farmers markets. Currently, to participate in farmers markets, wineries must grow grapes on land they own, reinforcing land ownership as a barrier to market access. SB 917 eliminates this requirement that locks small wineries out of farmers markets to increase equitable access to local markets and encourage consumers to engage with local wine producers."

*Winegrower License.* A winegrower license, commonly referred to as a Type 02 license, authorizes the holder to manufacture wine at a licensed premises and to sell the wine they produce, including direct sales from the winery. The license requires a winegrower to have facilities and equipment for the conversion of fruit into wine and engage in the production of wine. Winegrowers may also conduct tastings of their own wine at their licensed location and can operate additional tasting rooms outside of their primary licensed location.

Federal Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) regulations permit a winegrower to use the facilities and equipment of another winegrower to produce wine. This is commonly referred to as an "alternating proprietorship." Separate winegrower licenses are issued to each legal entity manufacturing wine under its own bonded winery permit. This license type is subject to RBS requirements and requires alcohol servers and managers of alcohol servers to be RBS certified.

In fiscal year 2024–25, there were approximately 6,874 licensed winegrowers in California. Napa County had the highest number, with 1,931 licenses, followed by Sonoma County with 1,380, and San Luis Obispo County with 614.

*Instructional Tastings at CFMs.* In 2000, Governor Gray Davis signed AB 2520 (Thomson, Chapter 384, Statutes of 2000) authorizing the Department of ABC to issue a CFM sales permit allowing winegrowers to sell wine produced and bottled entirely by the winegrower from grapes grown by the winegrower at a CFM. The

bill prohibited the licensee from selling more than 5,000 gallons of wine per year at a CFM and required the winegrower to report their total CFM wine sales annually to the Department of ABC.

In 2014, this privilege was expanded by the signing of AB 2488 (Levine, Chapter 98, Statutes of 2014) which further allowed a licensed winegrower the privilege of conducting limited instructional wine tastings for consumers at farmers' markets. Under the law, a winegrower who obtains a CFM sales permit may host limited instructional tasting events, provided the tasting area is clearly separated from the rest of the market by a barrier, such as a rope or fence. The winegrower may not pour more than three ounces of wine per person per day. Supporters of this change argued that instructional tasting helped winegrowers promote and educate consumers about their products in a setting where they were already authorized to sell their product.

This bill makes various changes to this provision in law. Specifically, this bill removes the requirement that wine sold at a CFM must be made only from grapes or agricultural products by the winery. Additionally, this bill increases the number of licensees allowed to conduct an instructional tasting at a CFM to three. Current law prohibits more than one licensed winegrower from conducting a tasting at a given CFM. As of March 2026, there were approximately 165 active CFM sales permits.

*Responsible Beverage Service Training.* AB 1221 (Gonzalez, Chapter 847, Statutes of 2017) created the RBS Training Program Act with the intention of reducing alcohol-related harm to local communities. The bill required the Department of ABC to create the RBS Training Program to ensure on-premises servers of alcoholic beverages and their managers are educated on the dangers of serving alcohol to minors and over-serving patrons.

Anyone that is employed at an ABC on-premises licensed establishment who is responsible for checking identifications, taking customer orders, and pouring or delivering alcoholic beverages must have a valid RBS certification from the Department of ABC. Servers and their managers must register in the RBS Portal, take RBS training from an approved training provider, and pass the department's RBS exam within 60 days of their first date of employment. Courses are typically offered online, in multiple languages, and cover topics like how alcohol affects the body, state laws and liability, checking IDs and spotting fake IDs, and techniques to prevent service to minors or intoxicated customers. RBS certification is valid for three years.

This bill simply clarifies that instructional tastings under a CFM sales permit, are subject to RBS requirements.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AB 774 (Levine, Chapter 107, Statutes of 2015) authorizes a licensed beer manufacturer that holds a CFM beer sales permit to provide limited instructional tastings for consumers at a CFM, under specific conditions.

AB 2004 (Chesbro, Chapter 806, Statutes of 2014), among other things, authorized a licensed beer manufacturer to apply to the Department of ABC for a “certified farmers’ market beer sales permit” for the purpose of allowing the licensee to sell packaged beer at a farmers’ market, including any area outside the footprint of the farmers’ market, under specified conditions.

AB 2488 (Levine, Chapter 98, Statutes of 2014) expanded an existing privilege in the ABC Act relating to the sale of wine by a licensed winegrower at certified farmers’ markets to also allow a licensed winegrower the privilege of conducting limited wine tastings for consumers at farmers’ markets under certain circumstances.

SB 1336 (Wiggins, 2010) would have removed the limitation on the amount of wine that can be sold pursuant to a CFM sale permit. (Never Heard in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

AB 2520 (Thomson, Chapter 384, Statutes of 2000) authorizes the Department of ABC to issue a permit allowing winegrowers to sell wine at a CFM, as specified. The bill prohibited the licensee from selling more than 5,000 gallons of wine per year at a CFM.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, staff notes that the Department of ABC’s activities are funded by regulatory and license fees and generally the department does not receive support from the General Fund. New legislative mandates, although modest in scope, may in totality create new cost pressures and impact the department’s operating costs and future budget requests.

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

California Association of Winegrape Growers (Co-source)

Family Winemakers of California (Co-Source)  
Weiler Vineyards

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the Family Winemaker's of California, "California's wine industry continues to struggle amid dozens of local, global, and industry challenges that threaten growers and wineries alike. Last year marked the lightest California wine harvest in 20 years, down 23% from the year prior, leaving many vineyards abandoned and unpicked, with growers shouldering the cost of unsold fruit. Family-owned wineries, in particular, are finding it increasingly difficult to sell their products, leading to closures across the state. Expanding opportunities for winemakers to reach consumers is essential to support both producers and grape growers as demand declines."

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530  
4/14/26 16:16:10

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

---

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 930  
Author: Reyes (D)  
Amended: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 4/6/26  
AYES: Cabaldon, Jones, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes,  
Umberg, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Student Test Taker Privacy Protection Act: end-to-end encryption

**SOURCE:** First Day Foundation  
Los Amigos de la Comunidad

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires a business providing proctoring services to a local educational agency, as provided, to use end-to-end encryption (E2EE), as defined, in providing those services to protect personal information.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain privacy. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), article (art.) I, § 1.)
- 2) Prohibits a business providing proctoring services in an educational setting from collecting, retaining, using, or disclosing personal information except to the extent necessary to provide those proctoring services, as specified. (Business & Professions Code § 22588(a).)
- 3) Provides that the above restriction does not prohibit a business from collecting, using, retaining, or disclosing personal information if doing so is necessary for specified purposes, including to comply with federal or state laws or a court order or subpoena. (Business & Professions Code § 22588(b)).

- 4) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. It does not apply to government entities or nonprofits. (Civil Code § 1798.100 et seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires a business providing proctoring services to a local educational agency for classroom or course-based exams to use E2EE to provide those proctoring services.
- 2) Provides the following definitions:
  - a) “End-to-end encryption” or “EE2E” means a security method where data is encrypted on the sender’s device and remains encrypted until it reaches the intended recipient’s device and is unreadable by any other party, including the business providing proctoring services.
  - b) “Local educational agency” means a school district, county office of education, or charter school.

## **Background**

Proctoring software collects sensitive information, such as video, audio, and screen data, but most current systems lack robust encryption safeguards. E2EE ensures that data is encrypted on the student’s device and remains protected during transmission and storage, accessible only to authorized school personnel—not to the proctoring vendor itself, or any other party. Current law allows proctoring companies to use the data to provide the necessary proctoring services.

This bill fortifies the Student Test Taker Privacy Protection Act by requiring that businesses providing proctoring services to specified educational institutions use E2EE to provide those services. E2EE is defined as a security method where data is encrypted on the sender’s device and remains encrypted until it reaches the intended recipient’s device and is unreadable by any other party, including the business providing proctoring services.

This bill is sponsored by First Day Foundation and Los Amigos de la Comunidad. The bill is supported by a number of groups, including the Center for Digital

Democracy, the Alameda County Office of Education, and Oakland Privacy. No timely opposition has been received.

## Comments

Proctoring software collects sensitive information, such as video, audio, and screen data. Unfortunately, most current proctoring systems lack robust encryption safeguards to protect such sensitive student data. This bill attempts to address that gap by amending the Student Test Taker Privacy Protection Act to require a business providing proctoring services to a local educational agency for classroom or course-based exams to use E2EE to provide those proctoring services.

According to IBM:

End-to-end encryption (E2EE) is a secure communication process that encrypts data before transferring it to another endpoint. Data stays encrypted in transit and is decrypted on the recipient's device. Messaging apps, SMS, and other communications services rely on E2EE to protect messages from unauthorized access.

End-to-end encryption (E2EE) is widely considered the most private and secure method for communicating over a network.

Similar to other encryption methods, E2EE transforms readable plaintext into unreadable ciphertext by using cryptography. This process helps to mask sensitive information from unauthorized users and ensures that only the intended recipients—with the correct decryption key—can access sensitive data.<sup>1</sup>

E2EE ensures that data is encrypted on the student's device and remains protected during transmission and storage. The data is accessible only to authorized school personnel, but not to the proctoring vendor itself.

According to the author:

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, schools across California rapidly adopted online learning platforms and virtual assessments both inside and outside the classroom. Due to their flexibility and

---

<sup>1</sup> *What is end-to-end encryption (E2EE)?* IBM, <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/end-to-end-encryption> [as of March 29, 2026].

efficiency, these digital tools remain widely used, transforming our K-12 education system. Unfortunately, some third-party proctoring companies have collected sensitive student data far beyond what is necessary to administer exams, including biometric information, browsing history, and recordings from students' homes. This excessive data collection raises serious privacy and security concerns.

Existing laws such as the California Consumer Privacy Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act provide important privacy protections. However, as technology evolves and becomes more deeply embedded in education, additional safeguards are necessary to ensure those protections remain meaningful in practice.

SB 930 strengthens existing law by requiring proctoring companies to implement end-to-end encryption for online assessments. This ensures sensitive student data is protected from unauthorized access, reduces the risk of breaches, and reinforces the principle that students should be able to pursue their education without sacrificing their privacy. Protecting student data is a matter of educational equity, and as technology advances, so must California's commitment to keeping our youth safe.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/7/26)

First Day Foundation (co-source)  
Los Amigos de la Comunidad (co-source)  
Alameda County Office of Education  
Center for Digital Democracy  
Oakland Privacy  
Proctorio, Inc.  
Wonder Wood Ranch

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/7/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The Center for Digital Democracy writes:

Privacy is a fundamental right, and for students it is also a matter of data justice. Young people are required to use digital systems that collect highly sensitive information, often without meaningful choice,

creating structural risks and imbalances that demand stronger protections.

Online proctoring technologies highlight these concerns. They collect video, audio, biometric, and behavioral data, yet current safeguards remain inadequate. Students should not have to accept intrusive surveillance in order to participate in their education.

SB 930 takes an important privacy by design approach by requiring end-to-end encryption for online assessments. By ensuring that student data is encrypted on the student's device and remains inaccessible to proctoring vendors, the bill builds protection directly into the system and reduces the risk of misuse or breach from the outset.

This is a necessary step to rebalance power, limit unnecessary data access, and ensure that educational technology respects students' rights in practice.

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548, Bill  
Herms / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548  
4/8/26 16:35:54

\*\*\*\* 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 \*\*\*\*

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 941  
Author: Padilla (D), et al.  
Introduced: 1/29/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 3/17/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Pérez, Reyes, Wiener

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 4/14/26  
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, McNerney, Reyes,  
Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

---

**SUBJECT:** Private detention facilities: canteens

**SOURCE:** Immigrant Defense Advocates

---

**DIGEST:** This bill prohibits the sale price of canteen items at a private detention facility from exceeding a 35-percent markup above the amount paid to a vendor for the item.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to maintain a canteen at an active prison or institution under its jurisdiction for the sale to persons confined therein of toilet articles, candy, notions, and other sundries, and may provide the necessary facilities, equipment, personnel, and merchandise for the canteen. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 5005, subd. (a).)
- 2) Limits the sale prices of items offered in the state's prison canteens from exceeding a 35-percent markup above the amount paid to the vendors until January 1, 2028. (Pen. Code, § 5005, subd. (a).)

- 3) Defines “private detention facility” as “a detention facility that is operated by a private, nongovernmental, for-profit entity, and operating pursuant to a contract or agreement with a governmental entity.” (Government Code, § 9500, subd. (b).)

This bill:

- 1) Defines “commissary” as “any onsite or online store, canteen, vendor-operated program, or retail service that sells goods, food, hygiene supplies, phone cards, or other items to people confined in a private detention facility, whether operated directly by the facility or through a third-party contractor.”
- 2) Uses the definition of “private detention facility” that exists in current law.
- 3) Prohibits the sale price of an item offered for sale in a commissary at a private detention facility from exceeding a 35-percent markup above the amount paid to a vendor for that item.

## Background

The federal government contracts with private detention facilities across the country to house immigration detainees. There are currently seven private detention facilities operating in California in four counties—San Bernardino County, Kern County, San Diego County, and Imperial County. These facilities have been rife with issues, including poor medical care, substandard living conditions, sexual abuse and harassment, detainee deaths, and disproportionate use of force against individuals with mental health diagnoses. (Disability Rights California, *Newly Opened California City ICE Detention Facility: Dangerous for Disabled People* (Nov. 3, 2025)

<<https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/reports/california-city-ice-processing-center-a-dangerous-expansion-of-immigration-detention-in> [hereafter Disability Rights California Report]; Department of Justice, *Immigration Detention in California: A Comprehensive Review with a Focus on Mental Health 2025*

<<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/immigration-detention-2025.pdf> ; Andrea Castillo, *Immigrant detainees say they were harassed, sexually assaulted by guard who got promoted*, Los Angeles Times (Nov. 12, 2025)

<<https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2025-11-12/calif-immigrant-detainees-say-they-were-harassed-sexually-assaulted-by-guard-who-got-promoted> .) As a result, several lawsuits have been filed against the operators of these private

detention facilities. (See Rachel Uranga, *Why California's newest detention facility faces federal lawsuit over medical neglect and 'punitive' unsanitary conditions*, Los Angeles Times (Nov. 13, 2025)

<<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-11-13/immigrants-held-in-inhumane-conditions-at-california-detention-facility-sue-ice-dhs> ; Salvador Hernandez & Ruben Vives, *Adelanto ICE facility isn't meant to hold immigrants, it's meant to break them, lawsuit alleges*, Los Angeles Times (Jan. 26, 2026) <<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-01-26/lawsuit-alleges-inhumane-conditions-at-adelanto-ice-facility> .)

The Legislature has enacted several laws in recent years related to the conditions of private detention facilities. AB 3228 (Bonta), Chapter 190, Statutes of 2020, required any private detention facility operator to comply with, and adhere to, the detention standards of care and confinement agreed upon in the facility's contract for operations, and created a private right of action for individuals to sue if a private detention facility violated the requirement to comply with detention standards of care and confinement. AB 263 (Arambula), Chapter 294, Statutes of 2021, required a private detention facility operator to comply with, and adhere to, all local and state public health orders and occupational safety and health regulations. Finally, SB 1132 (Durazo), Chapter 183, Statutes of 2024, authorized a county or city health officer to investigate a private detention facility. SB 1132 was challenged by GEO Group, an operator of private detention facilities, which argued that the law was unconstitutional because it interfered with the federal government's authority to manage detention centers and GEO Group claimed it had intergovernmental immunity by extension as a contractor of the federal government. The lawsuit was dismissed in May of 2025. (Wendy Fry & Jeanne Kuang, *California gave counties power to inspect ICE detention centers. They're not using it*, Cal Matters (Oct. 2, 2025) <<https://calmatters.org/justice/2025/10/ice-detention-center-inspections/> .)

### *Canteens*

A canteen is a store located in a detention facility where the incarcerated population can purchase toiletries, stationery, snacks, and other personal items. In 2023, the Legislature enacted SB 474 (Chapter 609, Statutes of 2023) to temporarily cap the markup of canteen items in the state's prisons to no more than 35% of the price CDCR paid to the vendor. At the time, advocates argued that canteen items had unreasonably high prices compared to the prices of the same or similar items available to the general public and cited a report that found that 60% of the formerly incarcerated individuals surveyed could not afford canteen

purchases while incarcerated, which sometimes led individuals to resort to extreme measures to gain access to canteen items such as engaging in gang activity and sexual relationships. (Leslie Soble, Kathryn Stroud, and Marika Weinstein, *Eating Behind Bars: Ending the Hidden Punishment of Food in Prison* (2020), p. 11 available at <<https://impactjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/IJ-Eating-Behind-Bars.pdf> .)

The proponents of this bill contend that items sold in the canteens in private detention facilities have similarly inflated and unreasonable prices. They argue that the high prices are especially problematic when considering that some canteen items are necessary for survival. For example, an inspection last year of the California City Detention Facility revealed that the facility's water was arguably unsafe to drink—it was brown with an unpleasant taste. (Disability Rights California Report, *supra*.) As a result, detainees had to rely on bottled water sold at the canteen but due to its high price, detainees could not afford to purchase sufficient water and suffered from dehydration. (*Ibid.*) This bill prohibits the price of an item offered for sale in a commissary at a private detention facility from exceeding a 35-percent markup above the amount paid to a vendor for that item.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/15/26)

Immigrant Defense Advocates (source)  
ACLU California Action  
Anti-Recidivism Coalition  
California Collaborative for Immigrant Justice  
California Community Foundation  
California Department of Justice  
California Public Defenders Association  
Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño  
Courage California  
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights  
GLIDE  
Imperial Valley Equity & Justice Coalition  
Jesse's Place  
Justice2Jobs Coalition  
La Defensa  
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children  
MILPA  
Oasis Legal Services

Riverside Sheriffs' Association  
Rubicon Programs  
San Francisco Public Defender's Office  
Secure Justice  
Smart Justice California  
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center  
The Place4Grace  
Uprise Theatre

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/15/26)

None received

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /  
4/20/26 9:40:32

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 949  
Author: Becker (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-0, 3/24/26  
AYES: Becker, Allen, Cabaldon, Laird, Stern  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Environmental protection: Natural Resources Agency: landscape of statewide significance: Santa Cruz Mountains

**SOURCE:** Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District  
Sempervirens Fund

---

**DIGEST:** This bill establishes the Santa Cruz Mountains, as specified, as a landscape of statewide significance that requires special protection.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Coyote Valley Conservation Program within the Santa Clara Valley Open-Space Authority and establishes the Coyote Valley as a resource of statewide significance facing intense development pressure and in need of restoration, conservation, and enhancement (Public Resources Code (PRC) §§35180 and 35182).
  - a) Requires Coyote Valley to be acknowledged as an area of statewide significance in local planning documents affecting land use within Coyote Valley.
  - b) Allocates 25 million dollars to the Coyote Valley Conservation Program, via the State Coastal Conservancy (PRC §91032; The Safe Drinking Water,

Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024 (Proposition 4)).

- 2) Establishes the East Bay Hills Conservation Program within East Bay Regional Parks and establishes the East Bay Hills as a resource of statewide cultural, historical, and environmental significance facing development pressures and impacts from growing urbanization which threaten their ecological integrity and recreational value (PRC §5598).
  - a) Requires the East Bay Hills be acknowledged as an area of statewide significance in local land use policy documents affecting land use within the area (PRC §5598(g)).
  - b) Allows the Department of Fish and Wildlife to consider, when determining the value of compensatory mitigation credits for wildlife connectivity actions, improved connectivity in critical terrestrial habitats in the Santa Cruz Mountains, among other locales (Fish and Game Code (FGC) §1957(c)(4)).

This bill:

- 1) Defines the geographic scope of the “Santa Cruz Mountains.”
- 2) Designates the Santa Cruz Mountains as a resource of statewide significance requiring special protection, as defined in PRC §90100.
- 3) Requires the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) and its boards, departments, and conservancies to encourage collaborative stewardship approaches that support:
  - a) Protection, restoration, and preservation of the Santa Cruz Mountains’ natural ecosystems.
  - b) Restoration and preservation of wildlife habitat in the Santa Cruz Mountains.
  - c) Promotion of healthy forest management in the Santa Cruz Mountains.
  - d) Improvement of watershed management in the Santa Cruz Mountains.
  - e) Development and maintenance of trails for public access and other recreational opportunities in the Santa Cruz Mountains.
  - f) Promotion of the long-term sustainability and conservation of working lands in the Santa Cruz Mountains to ensure they remain viable while contributing to the region’s overall environmental health.
  - g) Collaboration with local tribes to protect tribal cultural resources, partner on restoration and management efforts, and support opportunities for tribal

access, cultural practices, and the potential for co-management of ancestral lands in the Santa Cruz Mountains.

- h) Promotion of voluntary stewardship on public and private lands in the Santa Cruz Mountains through technical assistance, conservation easements, incentive programs, and multibenefit projects that contribute to the landscape-level goals of ecological health and climate resilience.
- 4) Establishes that sections 1) – 3) above shall not be construed as authorizing CNRA to impose additional regulatory requirements on land use or working lands in the Santa Cruz Mountains.
- 5) Makes related and supporting findings and declarations.

## **Background**

*Significant ecological values in Santa Cruz.* The Santa Cruz Mountains hold significant ecological value as a vital hotspot for biodiversity along California’s central coast. The region supports over 350 locally rare native plant species, as well as federally and/or state listed endangered species, including the California red-legged frog and marbled murrelet, San Francisco garter snake, Zayante band-winged grasshopper, and the Santa Cruz black salamander.

Its forests and coast redwoods filter water that flows into some of the most critical watersheds in the state. In addition, roughly 5 million people are within 20 miles of this mountain range, creating intense pressure on its wildlife, recreation, and other natural resources.

## **Comments**

*No associated Conservation Program?* Both of the bills previously authorizing resources of significance created managing programs for those areas within existing regional parks and open space districts (East Bay Regional Parks/East Bay Hills Conservation Program and Santa Clara Open Space Authority/Coyote Valley Conservation Program, respectively). These programs are specifically structured to provide authorities to the conservation programs to address the resource and recreational goals of their respective geographies, and have a regional coordinating agency through which funds may be allocated.

This bill establishes the Santa Cruz Mountains as a landscape of statewide significance, but does not establish an accompanying conservation program to administer programs to implement the “special protection” for the area called for in

the bill. Instead, this bill requires the CNRA and its boards, departments, and conservancies to encourage collaborative stewardship approaches that support those protections. Without such a conservation program, it is unclear who's responsibility and authority it is to implement the protection called for in the bill.

As this bill moves forward through the Legislative process, the author may wish to consider additional amendments to align this designation with the previous designations of resources of statewide significance which may include:

- A) Establishing a conservation program within an existing regional park or open space district to administer and implement funding and projects to protect the area, rather than state agencies; and
- B) Requiring local land use planning documents affecting the Santa Cruz Mountains to include an acknowledgement of the statewide significance of this resource.

### **Related Legislation**

SB 392 (Grayson, Chapter 754, Statutes of 2025) established the East Bay Hills as a resource of statewide cultural, historical, and environmental significance, facing development pressures and impacts from growing urbanization.

AB 948 (Kalra, Chapter 356, Statutes of 2019) established the Coyote Valley as a resource of statewide significance subject to intense development pressure.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/2026)

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (Co-source)  
Sempervirens Fund (Co-source)  
Amah Mutsun Land Trust  
County of Santa Clara  
Green Foothills  
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County  
Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency  
Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/2026)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the author, “The Santa Cruz Mountains are one of the California’s most important natural landscapes- not just because of their ecological value, but because of their direct connection to millions of Californians. Few natural landscapes play such a direct role in protecting the health, safety, water supply, and quality of life of so many people. “

“In addition to the biological uniqueness, the region plays a critical role in sustaining ecological processes that support the broader landscape, including providing critical water infrastructure and working lands.”

“Despite their ecological and recreational importance, there are currently no statewide policies that formally recognize the distinctiveness of the Santa Cruz Mountains. By enshrining the Santa Cruz Mountains in statute as an area of statewide significance, the Natural Resources Agency and its boards, departments, and conservancies will be better equipped to protect, restore, and preserve the natural ecosystems, habitats, and watersheds, while supporting healthy forest management alongside advancing public access and recreational opportunities.”

Prepared by: Edith Hannigan / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116  
4/15/26 11:53:16

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 969  
Author: Reyes (D)  
Amended: 3/23/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/6/26  
AYES: Becker, Ochoa Bogh, Laird, Pérez, Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Developmental services: remote services

**SOURCE:** California Disability Services Association

---

**DIGEST:** This bill (1) requires the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to develop a list of regional center services eligible for remote delivery and develop guidance to regional centers that includes specified processes related to implementation; (2) authorizes an individual and their family to voluntarily elect to receive remote services, as available, if it is determined that remote delivery would effectively meet the needs of the individual.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing Law:

- 1) Establishes the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act), which states that California is responsible for providing a range of services and supports sufficiently complete to meet the needs and choices of each person with developmental disabilities, regardless of age or degree of disability, and at each stage of life, and to support their integration into the mainstream life of the community. (Welfare and Institutions Code [WIC] § 4500 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes a system of nonprofit regional centers, overseen by DDS, to provide fixed points of contact in the community for all persons with developmental

disabilities and their families to coordinate services and supports best suited to them throughout their lifetime. (WIC § 4620)

- 3) Establishes an Individual Program Plan (IPP) as the process to ensure that services and supports are customized to meet the needs of consumers who are served by regional centers for the purpose of alleviating a developmental disability or toward the social, personal, physical, or economic habilitation or rehabilitation of an individual with a developmental disability, or toward the achievement and maintenance of independent, productive, and normal lives. (WIC § 4512(b))
- 4) Authorizes a regional center to purchase services or supports for a consumer from an individual or agency that the regional center and consumer or, if appropriate, the consumer's parents, legal guardian, or conservator, or authorized representative, determines will best accomplish all or part of that consumer's program plan. (WIC § 4648(a)(3)(A))
- 5) Authorizes the director of DDS to issue directives to the regional centers as the director deems necessary to protect consumer rights, health, safety, or welfare. Requires a regional center to comply with any directive issued by the director. Prohibits the directive from being in conflict with existing statutes or regulations. (WIC § 4639.6)

This bill:

- 1) Requires DDS to develop a list of regional center services eligible for remote delivery.
- 2) Requires DDS to develop, distribute, and post on its internet website guidance to regional centers to implement remote services that includes both of the following:
  - a) A process for informing individuals and their families of the option to voluntarily receive remote services.
  - b) Requirements for service providers offering remote services, including the processes for authorization, billing, and documentation.
- 3) Authorizes an individual and their family to voluntarily elect to receive remote services, as available, if it is determined in the IPP meeting that remote delivery would effectively meet the needs of the individual.

## Background

*Purpose of this Bill.* According to the author, “SB 969 would make the option of remote delivery a permanent resource for Californians with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD). During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of Developmental Services issued a directive temporarily authorizing remote delivery for specified regional center services for Californians with IDD, ensuring the continuity of care and support during unprecedented times. What began as an emergency response has proven to be a transformative and highly effective approach for service delivery. The option for remote access to employment programs, educational services, therapy, and healthcare has led to community empowerment and independence not only for individuals with intellectual disabilities, but also for their families and caregivers. The Department has extended this temporary directive several times, but statutory changes are necessary to make this directive permanent. This bill addresses this issue by codifying remote service flexibility into law, leveraging this powerful tool to address disparities in healthcare access for all communities and affirming our commitment to inclusive health care delivery.”

*Lanterman Act.* In 1969, the Lanterman Act established that individuals with developmental disabilities and their families have a right to receive the necessary services and supports required to live independently in the community. The Lanterman Act enumerates the rights of individuals with developmental disabilities, as well as the rights of their families, what services and supports are available to these individuals, and how regional centers and service providers work together to provide these services and supports. The term “developmental disability” is defined as a disability that originates before a person reaches 18 years of age, is expected to continue indefinitely, and is a significant disability for the individual. Such disabilities include, among others: epilepsy, autism spectrum disorder, intellectual disability, and cerebral palsy.

In addition to establishing the rights of individuals, the Lanterman Act also created California’s regional center system, comprised of 21 nonprofit regional centers throughout the state whose primary purpose is to connect individuals with services in the community. The Department of Finance estimates that approximately 489,254 individuals will receive developmental services in 2025–26, increasing to 526,848 in 2026–27.

*Individual Program Plan (IPP).* Services for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities are outlined in an IPP, which is developed according to

the needs and personal choices of the individual. The IPP is developed by an IPP team, which often includes the consumer, their legally authorized representative, and one or more regional center representatives. The IPP serves as a tool to maximize the opportunities for each consumer to develop relationships, integrate into community life, increase control over their life, and obtain positive roles in the community. The IPP is required to prioritize the services and supports that allow minors to live with their families and adults to live in the community as independently as possible. Regional center consumers receiving traditional services are assigned a service coordinator who is responsible for implementing, overseeing, and monitoring the consumer's IPP.

*Individualized Service Plan.* An individualized service plan is a plan informed by the consumer and prepared by the provider that identifies and describes the services that will be provided to support the person's needs, goals, and objectives. An individualized service plan may also be referred to as individualized service design, treatment plan, or plan of care. Providers must develop an individualized service plan for each consumer based on their IPP and maintain documentation of each consumer's progress toward achieving expected outcomes, including any needed adjustments. An individualized service plan is required for each consumer, regardless of whether they receive services in person or remotely.

*Remote Service Delivery.* Statute authorizes the director of DDS to issue directives to regional centers as deemed necessary to protect consumer rights, health, safety, or welfare, and requires regional centers to follow department directives. In July 2020, DDS issued a directive to regional centers to provide guidance on the alternative service delivery framework to continue to provide services that meet consumers' needs and limit potential exposure to COVID-19. At this time, providers were required to submit a certification to the regional center describing remote or alternate services they intended to provide and the health and safety measures that would be employed. Providers were also required to maintain documentation related to alternative services and submit a quarterly report.

In November 2022, DDS announced through a directive that consumers could voluntarily choose remote delivery of day programs, look-a-like day programs, and independent living services. Regional centers were required to inform consumers of the option to voluntarily choose remote delivery of these services, and providers were required to engage with consumers to determine if, and to what extent, each consumer prefers remote delivery of services. Behavioral therapy services and clinical assessment activities for Lanterman Act eligibility were added as eligible

for remote delivery in February 2023. After two extensions, the current sunset for remote service delivery is December 31, 2026.

This bill would make permanent a consumer's ability to choose to receive services through remote delivery. DDS shared these findings in its March 2025 directive: "The Department finds that remote services provided during the COVID-19 pandemic, and post pandemic, have been useful in ensuring continuity of and access to services, and may remove some barriers for individuals and families to receiving services. Additionally, remote services, when chosen by individuals and families, have played an important role in protecting an individual's welfare."

According to California Disability Services Association, sponsor of this bill, remote service delivery has become essential to nationwide efforts to provide person-centered supports.

### **Comments**

This bill seeks to make permanent regional center consumers' ability to choose remote services when remote delivery would support the goals outlined in their IPP. Consumers have been able to utilize remote services since July 2020. A consumer may choose remote service delivery because it is convenient or more comfortable for them, or because it protects their health for individuals who are more vulnerable or immunocompromised. Although there is limited data on the current utilization of remote services, according to DDS, providers have anecdotally shared that remote services are in high demand.

Since issuing the original directive allowing for remote delivery of regional center services, DDS has extended remote service authority several times, citing the benefits to service continuity and increased access for individuals and their families. The current authority to receive and provide remote services is set to expire December 31, 2026. The most recent remote services directive states that DDS does not intend to further extend this deadline outside of statutory authorization. Trailer bill language (TBL) included in the Governor's Budget proposes to authorize consumers and families to choose to receive specified services remotely if offered by the authorized service provider if receiving those services remotely would effectively meet the needs identified through the IPP process. The TBL limits services eligible to be received remotely to day programs, look-a-like day programs, independent living programs, behavioral therapy services, clinical assessment activities for Lanterman Act eligibility, and any other services determined by DDS that could appropriately address a need of a consumer

identified in an IPP. The TBL would additionally require providers to document the number of remote services each individual receives on a monthly basis.

This bill proposes a more formal structure to establish the ongoing provision of remote services. This bill would require DDS to develop a list of regional center services eligible for remote delivery and develop implementation guidance for regional centers, including processes for authorization, billing, and documentation.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AB 162 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 47, Statutes of 2024) removed the sunset date for meetings regarding the provision of services and supports by a regional center, including an IPP meeting, to be held by remote electronic communications if requested by the consumer, or, if appropriate, by the consumer's parents, legal guardian, conservator, or authorized representative. The bill required a regional center to hold an in-person meeting or visit if a regional center has not held an in-person meeting or visit with a consumer in the previous 12 months.

AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 44, Statutes of 2023), a budget trailer bill, extended the sunset date for remote meetings regarding regional center services and supports until June 30, 2024.

SB 188 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 49, Statutes of 2022), a budget trailer bill, required DDS to develop a pilot project to test the feasibility of remote consumer services and supports that use technology solutions. The bill also added remote electronic communication as a flexibility option for tailored day services and extended the sunset date for remote meetings regarding regional center services and supports until June 30, 2023.

AB 136 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 76, Statutes of 2021), a budget trailer bill, authorized, remote meetings regarding regional center services and supports until June 30, 2022.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

California Disability Services Association (Sponsor)

Adjoin

Alchemia

Arc Imperial Valley

Autism Speaks  
California Respite Association  
Care-rite Vocational Services INC  
Cedars  
College of Adaptive Arts  
Disability Rights California  
East Bay Legislative Coalition  
Hope Services  
Inalliance  
Jay Nolan Community Services  
Manos Home Care INC.  
Merakey  
Momentum  
Momentum Work INC.  
On My Own Independent Living Services  
Oparc  
Options for All  
Pathpoint  
Porterville Sheltered Workshop  
Scdd  
Simplyhome LLC  
The Arc Fresno Madera Counties  
Tri-county Respite Care Service  
Ukiah Valley Association for Habilitation

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Diana Dominguez / HUMAN S. / (916) 651-1524  
4/21/26 16:19:35

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 971  
Author: Choi (R), et al.  
Amended: 4/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 11-0, 3/25/26

AYES: Weber Pierson, Valladares, Caballero, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove,  
Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 4-0, 4/20/26

AYES: Becker, Niello, Laird, Weber Pierson

NO VOTE RECORDED: Pérez

---

**SUBJECT:** Healthy Aging Community Partnerships Program

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill provides that a local health department, area agency on aging, local school district, or other appropriate county department, may establish community-based programs for older adults designed to promote healthy aging, social engagement, and independent living in collaboration with relevant local entities, including school districts, libraries, faith institutions, and community organizations.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing Law:

- 1) Establishes the Older Americans Act, which promotes the well-being of Americans 60 years old and above through services and programs designed to meet their needs. (42 United States Code § 3001 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the Mello-Granlund Older Californians Act, which establishes the California Department of Aging (CDA), and sets forth its duties and powers, including, among other things, entering into a contract for the development of

information and materials to educate Californians on the concept of “aging in place.” (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 9100 et seq.)

- 3) Requires the Secretary of California Health and Human Services (CalHHS), in coordination with the Director of CDA, to lead the development and implementation of the Master Plan on Aging established pursuant to Executive Order N-14-19. (WIC § 9850)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that a local health department, area agency on aging, local school district, or other appropriate county department, may establish community-based programs for older adults designed to promote healthy aging, social engagement, and independent living in collaboration with relevant local entities, including school districts, libraries, faith institutions, and community organizations.
- 2) Provides that if a local entity establishes a community-based program, the program activities may include, but are not limited to, technology assistance, physical activity, music or arts programming, cultural programming, language learning opportunities, shared meals, and other community-based enrichment activities that support healthy aging and social connection.
- 3) Defines “older adults” as persons 55 years of age or older.
- 4) Provides that these programs are not mandatory for any local entity or department to implement.
- 5) Provides that implementation is subject to the availability of local resources and partnerships.

## Comments

According to the author, “California’s older adult population is growing rapidly, yet no designated public system is responsible for coordinating education and prevention services tailored to their real-life needs. SB 971 addresses this gap by establishing a statutory framework that authorizes counties to deliver older adult education. By partnering with community-based organizations, this approach aims to improve health outcomes, promote independence, and enhance quality of life for Californians age 55 and over.”

*Aging Californians* California is projected to be home to 10.8 million people age 60 and older by 2030. This is nearly twice as many people age 60 and older as there were in 2010. Additionally, by 2030 one out of every four Californians will be older adults. The state is making efforts to meet the needs of this growing population. In January 2021, the Newsom Administration published its Master Plan for Aging, which is intended to be a ten-year blueprint for state government, local government, the private sector, and philanthropy to prepare the state for the coming demographic changes and “continue California’s leadership in aging, disability, and equity.” The five goals of the Master Plan are: housing for all ages and stages; health reimaged; inclusion and equity, not isolation; caregiving that works; and affording aging.

This bill seeks to expand educational opportunities available to older adults. It further provides that program activities may include, but are not limited to, technology assistance, physical activity, music or arts programming, cultural programming, language learning opportunities, shared meals, and other community-based enrichment activities that support healthy aging and social connection. These proposed educational programs could help to achieve the goals in the Master Plan for Aging by reducing older adult isolation as well as spreading awareness of programs and strategies to help older adults stay healthy and active.

*Area Agencies on Aging (AAA)* The CDA administers programs serving older adults through contracts with local agencies in 33 locations across the state which provide a wide array of services on a community level to seniors and adults with disabilities. Each county is required to have an AAA to ensure all communities have access to local aging programs and to provide information and services for older adults. Some AAAs serve multiple counties at once. For example, one AAA serves Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou and Trinity counties. AAA programs often include long-term care ombudsman services, nutrition services, caregiver support and respite, Medicare counseling, legal referrals, transportation, and case management.

*Older Adult Education* Older adult education is noncredit courses offered to promote lifelong learning. Previously, older adult education programs were overseen by local school districts, with funding provided to those school districts to provide services to older adults. After the Great Recession of 2008, older adult education was consolidated into the community college system. This consolidation effectively eliminated older adult specific education as a distinct public service. California’s older adult education is now done primarily through the California Adult Education Program which offers free, noncredit, flexible courses on topics such as digital literacy and health.

This bill seeks to fill the gap of direct older adult education caused by the post-recession consolidation. It allows local entities to partner with county departments to establish older adult education programs.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 1249 (Roth, Chapter 337, Statutes of 2024), among other provisions, requires CDA, by September 30, 2026, to take various actions, including, among others, identify the core programs and services to be provided to older adults and family caregivers, and develop a statewide consumer engagement plan. Requires CDA to develop regulations that address specified topics related to AAA designations.

AB 3207 (Patterson of 2024) would have required the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to establish and administer a toll-free hotline to assist all Californians dealing with scams. The bill would have required CDSS to ensure that the program and its staff are equipped to meet the needs of individuals who are 60 years of age and older. AB 3207 was held on the Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file.

SB 228 (Jackson, Chapter 742, Statutes of 2019) requires the Secretary of CalHHS, in coordination with the Director of CDA, to lead the development and implementation of the Master Plan on Aging.

AB 2800 (Granlund, Chapter 1097, Statutes of 1996) amended the Older Californians Act by establishing new programs and making structural changes to service delivery.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 04/22/2026)

LeadingAge California

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 04/22/2026)

None received

Prepared by: Heather Hopkins / HUMAN S. / (916) 651-1524  
4/22/26 16:11:11

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

**THIRD READING**

---

Bill No: SB 977  
Author: Weber Pierson (D)  
Amended: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 11-0, 3/25/26

AYES: Weber Pierson, Valladares, Caballero, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove,  
Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Chain restaurants: children's meals

**SOURCE:** American Diabetes Association (co-source)  
American Heart Association (co-source)

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires a chain restaurant that sells a children's meal to offer at least one that meets specified nutritional requirements.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Retail Food Code (CalCode) to provide for the regulation of retail food facilities. Health and sanitation standards are established at the state level through the CalCode, while enforcement is charged to local agencies, carried out by the 58 county environmental health departments, and four city environmental health departments (Berkeley, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Vernon). [Health and Safety Code (HSC) §113700, et seq.]
- 2) Defines a "food facility" as an operation that stores, prepares, packages, serves, vends, or otherwise provides food for human consumption at the retail level.

Excludes various entities from the definition of a “food facility,” including a cottage food operation, and a church, private club, or other nonprofit association that gives or sells food to its members and guests, and not to the general public, at an event that occurs no more than three days in any 90-day period. [HSC §113789]

- 3) Requires a restaurant that sells children’s meals to make the default beverage offered with the children’s meal one of the following:
  - a) Water, sparkling, or flavored water, with no added natural or artificial sweeteners;
  - b) Unflavored milk; or,
  - c) A nondairy milk alternative that contains no more than 130 calories per container or serving that meets the standards for the National School Lunch Program. [HSC §114379.20]
- 4) Defines “children’s meal,” for purposes of the requirement in 3) above, as a combination of food items and a beverage, or a single food item and a beverage sold together at a single price intended primarily for consumption by a child. [HSC §114379.10]
- 5) Specifies that the requirement in 3) above does not prohibit a restaurant’s ability to sell an alternative beverage instead of the default beverage offered with the meal, if requested by the purchaser. [HSC §114379.30]
- 6) Specifies that a violation of the requirements described in 3) above is an infraction, with a first violation resulting in a notice of violation, a second violation within a five-year period from the initial notice of violation subject to a \$250 fine, and a third or subsequent violation within a five-year period subject to a fine of up to \$500. [HSC §114379.50]
- 7) Requires a food facility, defined in federal law as a chain restaurant with 20 or more locations, to comply with federal menu labeling requirements that provide calorie and other nutritional information. Provides for local enforcement of the menu labeling requirement, and provides for a fine of between \$50 and \$500 for a first violation, between \$100 and \$1,000 for a second violation in a five-year period, and a fine of between \$250 and \$2,500 for subsequent violations. [HSC §114094]

This bill:

- 1) Requires a chain restaurant that sells children's meals to offer at least one that meets the following minimum nutrition standard:
  - a) Does not contain more than: 550 calories; 700 milligrams of sodium; 10% of calories from saturated fat; 15 grams of added sugar; or, 0 grams of trans fat; or,
  - b) Contains at least two of the following servings:
    - i) One-half of a cup or more of fruit. Requires 100% fruit juice to be considered a serving of fruit for the purposes of this bill;
    - ii) One-half of a cup or more of vegetables;
    - iii) One-half of a cup or more nonfat or low-fat dairy;
    - iv) Meat or a meat alternative equal to at least one of the following: one ounce of meat, poultry, or seafood; one egg; one-fourth of a cup of soy products or pulses, including beans, peas, or lentils; two tablespoons of nut butter; or, one ounce of nuts and seeds; or,
    - v) Eight or more grams of whole grains that meets at least one of the following conditions:
      - (1) The serving contains 50% or more of whole grain ingredients; or,
      - (2) The first ingredient in the serving's ingredient list, in descending order of predominance, is whole grains.
- 2) Requires a chain restaurant to include an icon or symbol on the menu to identify the children's meal that meets the requirements of this bill. Requires the icon or symbol and accompanying text to be displayed prominently, clearly, and conspicuously next to or directly under the name of the healthy children's meal, and at a height no smaller than the largest letter in the name of the item.
- 3) Requires a chain restaurant, by July 1, 2027, to include information on how to comply with the requirements of this bill during an employee's ongoing training program and a new employee's training process.
- 4) Defines "chain restaurant" as a restaurant or similar retail food establishment that is part of a chain with 20 or more locations doing business under the same name and offering for sale substantially the same menu items, regardless of the type of ownership of the locations.

## Comments

According to the author of this bill:

“I am deeply committed to ensuring that all children in California have access to healthy meals that support their growth and development. As a physician, I’ve seen the alarming impact of poor nutrition on children’s health, and as a mother, I know how challenging it can be to find healthy options when dining out. Currently, our state faces a childhood obesity crisis, and we must take action now to reverse these trends. This bill is an important step forward by requiring chain restaurants to offer healthier meal options for children, helping families make better food choices. By setting clear nutritional standards and providing training for restaurant employees, we are making it easier for parents to provide healthy meals for their kids, no matter where they eat. I know how important it is to set our children up for a healthy future. This bill will help ensure that children’s meals not only meet basic nutritional standards but also support children’s long-term health. It’s time to prioritize our children’s well-being and take steps toward a healthier California for all.”

## Background

Information provided by the author’s office states that restaurants are a key source of food for families in California. Families with children consume food away from home four to five times a week on average. Between 2015 and 2018, children ages two to 11 years old consumed an average of 11.4% of their daily calories from fast food alone. While some chain restaurants such as McDonald’s have made their kids’ meals healthier, much of the food offered on restaurant children’s menus does not meet minimum nutrition standards for healthy meals. A 2018 analysis of kids’ meal combinations at the top 50 U.S. restaurant chains (as ranked by revenue) found that, among the chains with kids’ menus, 71.9% of kids’ meals did not meet expert nutrition standards for calories, total fat, saturated fat and trans fat combined, and sodium.

*Childhood obesity.* The Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health notes that a recent federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) report found that childhood obesity in the U.S. has reached its highest rate ever recorded. Between 2021 and 2023, 21.1% of American youth ages two to 19 were obese, whereas the same report in the 1970s found that between 1971 and 1974, just 5.2% of children and teens were obese. In the 2010s, obesity rates among youth ages two to five were on the decline, dropping from 12.1% between 2009 and 2010 to 9.4%

between 2013 and 2014. In 2017, 40% of 5th graders, 38% of 7th graders, and 36% of 9th graders were overweight or obese for their age. Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, Latino and Black children had disproportionately higher rates of obesity than other racial and ethnic groups. Today, the rate for those aged two to five has jumped to 14.9%. According to the CDC, about one in five American children have obesity. Compared to children with healthy weight, children with obesity are at a higher risk for asthma, sleep apnea, bone and joint problems, type 2 diabetes, high blood pressure, and mental health concerns like depression and anxiety. Children with obesity are more likely to have obesity as adults. Adults with obesity have higher risks for stroke, many types of cancer, heart disease, type 2 diabetes, premature death and mental health issues. Factors that influence obesity include genes, eating patterns, physical activity levels, access to health care, and sleep routines. Also, conditions where we live, learn, work, and play affect access to healthy food and safe places to be physically active. The CDC states that though there is no one solution to addressing obesity, there are many ways parents and caregivers can help children have a healthy weight and set up lifelong healthy habits at home, such as: modeling a healthy eating pattern; being more physically active as a family; setting simple routines for better sleep; replacing screen time with family time; looking for childcare that supports healthy habits; and, finding a family healthy weight program.

*Examples of restaurant kids' meals policies.* The Center for Science in the Public Interest notes that since 2010, various local governments and states have enacted policies regarding kids' meals. In May 2010, Santa Clara County was the first to enact a policy restricting the type of beverage a kids' meal could include if the meal comes with a toy or other incentive. The City and County of San Francisco enacted the same policy in November 2010. The City of Davis passed a default beverage policy (water, milk, or milk alternative) in June 2015, with the following local governments passing the same policy in 2016 and 2017: Stockton, Perris, Berkeley, Santa Clara County, Cathedral City, Long Beach, and Daly City. In 2018, California was the first state to implement a statewide default beverage bill via SB 1195 (Monning, Chapter 608, Statutes of 2018).

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

Senate Rule 28.8

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

American Diabetes Association (co-source)

American Heart Association (co-source)

California Medical Association  
California State Alliance of YMCAs

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The cosponsors of this bill, American Diabetes Association and the American Heart Association, state that this bill takes an important step toward improving the dietary environment for California's children and protecting them from the associated early health risk factors. Both associations argue that not only will this bill help address those concerns by ensuring parents and guardians have at least one clearly identifiable, healthier children's meal option, but it also addresses the issue of equity. National and local studies across the U.S. suggest that residents of low-income, minority, and rural neighborhoods are most often affected by poor access to supermarkets and healthy food. In contrast, the availability of fast-food restaurants and energy-dense foods has been found to be greater in lower-income and minority neighborhoods. These structural inequities shape children's diets. They further argue that parents understand their kids' needs and how to determine appropriate meals, but even the most informed parents cannot choose a healthier option if one doesn't exist where they are dining. This bill preserves complete parental choice while expanding the range of options available to families in communities where nutritious choices are often limited. The California State Alliance of YMCAs states that Tufts University researchers assessed the children's meal combinations available in the 10 largest quick-service and 10 largest full-service chain restaurants by sales in 2014, and found that less than one-third of these meal combinations at quick-service and one-quarter at full-service restaurants met expert recommendations for calories, fat, saturated fat, and sodium. Despite this limited availability, some chains do offer healthy children's meals, demonstrating that it is feasible.

Prepared by: Reyes Diaz / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111  
4/20/26 11:48:39

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 990  
Author: Grove (R)  
Amended: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 12-0, 4/7/26

AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Gonzalez, Grayson,  
Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Valladares, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Highways: exit information

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill allows the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to place signs along State Route (SR) 395 near the City of Ridgecrest as part of its Specific Services Sign Program.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law requires all states to create highway safety programs and adhere to uniform standards promulgated by the United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT). (Title 23 United States Code § 402)

Existing state law:

- 1) Provides that Caltrans has full possession and control of the state highway system. (State Highway Code (SHC) § 90)
- 2) Requires Caltrans to adopt rules and regulations for prescribing uniform standards and specifications for all traffic control devices. (Vehicle Code § 21400)

- 3) Directs Caltrans to adopt rules and regulations for its Specific Service Sign Program. As part of these rules, Caltrans must:
  - a) Ensure all business applicants have equal access to the program (SHC § 101.7(b)); and,
  - b) Ensure signs are not placed within urban areas designated by the United States Census Bureau as having a population of 5,000 or more. (SHC § 101.7(c))

This bill authorizes, despite the 5,000 person population limit, the placement of specific service signs at two specified locations of SR 395 near the City of Ridgecrest, until January 1, 2037.

### Comments

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author “This bill provides a narrow exception to allow business logo signage along U.S. Route 395 at the China Lake Boulevard exit serving Ridgecrest. Ridgecrest’s essential services are not visible from the highway and are located several miles off the roadway, despite serving motorists traveling a remote 120-mile corridor with limited service options. The bill improves traveler awareness, supports fatigue mitigation on a rural highway, and aligns with prior legislative exceptions granted to similarly situated communities.”
- 2) *General Service Sign Program.* General services signs are white-on-blue signs and are intended to guide motorists to services that are not readily apparent to the driver. A typical general service sign is rectangular and displays an icon, such as a gas pump to indicate access to a gas station. Other services that can be indicated include, among others, hospitals, food, lodging, and electrical vehicle charging. Notably, general services signs do not indicate the specific name of the business offering the service identified.
- 3) *Specific Service Sign Program.* In addition to general service signs, California law sets forth the Specific Service Sign Program, designed to direct motorists not familiar with the area to specific services at or near rural freeway interchanges. Unlike general service signs, these signs display the logos of particular businesses located in the vicinity. Under the program, eligible businesses request to have a sign created and must pay for its cost. Caltrans then approves the request and erects the sign, in compliance with the regulations in

the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUCTD). The program is explicitly designed to serve rural areas, and by statute is only authorized in areas with a population of less than 5,000.

Specific service signs accommodate up to six logos per type of service, and only four signs may be installed in a single location. Specific service signs are also limited to only displaying gas, electric vehicle (EV) charging, food, lodging, camping, 24-hour pharmacy, or attraction services. Furthermore, each service type must meet specific requirements regarding the exact services offered, total operating hours, and distance to the highway in order to qualify.

- 4) *The City of Ridgecrest.* Ridgecrest is a city with a population of roughly 28,000 located at the eastern edge of Kern County. It is located several miles east of SR 395 and is the largest city along the highway. It also exists in the middle of a large rural area, where services are often few and far between. Ridgecrest itself offers numerous services; however the city is not easily visible from the highway. The City of Ridgecrest has argued that this creates unsafe conditions on the state highway as fatigued motorists push past Ridgecrest, not realizing they can stop in the city.

Due to its population, the city is not currently eligible for the Specific Service Signs Program, however it should be noted that general services signs do currently exist along the highway near exits leading to the city. Caltrans District 9, in which Ridgecrest is located, is also currently working to revitalize the existing general service signs in the area. This bill would make an exception to the population limit for the Specific Service Sign Program for the city of Ridgecrest. This would allow businesses to request, and Caltrans to erect, business logo signs along SR 395 outside the city.

- 5) *Implementation hurdle.* Both MUCTD and the California Code of Regulations (CCR) (specifically 21 CCR 2111) mandate that any businesses participating in the Specific Service Sign Program must be no more than 3 miles from the location of the signs. However, the majority of the business district in Ridgecrest is approximately 6 to 10 miles away from the proposed locations of the signs. Because this rule is stated in regulation, additional regulatory changes beyond the statutory changes made in this bill may be required to permit Caltrans to place specific services signs at the proposed locations. It should be noted that Caltrans has expressed a willingness to provide necessary technical assistance to Ridgecrest as they navigate adding further signage in the future.

- 6) *Safety, or economics?* Since the inception of the Specific Services Sign program, two specific statutory exceptions to the population limit have been made. These were done for the City of Lincoln (population of roughly 56,000) and the City of Truckee (population of roughly 17,000). In both cases, supporters argued that these signs, which display specific business logos, were necessary to support local businesses. City leaders in Ridgecrest have also made similar arguments, saying their distance from the highway hurts local businesses, and that the addition of specific service signs would help ameliorate this effect.
- 7) *Recommendations against expansion.* As part of the legislation that created the population exceptions for Lincoln and Truckee, Caltrans was also required to create a report for the Legislature about the implementation of the exception and to make recommendations on further expansion of the Specific Service Sign Program. The report was released in 2019.

In that report, Caltrans recommended that the Specific Services Sign Program not be further expanded. This recommendation was based on a number of considerations. First and foremost, Caltrans expressed concern that visual sign congestion from too many signs could create the conditions for distracted driving and pose a safety risk. Furthermore, Caltrans emphasized that the program is not meant to take the place of traditional business advertising.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

City of Ridgecrest  
Ridgecrest Area Convention & Visitors Bureau  
Ridgecrest Chamber of Commerce  
Ridgecrest Police Department

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Samuel Myers / TRANS. / (916) 651-4879  
4/21/26 16:19:37

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1002  
Author: Niello (R), et al.  
Introduced: 2/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 3/23/26  
AYES: Wahab, Choi, Archuleta, Caballero, Grayson, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas,  
Strickland, Umberg  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arreguín, Menjivar

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Out-of-state physicians and surgeons: telehealth: license exemption

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill revises the requirements for an eligible patient to receive telehealth from an eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon licensed in another state.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing Law:

- 1) Enacts the Medical Practice Act, which provides for the licensure and regulation of physicians and surgeons by the Medical Board of California (MBC). (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 2000 *et seq.*)
- 2) Requires the MBC to issue a physician's and surgeon's certificate to an applicant that holds an unlimited license as a physician and surgeon in another state, or in a Canadian province, and that no disciplinary action has been taken against the applicant by any medical licensing authority and that the applicant has not been the subject of adverse judgments or settlements resulting from any evidence, as determined by the board, of negligence or incompetence. (BPC § 2135)

- 3) Requires the Osteopathic Medical Board of California (OMBC) to issue an osteopathic physician's and surgeon's certificate on reciprocity if the applicant holds an unlimited license in another state equivalent to content administered in California, and, among other requirements, that no disciplinary action has been taken against the applicant by any medical licensing authority and that the applicant has not been the subject of adverse judgements or settlements resulting from evidence, as determined by the board of negligence or incompetence. (BPC § 2153.5)
- 4) Defines telehealth as the mode of delivering health care services and public health via information and communication technologies to facilitate the diagnosis, consultation, treatment, education, care management, and self-management of a patient's health care. Requires, before the delivery of health care via telehealth, the health care provider initiating the telehealth to obtain verbal or written consent from the patient for the use of telehealth and requires that the consent be documented. Requires all laws regarding the confidentiality of health care information and a patient's rights to their medical information apply to telehealth. Requires all laws and regulations governing professional responsibility, unprofessional conduct, and standards of practice that apply to a health care provider under the health care provider's license apply to the provider while providing telehealth services. (BPC § 2290.5)
- 5) Enacts the David Hall Act, which authorizes a physician and surgeon licensed in another state that uses criteria substantially similar to the criteria used by the MBC to practice medicine in this state, if the practice is limited to delivering health care via telehealth to a patient who has a disease or condition that is immediately life-threatening, the patient has not been accepted in a clinical trial nearest to their home within one week of completion of the clinical trial application process, or, in the medical judgement of a physician and surgeon it is unreasonable for the patient to participate due to the patient's current condition and stage of disease. Has documentation from their primary physician and surgeon and a consulting physician and surgeon attesting that they meet the aforementioned requirements. (BPC §§ 2052.5 et.seq)
- 6) Defines "eligible patient" as a person who has an immediately life-threatening disease or condition, has given written or informed consent, or if the person lacks the capacity to consent, their legally authorized representative has given written consent on their behalf, for the use of an eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon's telehealth healthcare services, and authorized the release of

medical records to their primary physician and surgeon by the out-of-state physician. (BPC § 2052.5 (A-ii))

- 7) Defines “immediately life-threatening disease or condition” as a stage of disease in which there is a reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months. (HSC § 111548.1(d))
- 8) Defines “eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon” as a person who is licensed as a physician and surgeon in another state in good standing with no history of prior discipline and whose medical expertise is that of the eligible patient’s illness. (BPC § 2052.5(2))
- 9) Authorizes an eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon to practice medicine in California without a license from the MBC if the practice is limited to delivering health care via telehealth to an eligible patient. (BPC § 2052.5(b))

This bill updates the definition of “eligible patient” for purposes of receiving physician care via telehealth to include a patient that has been diagnosed with an immediately life-threatening disease or condition that is now in remission and the patient is continuing care with the previously established out-of-state physician and surgeon, and would provide that the eligible patient is not subject to the clinical trial requirement, as specified.

## **Background**

All physicians and surgeons who practice in California are required to hold an active license from the MBC or the OMBC. Any health care provider providing telehealth to a patient in California are required to have an active license and uphold the same standards of practice whether in person or via telehealth. When providing telehealth services the health care provider is required to obtain verbal or written informed consent from the patient and the consent must be documented, all laws regarding the confidentiality of the patient’s health care information, and the patient’s right to their medical information must be upheld pursuant to BPC section 2290.5.

*The David Hall Act.* In 2023, AB 1369 (Bauer-Kahan, Chapter 837, Statutes of 2023) created narrow circumstances authorizing an out-of-state eligible physician and surgeon to practice medicine in California without a license from the MBC if the practice is limited to delivering health care via telehealth to an eligible patient. The eligible patient must have a disease or condition that is immediately life

threatening with a reasonable likelihood that death will occur in a matter of months and they must have exhausted all other means of health care including participation in a clinical trial nearest their home.

This bill's eligibility criteria mirrors that of AB 1369 with the exception of the requirement that the eligible patient have a terminal diagnosis and has been narrowly expanded to include a pre-existing patient who is now in remission from the original diagnosis of an immediately life-threatening condition or disease and seeks to continue care with the established eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

60 Plus Association  
Als Association  
American Association of Senior Citizens  
Ata Action  
California Academy of Family Physicians  
California Senior Legislature  
Goldwater Institute for Public Policy Research  
Institute for Justice  
Pacific Legal Foundation  
R Street Institute  
The Association of Frontotemporal Degeneration

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

Association of Northern California Oncologists  
California Medical Association  
Medical Board of California  
Medical Oncology Association of Southern California

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The California Senior Legislature writes, "When a disease enters remission, patients frequently require ongoing monitoring, medication management, and consultation with the very specialist who guided them through active treatment. For seniors, especially those with mobility limitations, compromised immune systems, or limited transportation options, telehealth is not simply a convenience, it is a lifeline. Disrupting an established physician-patient relationship at this critical stage can create medical risk, emotional stress, and avoidable health system costs. Our laws must evolve

accordingly to support stability, access, and patient-centered care. SB 1002 is a modest but meaningful step toward ensuring that older adults can maintain trusted medical relationships without unnecessary disruption.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** The California Medical Association states, “One of the primary responsibilities of The Medical Board of California (MBC) is to protect the health care of consumers by ensuring physicians and surgeons are appropriately regulated to maintain high medical care standards. The MBC has a process for screening out-of-state physicians who wish to obtain a Temporary License including the following requirements: hold a current, active, unrestricted license to practice medicine in another U.S. state, district, territory; have no prior actions in any jurisdiction that would be grounds for denial, suspension, or revocation of a license under California law; and not having faced discipline by another licensing body or be the subject of an unresolved complaint, review, or disciplinary proceeding. The MBC’s requirement that out-of-state physicians who wish to practice medicine in California have no prior actions that would be grounds for discipline under California law is intended to keep California patients safe, as California can have stricter regulations than other states. As a result, any expansion to existing law allowing non-California licensed physicians to practice medicine in California should be met with extreme caution, since it circumvents this requirement. We propose the following amendment to BPC § 2052.5 to limit the scope of the bill:

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, an eligible out-of-state physician and surgeon may practice medicine in the state if the practice is limited to delivering **medical opinion** health care via telehealth to an eligible patient and **does not include the ordering of any medical service, procedure, test or treatment, or the prescribing of a dangerous drug or dangerous device as defined in section 4022.**

We believe our proposed amendment would allow patients to dialogue with out-of-state physicians regarding medical opinions, such as receiving a second opinion, while protecting patients from a physician who would not be eligible to practice medicine under California law as a result of prior actions in other jurisdictions.”

Prepared by: Anna Billy / B., P. & E.D. /  
4/14/26 16:16:11

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1036  
Author: Grayson (D)  
Amended: 4/8/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/15/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Mitigation Fee Act

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires that, if a development demolishes or changes an existing use, the local agency has to offset the fee amount to account for the demolition or change so that the fee amount is attributable only to the development's incremental impact on public facilities or services.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Allows local governments to require applicants for development projects to pay fees to mitigate the project's effects, known as mitigation or development impact fees.
- 2) Requires, under the Mitigation Fee Act, local officials that are establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approving a development project to:
  - a) Identify the fee's purpose.
  - b) Identify the fee's use, including the public facilities to be financed.
  - c) Determine a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the development.

- d) Determine a reasonable relationship between the public facility's need and the development.
  - e) Determine a reasonable relationship between the fee's amount and the cost of the public facility.
  - f) Hold at least one open and public meeting prior to levying a new fee or increasing an existing one.
  - g) If they decide to adopt capital improvement plans, indicate the approximate location, size, time of availability, and estimates of cost for all facilities or improvements to be financed with the fees.
  - h) Deposit and spend the fees within five years of collecting them.
  - i) Refund fees or make specific findings on when and how the fees will be spent for construction, if the fees aren't spent within five years of collection.
- 3) Requires local agencies to deposit mitigation fees to fund a capital improvement associated with a development in a separate account or fund.
  - 4) Requires local agencies that impose mitigation fees to produce an annual report within 180 days of the end of the fiscal year that includes specified information.
  - 5) Requires a city, county, or special district that has an internet website to post and update on their websites specified information, including a current schedule of housing development project costs, zoning ordinances and development standards, annual impact fee reports, and an archive of specified impact fee nexus studies.
  - 6) Requires local agencies to conduct and adopt a nexus study prior to the adoption of an impact fee, and specified standards and practices.

This bill:

- 1) Requires that, if a development demolishes or changes an existing use, the local agency has to offset the fee amount to account for the demolition or change so that the fee amount is attributable only to the development's incremental impact on public facilities or services.
- 2) Provides that it applies to capacity charges.
- 3) Provides that, if the offset amount exceeds the fee amount, the developer cannot use that remainder to refund or offset any other fees.

## Background

*Connection and capacity charges.* Connection fees and capacity charges are one-time fees assessed on new customers that reflect the reasonable cost of providing service, typically for water or sewer systems. A local agency assesses a connection fee when it physically connects a structure to the water or sewer system, which pays for or the physical facilities necessary to make a water connection or sewer connection, such as meters, meter boxes, pipelines, and the estimated reasonable cost of labor and materials for their installation of those facilities. A local agency assesses a capacity charge on the customer to cover the proportional cost of maintaining or constructing system wide infrastructure necessary to meet the additional water or sewer demand for new users of the system. The Mitigation Fee Act governs connection fees and capacity charges, but state law provides separate provisions related to their oversight and accounting.

*Net impacts.* Not all development projects are on empty parcels. In some cases, they replace one use for another, which may change the impact that development project has on local agencies. The underlying project may have paid impact fees for its use as an office, but that did not account for the additional public services necessary to support residential development, like increased utility usage, schools, and other public services. If the local agency applied the same fees on the development reusing the existing development as it did for an entirely new residential development, the fees would not account for the existing infrastructure serving the development.

## Comments

*Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, “The Mitigation Fee Act allows local jurisdictions to impose impact fees on specific developments to help “mitigate” the costs of new or additional facilities that are needed to serve those developments. In order to charge a fee, there must be a reasonable relationship between the fee’s use and the project on which the fee is imposed. Many development projects involve the redevelopment of sites with existing uses that already contribute to the demand for services or facilities funded by a particular impact fee. In certain cases, during redevelopment projects, local agencies can provide a “credit” to help reduce fees to account for prior usage. When accounting for prior use, many local jurisdictions currently recognize credits for most impact fees, however, this is not always the case throughout the state. To help provide uniformity and clarity under the Mitigation Fee Act, SB 1036 would require that all jurisdictions provide “credit” for prior uses when a project is redeveloping a site with similar prior uses.

This bill would help reduce the costs of duplicative impact fees, helping to lower overall development costs and unlock more housing across California.”

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/16/26)

AARP

Bay Area Council

Cal Chamber

California Association of Realtors

California Building Industry Association

California Council for Affordable Housing

Cbia

Fieldstead and Company, INC.

Habitat for Humanity California

Spur

Zillow Group

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/16/26)

City of Pico Rivera

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

4/20/26 9:40:33

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1038  
Author: Laird (D)  
Amended: 3/16/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 4-0, 3/25/26  
AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Durazo, Laird  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cortese

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** The Public Employees' Retirement System

**SOURCE:** California School Employees Association

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) to provide notice to the subject of an audit and require audited employers to provide notice to affected members' unions, as specified.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each state agency, school employer, and contracting agency to provide the following to the CalPERS board:
  - a) Immediate notice of the change in status of any member resulting from transfer, promotion, leave of absence, resignation, reinstatement, dismissal, or death.
  - b) Any additional information that CalPERS may require concerning any member of the retirement system.
  - c) The services of its officer and departments that CalPERS may request in connection with claims by members against CalPERS. (Government Code § 20221)

- 2) Requires every state agency, school employer, or contracting agency, upon CalPERS' request, to provide information on its employees who are not enrolled as members of the system to assist CalPERS to carry out the system's administration.
  - a) The public employer shall submit the required information in the manner and under the conditions prescribed by CalPERS.
  - b) These requirements do not supersede or diminish an employer's responsibility to determine eligibility or to enroll its qualifying employees in membership.
  - c) CalPERS shall treat any information obtained as confidential. (Government Code § 20221.5)
- 3) Requires the California State University to furnish monthly reports to CalPERS showing changes in the status of all members employed by the university during the preceding month and any additional information concerning any members that the CalPERS may require in the administration of the retirement system. (Government Code § 20222)
- 4) Authorizes CalPERS, during the course of an audit, to require each state employer, school employer, and contracting agency to provide information or make available for examination or copying at a specified time and place, or both, books, papers, any data, or any records, including, but not limited to, personnel and payroll records, as CalPERS deems necessary to determine eligibility for, and the correctness of, retirement benefits, reportable compensation, enrollment in, and reinstatement to this system. (Government Code § 20222.5 (a))
- 5) Requires CalPERS, before initiating an audit, to notify the subject of the audit of the estimated time required to complete the audit. (Government Code § 20222.5 (b))
- 6) Requires that CalPERS base the time estimate upon various factors, including, but not limited to, the number of employees; employment classifications; benefits; contract provisions; geographical location; time required for audits of comparable entities; and additional time factors raised by the subject of the audit. (Government Code § 20222.5 (b))
- 7) Authorizes CalPERS to assess a reasonable charge upon the employer, if an audit requires an excess of the time estimated, to recover additional costs incurred for the excess time to complete the audit. However, CalPERS may not

assess a contracting agency for delays during the course of an audit that are reasonably outside of the agency's control. (Government Code § 20222.5 (c))

- 8) Requires that information obtained from an employer remain confidential, as specified. (Government Code § 20222.5 (d))
- 9) Requires the California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) to provide written notice of an intended audit, including its purpose and scope, to the affected public agency and affected members' union. (Education Code § 22206.1)

This bill:

- 1) Requires CalPERS, before initiating an audit, to provide written notice to the subject of the audit that includes the audit's purpose and scope, as well as the estimated time required to complete the audit (already required under existing law).
- 2) Requires CalPERS, after providing the required notice, to list on its website the state employer, school employer, including each school district represented by a school employer, or contracting agency subject to the audit and the purpose and scope of the intended audit.
- 3) Requires the audited employer, as soon as practicable but no later than 10 working days after receiving notice from CalPERS, to forward the audit notice to its employees' union, if any, of members that may be affected by the audit.
- 4) Requires the audited employer to communicate to CalPERS that the employer has provided the audit notice to its employees' union.
- 5) Requires the audited employer, within 60 days of receiving CalPERS' final audit report, to provide its employees' union and CalPERS with a list of the names of any members affected by the final audit report.
- 6) Requires CalPERS to provide the audited employer with a copy of the final audit report upon issuance of CalPERS' final audit report.
- 7) Requires the audited employer, as soon as practicable but no later than 10 working days after receiving CalPERS' final audit report, to forward the report

to its employees' union, if any, of the affected members that may be affected by the audit.

- 8) Requires the audited employer to communicate to CalPERS that the employer has provided the final audit report to its employees' union.
- 9) Declares that this bill's provisions do not confer any additional rights upon the union, including, but not limited to, due process rights.

### **Comments**

Need for this bill? According to the author, "This audit notification provides employees' exclusive representatives with advance warning of an audit so they can properly inform and advocate for their members or proactively seek additional information regarding the audit and its effects. Public employees and their unions are important stakeholders in the audit process, and a quick resolution benefits everyone—especially in cases where an ongoing payroll reporting error compounds over many months or years."

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

California School Employees Association (source)  
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees  
California Federation of Labor Unions  
California Professional Firefighters  
California Teachers Association  
Service Employees International Union, California

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the California School Employees Association:

"CalPERS regularly audits employers to ensure that employee compensation is correctly reported. Accurate reporting of employee compensation is essential in calculating public employees' monthly pension benefits. The CalPERS Office of Audit Services typically conducts 100 employer audits each year to check for

compliance on issues ranging from pay schedules and payrates to part-time employee membership in PERS and employment after retirement.”

“The outcomes of these employer compliance audits can have important consequences for current public employees and retirees. For example, if an audit reveals that an employer inadvertently made an error in pay rate reporting, an employee or retiree may be required to reimburse CalPERS for the resulting overpayment and suffer a reduction in their monthly pension benefit. These mandatory repayments can amount to thousands of dollars depending on the length of time that the reporting error occurred...”

“When school employees receive notice of pension benefit reductions and required lump-sum repayments, they turn to their union for assistance and answers. It is critical that public employee unions be made aware of audits that could adversely impact the promised pension benefits of active members and retirees at the start of the audit process. Timely audit notification allows public employee unions to properly advocate for our members and to proactively seek additional information regarding an audit and its effects. Public employees and their unions are important stakeholders in the audit process, and quick resolution benefits everyone — especially in cases where an ongoing payroll reporting error compounds over many months or years.”

According to the Service Employees International Union, California:

“Existing law already requires that unions representing certificated teachers participating in the California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) receive timely notice of employer audits by CalSTRS. SB 1038 would bring parity to public employees participating in CalPERS by ensuring their union representatives also receive proactive audit notification.”

Prepared by: Glenn Miles / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556  
4/14/26 16:16:11

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1048  
Author: Becker (D), et al.  
Amended: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/8/26  
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** State Seal of Climate Literacy

**SOURCE:** California State PTA  
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action  
Ten Strands  
UndauntedK12

---

**DIGEST:** This bill (1) establishes the voluntary State Seal of Climate Literacy (SSCL) to be affixed to the diploma of qualifying high school graduates and requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to recommend criteria under which participating local educational agencies (LEA) may award said seal to qualified students; (2) requires participating LEAs to collect and annually submit to the California Department of Education (CDE) specified data related to SSCL participation.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Office of Education and the Environment (OEE) in the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) and requires the OEE to implement a statewide environmental education program. (Public Resources Code (PRC) § 71300)

- 2) Requires the OEE, under the direction of CalRecycle and in cooperation with the CDE and the State Board of Education (SBE), to develop and implement a unified education strategy of the environment for elementary and secondary schools, as specified. (PRC § 71300)
- 3) Requires the CDE and SBE, in cooperation with CalRecycle, to develop and implement, to the extent feasible, a teacher training and implementation plan that guides the phased implementation of the unified education strategy in elementary, middle, and high school programs, for the education of pupils, faculty, and administrators on the importance of integrating environmental concepts and programs in schools. (PRC § 71300)
- 4) Establishes the voluntary State Seal of Civic Engagement (SSCE), affixed to the diploma or transcript of an eligible student, to encourage, and create pathways for, students in elementary and secondary schools to become civically engaged in democratic governmental institutions at the local, state, and national levels. (Education Code (EC) § 51475)
- 5) Requires the SPI, in developing criteria for the SSCE, to incorporate the Six Proven Practices for Effective Civic Learning, and to consult with a diverse group of credentialed, current classroom teachers who teach the subject of history-social science, including government, in secondary schools. Requires the SPI, on or before January 1, 2020, to recommend to the SBE criteria for awarding a SSCE to students, as specified. Requires the SBE, on or before January 31, 2021, to adopt, reject, or modify the SSCE criteria recommended by the SPI. (EC § 51470 et seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the voluntary SSCL for the purpose of giving high school pupils personal agency to help them and their communities understand and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- 2) Requires the SPI, on or before March 15, 2027, to recommend to the SBE criteria for awarding the SSCL to pupils who have demonstrated mastery in climate literacy disciplines, green skills or technical green skills, and any and all other best practices for climate literacy. Requires the SPI to consider, in the development of criteria, the following:
  - a) Successful completion of at least two approved courses in the area of climate literacy, as specified.

- b) Successful completion and presentation of a climate literacy final experiential learning project as specified.
- 3) Requires the SPI to also recommend the criteria necessary for a participating LEA to additionally award to eligible pupils with an Industry and/or Higher Education Distinction, as specified.
  - 4) Requires the SPI to ensure, to the greatest extent feasible, that the criteria developed pursuant to 2) and 3) above adhere to all of the following:
    - a) Provides all pupils with an opportunity to earn the SSCL.
    - b) Recognizes pupil excellence and outstanding achievement.
    - c) Is not based primarily on pupil achievement that is already recognized through grades or other standard measures of pupil achievement.
    - d) Results in a seal that confers a benefit to pupils beyond high school.
  - 5) Requires the SBE, on or before May 1, 2027, to adopt, or adopt with modifications, the SSCL criteria recommended by the SPI.
  - 6) Requires the SPI to do all of the following:
    - a) Prepare and deliver to participating LEAs, an appropriate insignia to be affixed to the diploma or transcript of the pupil indicating that the pupil has been awarded an SSCL by the SPI.
    - b) Provide other information the SPI deems necessary for LEAs to successfully participate in awarding the SSCL to pupils.
    - c) Provide information to pupils who earn a SSCL about post secondary opportunities and career pathways that leverage the knowledge and skills that pupils develop through earning the SSCL.
  - 7) Requires a participating LEA, after the SBE adopts criteria for the SSCL, to do the following:
    - a) Maintain appropriate records in order to identify pupils who have earned an SSCL.
    - b) Affix the appropriate insignia to the diploma or transcript of each pupil who earns an SSCL.

- c) Provide information to pupils about available options and supports, including, but not limited to, approved courses, experiential learning, or final projects that pupils may complete to meet the criteria to earn an SSCL.
  - d) Establish a process for determining if a pupil has met the criteria necessary to earn an SSCL.
  - e) On or before September 15, 2027, and on or before September 15 of each year thereafter, provide CDE with specified data.
- 8) Establishes several definitions pursuant to this bill.

### **Comments**

*Need for this bill.* According to the author, “California has long led the nation in climate action. SB 1048 ensures we are also leading in climate education by preparing the next generation with the knowledge and real-world experience they need to meet the challenges of a changing climate.”

*California’s Environmental Principles and Concepts.* In 2003 and 2005, the Legislature passed AB 1548 (Pavley, Chapter 665, Statutes of 2003) and AB 1721 (Pavley, Chapter 581, Statutes of 2005), which ultimately established the OEE under CalRecycle to develop education principles for the environment for elementary and secondary school pupils. The resulting California Environmental Principles and Concepts (EP&Cs) are comprised of five environmental principles and 15 supporting concepts that highlight the deep relationship between humans and the natural world and serve as “big ideas” intended to inform standards-based instruction and fuel student inquiry. These EP&Cs have been integrated into several state curriculum frameworks for California public schools serving kindergarten through grade twelve, including the 2016 History and Social Science Framework, the 2016 Science Framework, and the 2019 Health Education Framework.

*Equity in Access to Climate Literacy Opportunities.* This bill borrows the model of SSCE to create the SSCL. Specifically, it requires the SPI to recommend to the SBE criteria that would allow LEAs to recognize students who have demonstrated mastery in climate literacy disciplines, green skills or technical green skills, and any and all other best practices for climate literacy. In the development of criteria, the bill requires the SPI to consider factors such as the completion of courses in the area of climate literacy and the completion and presentation of a climate literacy final experiential learning project, as specified.

While the SSCL is intended to serve as a voluntary program, its implementation relies heavily on an LEA's ability to leverage partnerships with state and local climate literacy nonprofits, as well as labor and private sector entities engaged in the green economy. There are certainly areas of the state that have an abundance of local entities that are engaged with LEAs and have the capacity to partner with schools to provide learning opportunities for students; however, without careful attention to expanded access, such opportunities cannot be guaranteed for all students across the state. As a result, the SSCL may have the unintended consequence of highlighting LEAs that have the means to provide an environment where students can meet eligibility criteria, and leaving students at LEAs without such means behind.

*This bill requires the SPI, in the development of recommended criteria, to ensure that to the greatest extent feasible, the recommended criteria provides all pupils with an opportunity to earn the SSCL and results in a seal that confers a benefit to the pupil beyond high school. This bill also authorizes the SPI to work with nonprofit organizations in furtherance of these priorities and others.*

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/16/26)

California State PTA (co-source)

Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action (co-source)

Ten Strands (co-source)

UndauntedK12 (co-source)

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond

350 Bay Area Action

7th Generation Advisors

Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet

Adolfo Camarillo High School

American River Natural History Association dba Effie Yeaw Nature Center

Arc

Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education

Bay Tree Design

Bluesky Consulting

Burbank Eco Council

Cadman Cooking and Garden Education Program

California Academy of Sciences

California Outdoor Recreation Partnership

California State Parks Foundation  
California Teachers Association  
Camp Chrysalis  
Camp Ocean Pines  
Canopy  
Center for Ecoliteracy  
CFT  
Children Now  
Children's Environmental Literacy Foundation  
Citizens' Climate Lobby San Mateo County Chapter  
City and County of San Francisco  
City of Mountain View  
Climate Action Campaign of the Humboldt Unitarian Universalist Fellowship  
Climate Action Pathways for Schools  
Climate Justice Committee, Unitarian Universalist Church of Berkeley  
Common Vision  
Community for Natural Play Surfaces  
Community Resources for Science  
Crystal Cove Conservancy  
Dfusion Inc.  
Earthday.org  
EdTrust-West  
Elder Climate Action Northern California Chapter  
Elders Climate Action Southern California Chapter  
Environmental Education Collaborative  
Environmental Nature Center  
Equity Meets Design  
Exploring New Horizons Outdoor Schools  
Fremont Union High School District  
Fresno Chaffee Zoo  
Friends of the LA River  
Friends of the Lost Coast  
Green Schoolyards America  
HED  
Heirs to Our Oceans  
iCrest Education Foundation  
Inner City Bliss  
Life Lab  
Living Classroom  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Los Gatos Almaden Pollinator Garden  
Master Gardener Association of San Diego County  
Menlo Spark  
National Marine Educators Association  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Nurture Nature  
Oakland Goes Outdoors  
People, Food and Land Foundation  
Petaluma City Schools  
Pittsburg Unified School District  
Plant-Based Advocates  
Rialto Unified School District  
Richmond Outdoors Coalition  
Roots to Branches Education  
Sacramento Splash  
Samuel Lawrence Foundation  
San Diego Pediatricians for Clean Air  
San Francisco Climate Literacy Advocates  
San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School  
SanDiego350  
Santa Clara County Medical Association  
Santa Cruz Climate Action Network  
Steam Learning Institute  
Strategic Energy Innovations  
Sustainable Marin Schools  
Sustainable Mill Valley  
SustainConsulting, LLC  
The Escondido Creek Conservancy  
The Friends of Daley Ranch  
Three Oaks Outdoor Science School, Inc.  
Tomorrow's Talent  
TreePeople  
trubel&co  
U.S. Green Building Council  
UC Davis Center for Community and Citizen Science  
United Teachers Los Angeles  
Water Energy Education Alliance  
Western Municipal Water District  
YES Nature to Neighborhoods  
Youth v. Oil

Three Individuals

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105  
4/21/26 16:19:37

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1058  
Author: McNerney (D)  
Introduced: 2/12/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/25/26  
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

---

**SUBJECT:** School districts: contracting: purchases for child nutrition programs

**SOURCE:** California School Nutrition Association

---

**DIGEST:** This bill makes clarifying changes to align statute—specifically relating to procurement bid solicitations and awards for school districts operating approved federal child nutrition programs—with federal procurement standards, which include removing a reference to price being the primary consideration for procurement bid solicitations and awards as well as correcting references to the Code of Federal Regulations.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law requires, as a condition of receipt of federal funds, that the recipient award contracts only to responsible contractors possessing the ability to perform successfully under the terms and conditions of a proposed contract. Consideration is to be given to such matters as contractor integrity, public policy compliance, past performance record, and financial and technical resources. Contracts are to be awarded to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the recipient or subrecipient considering price and other factors. (Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 2, § 200.318 and 200.320)

Existing state law requires that procurement bid solicitations and awards made by a school district approved to operate at least one federal nonprofit child nutrition program for purchases in support of those programs shall (1) be consistent with specified federal procurement standard sections in the CFR; (2) that these awards shall be let to the most responsive and responsible party; and (3) that the price shall

be the primary consideration, but not the only determining factor. (Public Contract Code (PCC) § 20111)

This bill makes clarifying changes to align statute—specifically relating to procurement bid solicitations and awards for school districts operating approved federal child nutrition programs—with federal procurement standards, which include removing a reference to price being the primary consideration for procurement bid solicitations and awards as well as correcting references to the CFR.

### Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, school nutrition directors “often use requests for proposals (RFPs) in their purchasing... This bill helps schools to better tailor their meal programs to the specific needs of their local communities by allowing them to consider factors beyond price when selecting vendors through the RFP process. ... Clarity is needed to ensure that they are able to obtain the highest quality locally sourced, minimally processed, most sustainable food and most culturally appropriate products for their students.”
- 2) *Procurement types for school districts operating nutrition programs.* Both federal regulations and California state laws require competitive procurements to be conducted in a manner that provides full and open competition. School food authorities (SFAs), which are governing boards of school districts that are authorized to operate federal child nutrition programs, must conduct either a formal or an informal procurement process. There are two primary formal competitive procurement methods: 1) RFPs and 2) Invitation for Bids (IFBs).

An RFP is a method of procurement in which SFAs publicly solicit (A) a technical proposal that explains how the prospective contractor will meet the objectives of the solicitation and (B) a cost proposal that identifies a price that could accomplish the technical proposal. The CFR states that these RFP contracts are to “be awarded to the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the recipient or subrecipient considering price and other factors.”

An IFB, also known as “sealed bids”, is a method of procurement in which SFAs publicly solicit sealed bids from an adequate number of known suppliers, with the goal of obtaining three bids at a minimum. An SFA must award the fixed-price contract to the lowest priced, most responsible bidder, whose bid is responsive, and conforms with all the material terms and conditions of the IFB.

SFAs must allow bidders sufficient time to respond prior to the date set for opening the bids.

- 3) *State's recent approach has trended toward healthier, local food options.* In recent years, California state government has taken action to encourage healthier food options and choices in schools, including encouraging school districts to procure and use fresh produce from local farms to prepare healthy and nutritious school meals for students. In addition, AB 1264 (Gabriel, Chapter 467, Statutes of 2025) reduces the consumption of ultra processed foods that are sold or served in schools by phasing these out over time. The state's recent approach necessitates changes in what foods and supplies schools procure, which could lead to increased costs for healthier, local foods.
- 4) *Proposed statutory changes intended to point at federal regulations.* This bill includes two technical amendments that: (1) correct the specific federal regulations code sections cited in the Public Contract Code (PCC) and (2) strike a phrase about selection criterion that only applies to one out of the two formal competitive procurement methods (specifically IFBs). These amendments are intended to point this specific provision in statute to federal procurement standards for school districts making purchases for federal nonprofit child nutrition programs.

SB 544 (McGuire, Chapter 395, Statutes of 2017), was the most recent legislation that amended the PCC code section being amended by SB 1058, and that bill required school districts operating child nutrition programs to award contracts for these programs with price being the primary, but not the only, selection criterion. Though the language for federal procurement standards on RFPs has been fairly consistent over the past ten years in requiring that RFP contracts must be awarded "while considering price and other factors", the California Department of Education (CDE) indicated that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has shifted their guidance on RFP selection criteria in recent years. According to the CDE, when SB 544 was being heard in the Legislature in 2017, the USDA indicated in webinars and trainings that price was the primary, but not the only consideration, for awarding contracts using the RFP procurement method.

However, in 2022, the USDA published updated written guidance through a guide called "Procuring Local Foods for Child Nutrition Programs" that stated explicitly that an RFP "allows for consideration of factors other than price", which is a change from SB 544. This 2022 guidance is also consistent with the

CFR language on RFPs. SB 1058 proposes changes that point to the federal regulations, and if a scenario arises where the federal government shifts its guidance again, whether formally or informally, SB 1058's proposed language is intended to be broad enough to accommodate those changes by simply pointing to the federal regulations.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 544 (McGuire, Chapter 395, Statutes of 2017) required school districts operating federal child nutrition programs to award contracts for these programs consistent with federal procurement standards. This bill also required that these contracts be awarded to the most responsive and responsible party, and that price shall be the primary, but not the only, consideration when awarding contracts.

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

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

California School Nutrition Association (source)  
Alameda County Office of Education  
California Association of School Business Officials  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

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

None received

Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen / ED. / (916) 651-4105  
4/3/26 9:46:00

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1099  
Author: Reyes (D)  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 11-0, 3/25/26  
AYES: Weber Pierson, Valladares, Caballero, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove,  
Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 3-0, 4/20/26  
AYES: Becker, Laird, Weber Pierson  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Pérez

---

**SUBJECT:** State and local public benefits

**SOURCE:** Civil Prosecutors Coalition

---

**DIGEST:** This bill aligns terminology in state statute that permits local entities to provide benefits for immigrants ineligible for those benefits under federal law with the federal statute that requires a state to expressly authorize such eligibility.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law:

- 1) Prohibits, under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), individuals without a qualified immigration status, as defined, from being eligible for any state or local public benefits, except for assistance for health care items and services that are necessary for the treatment of an emergency medical condition, short-term, non-cash, in-kind emergency disaster relief, public health assistance for immunizations, public health assistance for testing and treatment of symptoms of communicable disease, and other community in-kind services specified by the Attorney General. [8 United States Code (USC) §1621]

- 2) Defines “state or local public benefit” as a grant, contract, loan, professional or commercial license, or a retirement, welfare, health, disability, public or assisted housing, postsecondary education, food assistance, unemployment or other similar benefit, unless the individual or benefit meets a specified exception. [8 USC §1621]
- 3) Authorizes states to provide eligibility for state and local public benefits to immigrants without qualified immigration status only upon the enactment of a statute after August 22, 1996, which affirmatively provides for such eligibility. [8 USC §1621]

Existing state law:

- 1) States the intent of the Legislature to affirm the ability of counties, cities, and hospital districts to provide health care and other services to all residents, if any of these entities decides to do so at its own discretion. [Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) §17850]
- 2) Authorizes a city, county, city and county, or hospital district, at its discretion, to provide aid, including health care, to persons who, but for the federal law restricting immigrant access to public benefits, would meet eligibility requirements for the program of that entity. [WIC §17851]

This bill aligns terminology in state statute that permits local entities to provide benefits for immigrants ineligible for those benefits under federal law with the federal statute that requires a state to expressly authorize such eligibility.

## Comments

According to the author of this bill:

Historically, California has relied on a statutory exemption under PRWORA that allows local governments, at their discretion, to provide state and local public benefits to all residents. Unfortunately, the California statute that provides this PRWORA exemption is too vague and is not directly tied to how “local and state public benefits” are defined at the federal level. This is an issue because the federal definition can be, and has been, subject to regulatory interpretation. If the federal definition of public benefit is expanded and California’s statute does not reflect that change, then it puts our local governments at risk of being out of compliance with federal law. This bill addresses this issue by tying the existing exemption in state law to the PRWORA definition of “state or local public benefit.” In doing so, it

ensures that local governments have the certainty they need to continue providing critical services that protect community health, safety, and economic stability.

## **Background**

*PRWORA.* In 1996, Congress passed and President Clinton signed PRWORA (also known as “welfare reform”) into law to tighten eligibility for federal public benefits including Medicaid (Medi-Cal in California), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF or CalWORKs in California) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP or CalFresh in California) and give states greater control over their administration. One way PRWORA reduced eligibility for federal public benefits was by restricting which lawfully present immigrants could access those programs either due to their specific immigration category or due to the length of time they had resided in the U.S. PRWORA not only applied to federal public benefits, but it also prohibited state and local entities from including immigrants without a qualified immigration status in their state and local programs unless the states enacted specific legislation after the passage of PWRORA authorizing such eligibility.

*Recent reductions of services to immigrants.* This past July, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced that it had rescinded a 1998 rule interpreting PRWORA defining which federal public benefits could exclude individuals for reasons of immigration status. The new policy reinterpreted what programs qualify as an HHS program benefit that could not be provided to individuals without a qualified immigration status, adding 13 new programs. The prohibited health programs added were certified community behavioral health clinics, health center programs, programs funded through community mental health services block grants, mental health and substance use programs administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and Title X family planning programs. In the meantime, the California Attorney General, along with 19 other state attorneys general, sued the Trump Administration on the decision to restrict access to these programs and obtained a stay in the implementation of the policy. While federal, rather than state and local public benefits, are the topic of this controversy, reinterpretation of PRWORA has understandably caused concern among providers of any public benefits. Also in July, Congress passed and President Trump signed H.R. 1, a vast budget reconciliation bill, into law. H.R. 1 restricted access to and funding for SNAP and Medicaid. It also cut federal funding for these programs for additional groups of immigrants who are lawfully present, including refugees, asylees, victims of

trafficking and others under humanitarian immigration statuses. Similarly, health insurance exchanges, such as Covered California, can no longer give federal subsidies to these same groups of immigrants, putting commercial insurance out of reach. Finally, to address state budget concerns, California also reduced access to Medi-Cal for certain groups of immigrants who are not qualified for federal benefits by enacting a freeze on enrollment, reducing dental benefits, and will soon be charging premiums. Given this vast reduction in the availability of public benefits, local entities may be looking to fill in some of the gaps with their own programs to affected populations.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/2026)

Civil Prosecutors Coalition (source)  
California Primary Care Association  
City and County of San Francisco  
County of Santa Clara  
Los Angeles LGBT Center  
San Diego City Attorney, Heather Ferbert  
San Francisco City Attorney, David Chiu

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/2026)

Three individuals

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The source of this bill, the Civil Prosecutors Coalition, which includes many of the largest city attorney and county counsel offices in California, write that this bill would clarify the existing authority of local governments to provide state or local benefits to all residents at their discretion. Uncertainty about California's existing exemption from PRWORA, particularly at a time of heightened focus on immigration compliance, may create confusion and deter local governments from continuing to provide critical services that protect community health, safety, and economic stability. Moreover, they add, this lack of clarity could impact services for all community members because many programs would be operationally unable to screen for immigration status. For example, programs that help individuals experiencing homelessness obtain identification documents or access basic shelter cannot feasibly verify citizenship before providing assistance. Eliminating any uncertainty about California's PRWORA exemption would thus benefit the community overall.

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** Three individuals write in opposition not wanting any programs except emergency services to be provided to individuals who are undocumented.

Prepared by: Jen Flory / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111  
4/22/26 16:11:12

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1106  
Author: Cabaldon (D)  
Introduced: 2/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 8-0, 4/6/26  
AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg,  
Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Jones

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/20/26  
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

---

**SUBJECT:** Data brokers

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill shortens the timelines within which a data broker must comply with various provisions within the Delete Act.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires a business, on or before January 31 following each year in which it meets the definition of a data broker, to register with the Privacy Protection Agency (PPA), as provided. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1798.99.82.)
- 2) Defines “data broker” as a business that knowingly collects and sells to third parties the personal information of a consumer with whom the business does not have a direct relationship, except as provided. (Civ. Code § 1798.99.80.)
- 3) Requires data brokers to provide, and the PPA to include on its website, the name of the data broker and its primary physical, email, and website addresses,

as well as various other disclosures, including whether the broker collects consumers' precise geolocation or reproductive health care data and whether they collect the personal information of minors. Data brokers may, at their discretion, also provide additional information concerning their data collection practices. (Civ. Code §§ 1798.99.82, 1798.99.84.)

- 4) Subjects a data broker that fails to register as required to administrative fines and costs to be recovered in an administrative action brought by the PPA. (Civ. Code § 1798.99.82.)
- 5) Requires the PPA to establish an accessible deletion mechanism, as provided, that allows consumers, through a single request, to request all data brokers to delete any personal information related to the consumer, as specified. Data brokers are required to access the mechanism every 45 days and process requests for deletion, as specified, within 45 days.
- 6) Provides that in cases where a data broker denies a consumer request to delete because the request cannot be verified, the data broker must process the request as an opt-out of the sale or sharing of the consumer's personal information, as provided for pursuant to the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), within 45 days of receiving the request. (Civ. Code § 1798.99.86.)
- 7) Provides that after a consumer has submitted a deletion request and a data broker has deleted the consumer's data pursuant hereto, the data broker must delete all personal information of the consumer, except as provided, within 45 days beginning August 1, 2026. (Civ. Code § 1798.99.86.)
- 8) Establishes the CCPA, which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information. (Civ. Code § 1798.100 et seq.)
- 9) Provides consumers the right to request that a business delete any personal information about the consumer which the business has collected from the consumer. (Civ. Code § 1798.105(a).)
- 10) Provides a consumer the right, at any time, to direct a business that sells or shares personal information about the consumer to third parties not to sell or share the consumer's personal information. (Civ. Code § 1798.120.)

This bill reduces the above timelines in the Delete Act from 45 days to 30 days.

## **Background**

Data brokers collect and profit from consumers' data without having any direct relationship with the consumers whose information they amass. In order to bring this industry into the light and more fully inform consumers about who is collecting their personal information and how, California established a data broker registry, requiring data brokers to register annually with the California Privacy Protection Agency (CalPrivacy). Data brokers are required to pay a fee and provide certain information about their location, email, and website addresses.

Recent updates have bolstered the law to provide consumers more control over their information. This included a requirement that CalPrivacy create an accessible deletion mechanism that allows consumers, through a single request, to request all data brokers to delete any personal information related to the consumer, as specified. Data brokers are required to access the mechanism every 45 days and process requests for deletion and delete such information within 45 days thereafter. Beginning August 1, 2026, data brokers are required to delete all personal information of such consumers at least once every 45 days, as specified.

This bill again fortifies the law by shortening these time frames from 45 to 30 days. The bill is author sponsored. The California Initiative for Technology and Democracy is in support. No timely opposition has been received.

## **Comments**

To address concerns about the lack of transparency around data brokers' collection of consumer information, AB 1202 (Chau, Chapter 753, Statutes of 2019) established California's data broker registry. The bill was modeled on a Vermont law, Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9, §§ 2446 et seq., and requires data brokers to register and pay a registration fee on an annual basis.

The law defines a "data broker" as "a business that knowingly collects and sells to third parties the personal information of a consumer with whom the business does not have a direct relationship." To ensure consistency and to avoid confusion, the statute relies on existing definitions of "personal information," "third party," and "sale" in the CCPA.

Last session, SB 362 (Becker, Chapter 709, Statutes of 2023) bolstered the utility and effectiveness of the data broker registry law in myriad ways and strengthened consumers' right to deletion as to data brokers. Known as the "Delete Act," SB 362 required the creation of an accessible deletion mechanism by CalPrivacy that

allows consumers, through a single request, to request all data brokers to delete any personal information related to the consumer, as specified. CalPrivacy has created that mechanism, which is known as the “Delete Request and Opt-out Platform” or DROP.

*Strengthening the Delete Act.* Beginning August 1, 2026, a data broker is required to access DROP at least once every 45 days. Within 45 days after receiving a request, data brokers are required to process the deletion request and delete all personal information related to the consumer making the request consistent with the requirements of the Delete Act. In cases where a data broker denies a consumer request to delete because the request cannot be verified, the data broker must process the request as an opt-out of the sale or sharing of the consumer’s personal information, as provided in the CCPA, within 45 days of receiving the request.

Beginning August 1, 2026, after a consumer has submitted a deletion request and a data broker has deleted the consumer’s data, the data broker must delete all personal information of the consumer at least once every 45 days unless the consumer requests otherwise or the deletion is not required.

This bill reduces each of the above 45-day timelines to 30 days, expediting the ability of consumers to have their personal information deleted by data brokers.

According to the author:

California has taken important steps to give consumers the power to delete that data through a centralized deletion mechanism, but current law allows data brokers up to 45 days to act on those requests.

SB 1106 reduces that window to 30 days. When Californians exercise their power to reclaim their personal information, data brokers should act promptly. This bill holds the industry to a standard that puts people first.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The California Privacy Protection Agency (CalPrivacy) anticipates costs associated with updating the DROP platform, rulemaking, and enforcement. Costs to update the Delete Request and Opt-Out Platform (DROP) include content updates, technical implementation, and testing, and are estimated to

be \$100,000 one-time. For rulemaking and enforcement, CalPrivacy expects costs will be absorbable in the near term. However, based on overall compliance with the requirements of the measure enforcement, when data brokers fail to meet their 45 day data download/upload obligations, may require additional resources.

DROP, which is set to be fully operational August 1, 2026, is funded by registration fees deposited annually into the Data Broker Registry Fund. Any changes in programmatic spending may require a commensurate increase in registration fees.

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

California Initiative for Technology and Democracy

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The California Initiative for Technology and Democracy writes:

Online disclosure of personal information creates privacy risks for Californians, allowing them to be tracked and targeted with great precision. Moreover, once personal information about an individual is shared or collected, it can be sold and shared among hundreds of data brokers, making a mockery of any sense of privacy we may have. To increase online privacy, California's Delete Request and Opt-Out Platform or DROP, established by SB 362 (Becker), Chap. 709, Stats. 2023, and fully effective in August 2026, allows Californians, through a single request made to CalPrivacy, to opt-out of most online data collection of their personal information. Data brokers are required to delete that information within 45 days of request and then at least once every 45 days thereafter.

SB 1106 shortens the timeframe in which data brokers have to delete personal information, from 45 days of the request to 30 days and then every 30 days thereafter. This shortened deletion period better protects

Californians who choose to use DROP by requiring more timely removal of their personal information. More timely removal means less private information is circulating around the internet to anyone willing to pay for it.

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548  
4/21/26 16:19:38

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1111  
Author: Ashby (D)  
Amended: 3/23/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 8-1, 4/13/26  
AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg,  
Wiener  
NOES: Jones

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/21/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Digital replicas

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill (1) ensures that “digital replicas” are incorporated into the right of publicity law and criminal false impersonation statutes; (2) removes a presumption about incidental use of another’s likeness.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes California’s right of publicity law, which provides that any person who knowingly uses another’s name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness, in any manner, on or in products, merchandise, or goods, or for purposes of advertising or selling, or soliciting purchases of, products, merchandise, goods or services, without such person’s prior consent, shall be liable for any damages sustained by the person or persons injured as a result thereof. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 3344(a).)
- 2) Subjects a person in violation to liability to the injured party for the greater of the actual damages suffered or statutory damages of \$750, and any profits from

the unauthorized use that are attributable to the use and are not taken into account in computing the actual damages. Punitive damages may also be awarded to the injured party or parties. The prevailing party shall also be entitled to attorney's fees and costs. (Civ. Code § 3344(a).)

- 3) Provides that where a photograph or likeness of an employee of the person using the photograph or likeness appearing in the advertisement or other publication prepared by or on behalf of the user is only incidental, and not essential, to the purpose of the publication in which it appears, there shall arise a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence that the failure to obtain the consent of the employee was not a knowing use of the employee's photograph or likeness. (Civ. Code § 3344(c).)
- 4) Provides that any person who knowingly and without consent credibly impersonates another actual person through or on a website or by other electronic means for purposes of harming, intimidating, threatening, or defrauding another person is guilty of a public offense punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment. (Penal (Pen.) Code § 528.5.)
- 5) Provides that every person who falsely impersonates another in either their private or official capacity, and in that assumed character carries out specified actions, is punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment. (Pen. Code § 529.)
- 6) Provides that every person who falsely impersonates another, in either their private or official capacity, and in such assumed character receives any money or property, knowing that it is intended to be delivered to the individual so personated, with intent to convert the same to their own use, or to that of another person, or to deprive the true owner thereof, is punishable in the same manner and to the same extent as for larceny of the money or property so received. (Pen. Code § 530.)
- 7) Defines "digital replica" as a computer-generated, highly realistic electronic representation that is readily identifiable as the voice or visual likeness of an individual that is embodied in a sound recording, image, audiovisual work, or transmission in which the actual individual either did not actually perform or appear, or the actual individual did perform or appear, but the fundamental character of the performance or appearance has been materially altered. It does not include the electronic reproduction, use of a sample of one sound recording or audiovisual work into another, remixing, mastering, or digital remastering of

a sound recording or audiovisual work authorized by the copyright holder. (Civ. Code § 3344.1.)

This bill:

- 1) Provides, for purposes of the right of publicity law, that a voice or likeness includes a digital replica, as defined in Section 3344.1.
- 2) Removes the rebuttable presumption from the right of publicity statute.
- 3) Provides that for the purposes of all Penal Code provisions for which the false impersonation of another is a required element, including, without limitation, Sections 528.5, 529, and 530, false impersonation includes the use of a digital replica with the intent to impersonate another. “Digital replica” has the same meaning as in Section 3344.1 of the Civil Code.

## **Background**

Given the recent explosion in generative artificial intelligence (AI) capabilities and its near ubiquitous use, concerns have been raised that existing law must be updated to account for harms associated with its use. The rapid advancement of AI technology has made it drastically cheaper and easier to produce realistic synthetic content that is virtually impossible to distinguish from authentic content. “Digital replicas” are computer-generated, highly realistic electronic representations that are readily identifiable as the voice or visual likeness of an individual embodied in a sound recording, image, audiovisual work, or transmission in which the actual individual either did not actually perform or appear, or the actual individual did perform or appear, but the fundamental character of the performance or appearance has been materially altered.

This bill makes clear that digital replicas are incorporated into existing laws involving false impersonation, or use of likeness, of another, namely the right of publicity law and false impersonation criminal laws. It also removes a presumption regarding incidental use of another’s likeness without their consent.

This bill is supported by various advocacy groups, including 11:11 Media, Transparency Coalition.AI, and the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network. No timely opposition was received.

## Comment

This bill seeks to ensure that existing laws are equipped to handle the implications of the explosion of AI-generated or manipulated content. This bill is significantly similar to SB 970 (Ashby, 2024), which was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and SB 11 (Ashby, 2025), which was vetoed by Governor Newsom.

First, this bill amends California's right of publicity statute. That law provides that any person who knowingly uses another's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness, in any manner, on or in products, merchandise, or goods, or for purposes of advertising or selling, or soliciting purchases of, products, merchandise, goods or services, without such person's prior consent shall be liable for any damages sustained by the person or persons injured as a result thereof.

While initially designed for traditional media, the law's principles have become increasingly relevant in the GenAI era. This bill adds that a voice or likeness includes a digital replica. This bill also removes the following provision from the right to publicity statute:

Where a photograph or likeness of an employee of the person using the photograph or likeness appearing in the advertisement or other publication prepared by or in behalf of the user is only incidental, and not essential, to the purpose of the publication in which it appears, there shall arise a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence that the failure to obtain the consent of the employee was not a knowing use of the employee's photograph or likeness.

This bill amends the Penal Code to provide that for any provisions therein that have false impersonation as a required element, false impersonation includes the use of a digital replica with the intent to impersonate another.

Both changes rely on the definition of "digital replica" currently provided in Section 3344.1.

According to the author:

California is leading the nation in AI regulations. However, a significant gap remains. The lack of a comprehensive legal framework to address the non-consensual creation of AI deepfake images leaves victims with no remedy. While some deepfakes target public figures,

AI software now allows users to create content featuring anyone. Often, women are the targeted victims, and the vast majority of incidents are sexually explicit in nature.

SB 1111 creates a framework to hold AI users accountable by establishing clear legal standing for victims and defining the boundaries of AI technology. As technology changes, California must continue to advance the standard for protections against AI violence and those affected by it.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/22/26)

11:11 Media Impact  
California Initiative for Technology & Democracy  
Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network  
SAG-AFTRA  
Transparency Coalition.AI

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** 11:11 Media Impact writes:

This issue is urgent. AI-generated abuse is already being used to create sexually explicit deepfakes, spread false statements, and impersonate real people in deeply harmful ways. California's Department of Justice cites research showing that 90% of victims are women, 93% suffered significant emotional distress, 51% had suicidal thoughts, and 49% reported being stalked or harassed online by people who saw the material. These harms disproportionately affect women and girls and increasingly affect children as well.

At 11:11 Media Impact, we are proud to support legislation that addresses technology-facilitated abuse with the seriousness it demands. Survivors should not be left without meaningful recourse when their identities, dignity, and safety are violated.

SB 1111 is an important step to ensure California law keeps pace with this growing threat. It reflects a simple principle: people deserve

protection when their voice or likeness is used without consent, including through AI-generated digital replicas. As technology moves faster than the law, California must act to protect victims and provide clearer paths to accountability.

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548  
4/24/26 11:07:14

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1143  
Author: Caballero (D), et al.  
Amended: 4/14/26  
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.

*Senate Floor Amendments* of 4/14/26 permit, rather than require, a children’s advocacy center or other identified multidisciplinary team member to share recordings of forensic interviews with child welfare agencies.

**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 4/14/26)

County Welfare Directors Association (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/14/26)

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. /  
4/15/26 19:55:19

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1154  
Author: Reyes (D)  
Introduced: 2/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 5-2, 4/8/26  
AYES: Pérez, Cabaldon, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes  
NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Choi

---

**SUBJECT:** Public contracts: best value procurement: community college districts

**SOURCE:** San Bernardino Community College District

---

**DIGEST:** This bill authorizes community college districts to use the best value procurement method for public works projects over \$1 million until December 31, 2030, establishes related procedural requirements, and requires participating districts to submit a report to the Legislature by January 1, 2030.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires school districts and community college districts to competitively bid contracts for equipment, materials, or supplies exceeding \$50,000 and award to the lowest responsible bidder, or reject all bids.
- 2) Authorizes school districts, until December 31, 2030, to use the best value procurement method for public works projects exceeding \$1 million.
- 3) Permanently authorizes the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to use best value procurement.
- 4) Requires school districts using best value procurement under the statewide pilot to submit a report to the Legislature by January 1, 2030.

- 5) Allows other public entities, including the University of California (UC), to use best value procurement methods.

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a community college district to use the best value procurement method for public works projects exceeding \$1 million until December 31, 2030.
- 2) Requires community college districts using this method to adopt and publish procedures and guidelines for evaluating bidder qualifications that ensure a fair and impartial process.
- 3) Requires contracts to be awarded to the bidder representing the best value, or else all bids must be rejected.
- 4) Establishes procedural requirements for bid solicitations, evaluation criteria, and selection processes consistent with existing best value statutes applicable to school districts.
- 5) Requires community college districts using best value procurement to submit a report to the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature on or before January 1, 2030.
- 6) Repeals these provisions on January 1, 2031.

### **Comments**

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, “California’s Community College Districts play a critical role in preparing our workforce, supporting economic mobility, and serving millions of students across the state. The quality, safety, and functionality of campus facilities directly impact student learning, program access, and overall student success. Unfortunately, when it comes to delivering major construction projects, community colleges are held to a procurement standard that limits their ability to select contractors based on overall quality and long-term value.

SB 1154 addresses this issue by allowing community college districts to use a best value procurement method for public works projects exceeding one million dollars, allowing contracts to be awarded based on a combination of price and objective qualitative criteria, not simply the lowest bid. This grants them with

same flexibility already provided to K–12 school districts, the University of California, and the California State University.

Best value procurement helps ensure that projects are completed on time, built to high standards, and designed to support long-term functionality. By allowing districts to evaluate contractor experience, safety records, technical expertise, and life-cycle costs, SB 1154 promotes durable, high-quality facilities that enhance learning environments and support innovative instruction. These projects are essential to preparing students for transfer, career pathways, and participation in California’s evolving workforce and will ensure we are setting up our infrastructure for their long-term success.”

- 2) *Aligning K–14 procurement authority.* With the enactment of AB 361 (Schultz, Chapter 144, Statutes of 2025), school districts now have statewide authority, on a pilot basis, to use best value procurement, while LAUSD has permanent authority. Community college districts remain outside this framework despite managing significant capital outlay programs. This bill brings community college districts into alignment with the K-12 system, creating a more consistent procurement structure across publicly funded education segments.
- 3) *Revisiting the “lowest responsible bidder” model.* California’s traditional procurement model emphasizes awarding contracts based on the lowest responsible bid. While straightforward, this approach can undervalue contractor experience, safety records, and demonstrated ability to deliver projects on time and within budget. Best value procurement reflects a broader definition of value that incorporates qualitative factors alongside cost. This bill extends that policy shift to community college districts, raising similar questions considered in prior legislation: whether upfront cost savings should continue to outweigh long-term project performance.
- 4) *Evidence from K-12 and higher education entities.* The Legislature has already authorized best value procurement for several entities, including LAUSD and the UC. Evaluations of LAUSD’s use of best value procurement have found reductions in change orders, project delays, and claims. These findings suggest that incorporating non-cost factors into procurement decisions can produce more predictable project outcomes. Extending this authority to community college districts allows the state to test whether these benefits translate to a different segment of the education system with its own governance structures and project delivery needs.

- 5) *Guardrails and accountability.* Consistent with the K-12 pilot, this bill includes procedural safeguards to promote fairness and transparency, including requirements for published evaluation criteria and formal bid processes. It also requires community college districts to report to the Legislature on their use of best value procurement by January 1, 2030. These reporting requirements will provide important data to assess whether the method improves project delivery and cost outcomes in the community college context.
- 6) *A parallel pilot structure.* By aligning the sunset date (January 1, 2031) and reporting deadline (January 1, 2030) with the K-12 best value pilot, this bill creates an opportunity for the Legislature to evaluate procurement outcomes across both systems simultaneously. This parallel structure may support a more comprehensive statewide assessment of best value procurement and inform future decisions about whether to expand, modify, or make permanent these authorities.
- 7) *Capacity and implementation considerations.* Best value procurement requires more administrative capacity than traditional low-bid contracting, including the ability to design evaluation criteria, review qualifications, and conduct structured scoring processes. While some community college districts, particularly larger ones, may be well-positioned to implement these requirements, smaller districts may face challenges. As with the K-12 pilot, the effectiveness of this authority may depend in part on local capacity and the availability of technical assistance or model procurement frameworks.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/8/26)

San Bernardino Community College District (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/8/26)

Associated General Contractors

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105  
4/10/26 12:30:55

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1159  
Author: Cabaldon (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/25/26  
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

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 4/6/26  
AYES: Cabaldon, Jones, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes,  
Umberg, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Artificial intelligence: transparency and governance

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill provides that for the purposes of the California Public Records Act, the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, the Ralph M. Brown Act, the California Environmental Quality Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Political Reform Act of 1974, the terms “person,” “interested person,” “participant,” “member of the public,” as applicable, and any other similar terms under each act referring to those who may engage with governmental agencies, do not include artificial intelligence (AI) systems, autonomous agents, robots, or other nonhuman entities, whether physical or digital.

**ANALYSIS:** Existing law:

- 1) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies are required to be open to public scrutiny. (California Constitution, Article I, § 3(b)(1).)

- 2) Governs the disclosure of information collected and maintained by public agencies pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA). (Government (Gov.) Code §§ 7920.000 et seq.)
- 3) Establishes the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Bagley-Keene), which requires state bodies to conduct their business in open public meetings, except as provided by the Act, and establishes requirements and procedures for such meetings. (Gov. Code § 11120 et seq.)<sup>1</sup>
- 4) Establishes the Ralph M. Brown Act (Brown Act), which secures public access to the meetings of public commissions, boards, councils, and agencies in the state. (Gov. Code §§ 54950 et seq.)
- 5) Requires lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed discretionary project to prepare a negative declaration, mitigated declaration, or environmental impact report (EIR) for this action, unless the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA includes various statutory exemptions, as well as categorical exemptions in the CEQA Guidelines). (Public Resources Code §§ 21100 et seq.)<sup>2</sup>
- 6) The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) governs the adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations by state agencies and for the review of those regulatory actions by the Office of Administrative Law. (Gov. Code §§ 11340 et seq.)
- 7) Establishes the Political Reform Act of 1974 (PRA), which creates the Fair Political Practices Commission and makes it responsible for the impartial, effective administration and implementation of the PRA. (Gov. Code §§ 81000 et seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that for the purposes of the CPRA, Bagley-Keene, Brown Act, CEQA, APA, and the PRA, the terms “person,” “interested person,” “participant,” “member of the public,” as applicable, and any other similar terms under each act referring to those who may engage with governmental agencies, do not include artificial intelligence systems, autonomous agents, robots, or other nonhuman entities, whether physical or digital.

---

<sup>2</sup> All further references are to the Public Resources Code unless otherwise indicated.

- 2) Defines “artificial intelligence” to mean an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.
- 3) Makes various legislative findings and declarations.

### **Comments**

The author points to a recent situation that necessitates the need for this bill. In 2025, the South Coast Air Quality Management District Board (SCAQMDB) voted on proposed regulations to place fees on natural gas-powered water heaters and furnaces with the goal of encouraging a shift toward electric appliances. SCAQMDB received tens of thousands of emails regarding the pending air quality rules, with at least 20,000 of them being generated by an AI-powered platform CiviClick. According to an L.A. Times story, “[w]hen staffers at the air district reached out to a small sample of people to verify their comments, at least three said they had not written to the agency and were not aware of any such messages, records show[.]” Some commenters allege that these AI-generated comments led to the SCAQMDB voting down the proposed regulations.

This bill seeks to ensure that state and local governments can continue to meet their obligations to the public under California’s transparency laws and public participation statutes by not being overwhelmed by AI-generated requests, comments, petitions, or other communications. The author argues this will ensure that limited public resources are not diverted from serving the people of California. The bill states that AI systems lack the essential attributes of personhood. To bolster this conclusion, the author points to the fact that the Federal Circuit has found that only natural persons can be named as inventors on patent applications and that that AI systems are not natural persons. In this vein, the Patent and Trademark Office has issued guidance that states: “AI systems, including generative AI and other computational models, are instruments used by human inventors. They are analogous to laboratory equipment, computer software, research databases, or any other tool that assists in the inventive process.”

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/8/26)

ACT Now Bay Area  
Active San Gabriel Valley

Building Decarbonization Action Fund  
California Association of Nonprofits  
California Municipal Clerks Association  
California Special Districts Association  
California State Association of Counties  
California YIMBY  
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Chamber of Progress  
Circulate Planning & Policy  
City of Newport Beach  
City of Placentia  
City of San Jose  
City of Stanton  
City of Westminster  
Climate Action Campaign  
Contra Costa County  
County of Napa  
County of Sacramento  
County of Yolo  
League of California Cities  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay  
Rural County Representatives of California  
Sierra Club California  
Streets for All  
TechEquity Action  
U.S. Green Building Council California  
Urban Counties of California

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/8/26)

Oakland Privacy  
1 individual

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The author writes:

AI slop drowns out the voices of genuine human citizens trying to make their voices heard. SB 1159 puts an end to the intentional corruption of public engagement guarantees by those using AI agents to overwhelm public agencies, divert attention from real constituents, and strip public discourse of any meaning at all.

AI swarming has emerged as a real problem. Recently, the Los Angeles Times reported at least 20,000 public comments generated by AI may have convinced Southern California's top air pollution authority to scrap a plan to phase out gas-powered appliances. The Times confirmed a public affairs consultant used a company that bills itself as an "AI-powered grassroots advocacy platform" to send the messages. The same playbook is being used to target the Bay Area air district, where a Chronicle investigation found that the residents who had comments submitted under their names never submitted anything. "This was forged," one San Pablo resident told the Chronicle. "I never wrote the letter." In the United Kingdom, an AI service called Objector.ai is generating similar concerns about swarming government with infinite objections ("AI-powered nimbyism could grind UK planning system to a halt, experts warn", The Guardian).

The Rural County Representatives of California, California State Association of Counties, Urban Counties of California, and the League of California Cities write in support stating:

[...] California's open meeting and open governance laws are intended to not only allow the public to observe deliberations about issues that will affect their communities, but to participate as well. Local agencies accept public comment on matters both on the agenda and off. Technology has been a powerful tool to make public participation more accessible than ever, as agendas and the time and location of public meetings are posted online. Those unable to comment or observe in person are able to follow along online or submit written comments via email or web portal.

However, emerging AI and Large Language Model (LLM) tools have now made it easier than ever for bad actors to misrepresent public opinion in governance decisions. According to reporting from multiple outlets, in June 2025 a political consultant used AI tools to generate twenty thousand emails to the South Coast Air Quality Management District regarding a regulatory proposal before the board. The AI generated emails purported to be from members of the public in South Coast AQMD's jurisdiction, but during an audit by air district staffers many said that they were not aware of signing onto any such messages. In an interview with a trade publication, the political consultant behind the advocacy effort bragged about how the volume "left the South Coast AQMD staff reeling."

Automated engagement tools have the capacity to overwhelm government agencies, crowd out the voices of actual members of the public, and undermine the intent of California’s transparent governance laws. Clarifying how these laws apply in the context of emerging technologies, particularly distinguishing between authentic public input and activity generated at scale by artificial intelligence systems, represents an important step toward protecting meaningful public participation, open governance, and critical staff resources for local agencies. With thoughtful refinement, SB 1159 will help address these challenges in a way that is both effective and implementable as technology continues to evolve quickly. [...]

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** Oakland Privacy writes in opposition stating:

[...]The current language in the bill sweeps extremely broadly beyond the particular situation described – that of a large volume of automated comments in an administrative proceeding, but we will discuss our concerns in that context before turning to the other components of the bill.

One of the hallmarks of California’s venerable open government law is that individuals who give public comment at public meetings do not have to vet themselves in any way. They do not have to identify themselves, they do not have to live in the jurisdiction in question, and they do not need to verify their identity in any fashion or form if they choose not to do so. [...]

In short, we don’t think that the advent of artificial intelligence renders California’s governmental transparency legal structure moot and in need of serious revision. The problems potentially presented by AI, including fraudulent bulk emails, lengthy Zoom public comment sessions, and high volume public records requests all have their analog equivalents and existing tools to address them. They are not, like most things, perfect, and the author knows as well as anyone that it can be exhausting to be a public servant, but they have on the whole served California well for the past 70+ years.

We do not think Californians should have to worry that the newest response to speech that the government doesn’t like is “you’re not human, you’re an AI”.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113

4/8/26 16:35:54

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

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1170  
Author: Durazo (D)  
Introduced: 2/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/22/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Joint powers agreements: nonprofit housing developers

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill allows nonprofit housing developers to join risk pooling joint powers authorities.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Allows two or more public agencies to use their powers in common if they sign a joint powers agreement under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act. Each public agency must independently possess the authority to perform the activity that is to be performed jointly pursuant to a joint powers agreement. Sometimes an agreement creates a new, separate government called a joint powers authority (JPA).
- 2) Allows public agencies to use the JPA law and the related Marks-Roos Local Bond Pooling Act to form bond pools to finance public works, working capital, insurance needs, and other public benefit projects.
- 3) Generally limits membership in JPAs to public agencies: federal, state, and local governments. However, legislation has authorized some types of private entities to enter into joint powers agreements with public agencies for specified purposes, including:

- 4) Allows mutual water companies and private water companies to join a JPA for risk-pooling and providing technical support, continuing education, safety engineering, and operational and managerial advisory assistance to JPA members to reduce risk liabilities.

This bill allows nonprofit housing developers to join risk pooling joint powers authorities.

## **Background**

*Risk pooling JPAs.* State law allows a mutual water company to enter into a joint powers agreement with any public agency to jointly exercise any power common to the contracting parties provided the agreement ensures no participating public agency becomes responsible for the underlying debts or liabilities of the joint powers agency (AB 2014 (Cortese, Chapter 250, Statutes of 1994)). However, mutual water companies do not have the independent power to offer insurance, so they could not join a JPA for insurance purposes. AB 656 (Cristina Garcia, Chapter 250, Statutes of 2015) addressed this issue by allowing mutual water companies to join a JPA for risk-pooling and providing technical support, continuing education, safety engineering, and operational and managerial advisory assistance to JPA members to reduce risk liabilities.

Prior to AB 656, mutual water companies had to purchase insurance in the open market. Because the pooling of self-insurance among entities participating in a JPA is not subject to insurance premium taxes, a risk-pooling JPA can generally set lower premiums and offer broader coverage than would be available through the private marketplace. By allowing mutual water companies to realize some of these savings through membership in a mutual water company insurance JPA, AB 656 made residual funding available to help mutual water companies. AB 428 (Blanca Rubio, Chapter 151, Statutes of 2025) extended SB 656 to private water companies.

*Affordable housing insurance.* Just like other types of development, affordable housing developers need insurance policies to cover losses from property damage or injury claims. Recently, affordable housing developers have reported significant insurance premium increases, or trouble purchasing insurance policies altogether.

## **Comments**

*Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, “I am proud to author Senate Bill 1170, which allows affordable housing developers and public agencies to partner

on self-insuring affordable housing developments through a risk-pooling Joint Powers Authority (JPA). This measure aims to address the significant increases in insurance costs for 100% affordable housing developers, as well as a lack of available insurance altogether. California is struggling with an affordable housing crisis, with over half of Californians considered rent-burdened. At the same time, the affordable housing supply in California cannot meet current demand, exacerbating the affordable housing crisis in the most populous and second most expensive state in country. As affordable housing developers are working on addressing the urgent need for housing, they are seeing insurance premiums rise, if they can get insurance at all. Many affordable housing developers are reporting over 100 percent insurance premiums increases. By allowing non-profit developers to join a risk-pooling JPA that pools self-insurance claims and losses, SB 1170 will help reduce affordable housing insurance costs and lower affordable housing production costs. This will help preserve existing affordable housing developments and encourage the production of more affordable housing.”

*Public agency in name only.* The beauty of the Joint Exercise of Powers Act is its flexibility: local agencies can come together to form an agreement of their own design to carry out any power common to each of its members. As such, local agencies do not need legislative authority to form a JPA unless it requires powers not common to all its members, or when statutory certainty and specificity is preferable to the agreement’s details. The Legislature has seldom offered private entities the opportunity to join JPAs because they are not public agencies: unlike public agencies, private companies are not subject to laws regarding public meetings, their records are not always public. SB 1170 opens up the Joint Exercise of Powers Act to more private entities, but it does so in an effort to protect and produce affordable housing.

*Something different?* The problems affordable housing developers face getting insurance is not a new problem, nor is the proposed risk-pooling strategy a new potential solution. Public housing authorities have had a risk pool since 1987, but that did not cover nonpublic entities. AB 2327 (Harkey, Chapter 384, Statutes of 2010) authorized an affordable housing entity to join with others in an arrangement providing for the pooling of self-insured claims or losses. Despite these existing risk pools, insurance for affordable housing remains an issue. SB 1170 creates another option for affordable housing developers to pursue lower insurance premiums, but it remains to be seen whether a JPA model can help in ways these previous efforts have not. SB 1170 does not mandate its formation, or limit exactly who governs it, or specify how it provides insurance. Figuring out how to model a JPA to fill in gaps in the affordable housing insurance market will come down to each JPA.

**Related/Prior legislation**

AB 1339 (Mark González, Chapter 728, Statutes of 2025) requires, upon appropriation, the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to conduct a study on the availability of property, liability, and builders' risk insurance coverage for certain affordable housing entities within one-year of such an appropriation. CDI has not released this report yet.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/23/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
4/24/26 11:07:15

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1173  
Author: Caballero (D)  
Amended: 3/23/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 4/14/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener  
NOES: Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Jury instructions: lesser related offenses

**SOURCE:** California Attorneys for Criminal Justice; Californians for Safety and Justice

---

**DIGEST:** This bill restores a criminal defendant's right to a jury instruction on lesser related offenses to the offense charged, and permits a jury, or a judge if a jury trial is waived, to find the defendant guilty of the lesser offense if certain conditions are met.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that after closing arguments in a criminal trial, the judge may then charge the jury, and shall do so on any points of law pertinent to the issue, if requested by either party. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 1093, subd. (f).)
- 2) Provides that at the beginning of the trial or from time to time during the trial, and without any request from either party, the trial judge may give the jury such instructions on the law applicable to the case as the judge may deem necessary for their guidance on hearing the case. (Ibid.)
- 3) Provides that in any criminal case which is being tried before the court with a jury, all requests for instructions on points of law must be made to the court and all proposed instructions must be delivered to the court before commencement of argument. (Pen. Code, § 1093.5)

- 4) Provides that before the commencement of the argument, the court, on request of counsel, must:
  - a) Decide whether to give, refuse, or modify the proposed instructions.’
  - b) Decide which instructions shall be given in addition to those proposed, if any.
  - c) Advise counsel of all instructions to be given. (Ibid.)
- 5) Provides that if, during the argument, issues are raised which have not been covered by instructions given or refused, the court may, on request of counsel, give additional instructions on the subject matter thereof. (Ibid.)
- 6) Provides that when it appears that the defendant has committed a public offense, or attempted to commit a public offense, and there is reasonable ground of doubt in which of two or more degrees of the crime or attempted crime he is guilty, he can be convicted of the lowest of such degrees only. (Pen. Code, § 1097.)
- 7) Defines a special verdict as that by which the jury finds the facts only, leaving judgment to the court, as specified. (Pen. Code § 1152.)
- 8) Provides that the court must give judgment upon the special verdict as follows:
  - a) If the plea is not guilty, and the facts prove the defendant guilty of the offense charged in the indictment or information, or of any other offense of which he could be convicted under that indictment or information, judgment must be given accordingly. But if otherwise, judgment of acquittal must be given.
  - b) If the plea is a former conviction or acquittal or once in jeopardy of the same offense, the court must give judgment of acquittal or conviction, as the facts prove or fail to prove the former conviction or acquittal or jeopardy. (Pen. Code, § 1155.)
- 9) Provides that whenever a defendant is convicted of a crime or attempt to commit a crime which is distinguished into degrees, the jury, or the court if a jury trial is waived, must find the degree of the crime or attempted crime of which he is guilty. Upon the failure of the jury or the court to so determine, the degree of the crime or attempted crime of which the defendant is guilty, shall be deemed to be of the lesser degree. (Pen. Code, § 1157.)

- 10) Provides that the jury, or the judge if a jury trial is waived, may find the defendant guilty of any offense, the commission of which is necessarily included in that with which he is charged, or of an attempt to commit the offense. (Pen. Code, § 1159.)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that a jury, or a judge if a trial is waived, upon request of a defendant, may find the defendant guilty of a lesser offense, the commission of which is closely related to the offense with which the defendant is charged, if the court determines that all of the following conditions are met:
  - a) The defendant relies on a theory of defense that is consistent with a conviction for the lesser offense.
  - b) The evidence of the lesser offense is relevant to and admitted for the purpose of establishing whether the defendant is guilty of the charged offense.
  - c) A basis exists, other than an unexplainable rejection of prosecution evidence, on which the jury could find the offense to be less than that charged.
- 2) States that it is the intent of the Legislature in enacting the provision above to restore the right of a defendant to receive jury instructions on lesser related offenses as originally guaranteed by the California Supreme Court in *People v. Geiger* (1984) 35 Cal.3d.510.

## Comments

California law has long provided that a trial court must instruct a criminal jury on any lesser included offense if there is substantial evidence only the lesser crime was committed. In 1984, however, the California Supreme Court in *People v. Geiger* (1984) 35 Cal.3d 510 ruled that in certain circumstances, and only upon the request of the defendant, the defendant also has a right to have the jury instructed on lesser related offenses that bear some conceptual and evidentiary relationship to the greater offense. The *Geiger* Court rooted its reasoning in the constitutional principles requiring instruction on lesser included offenses:

The necessity for instructions on lesser offenses is founded in the defendant's 'constitutional right to have the jury determine every material issue presented by the evidence.' [...] The requirement of instructions on lesser included offenses is based on the elementary principle that the court should instruct the jury on every material question. The state has no

interest in a defendant obtaining an acquittal where he is innocent of the primary offense charged but guilty of a necessarily included offense. Nor has the state any legitimate interest in obtaining a conviction of the offense charged where the jury entertains a reasonable doubt of guilt of the charged offense but returns a verdict of guilty of that offense solely because the jury is unwilling to acquit where it is satisfied that the defendant has been guilty of wrongful conduct constituting a necessarily included offense. Likewise, a defendant has no legitimate interest in compelling the jury to adopt an all or nothing approach to the issue of guilt.

As such, the Court in *Geiger* opined that “it would be fundamentally unfair to deny the defendant the right to have the court or jury consider the ‘third option’ of convicting the defendant of the related offense,” and that the prosecution would also benefit because “some guilty defendants who would otherwise go free will be punished for a crime which they committed even though it was overlooked by a prosecutor or was not charged because the prosecutor overestimated the strength of the Peoples’ evidence.”

Reasoning that these considerations of due process, fairness, and accuracy should apply to lesser related offenses with equal force, the Court held that, upon the defendant’s request, a trial court must instruct a jury on lesser related offenses, but only when three prerequisites are met. First, there must be some basis, other than an unexplainable rejection of the prosecution evidence on which the jury could find the offense to be less than that charged. Second, although some evidence offered by the prosecution or the defendant may indicate that the defendant committed a crime other than that charged, instructions regarding that crime need not be given “unless the evidence is also relevant to and admitted for the purpose of establishing whether the defendant is guilty of the charged offense.” Finally, the instructions must be justified by the defendant’s reliance on a theory of defense that would be consistent with a conviction for a related offense. That is, if the defense was predicated on a complete denial of criminal culpability, or mistaken identity, a lesser related offense instruction was unnecessary.

A California criminal defendant’s right to have the jury instructed on lesser related offenses lasted until the California Supreme Court overruled its decision in *Geiger* when it handed down *People v. Birks* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 108. In *Birks*, the Court held that a defendant is not entitled to jury instructions on lesser related offenses as a matter of due process, even if he or she requests the instruction and it would have been supported by substantial evidence, and courts may not instruct concerning an uncharged lesser related crimes unless agreed to by both parties. The Court

reasoned that “the Geiger rule contravenes the principle of mutual fairness by giving the defendant substantially greater rights either to require, or to prevent, the consideration of lesser nonincluded offenses than are accorded to the People, the party specifically responsible for determining the charges,” and, moreover “invites the jury to convict the defendant of a crime that no party may have attempted to establish beyond a reasonable doubt.” The Court also suggested that the Geiger rule may raise separation of powers issues under Article 3 of the California Constitution, but refrained from resolving such issues in its opinion.

This bill, reinstating the *Geiger* rule, additionally provides that a jury, or a judge if a jury trial is waived, upon request of the defendant, may find the defendant guilty of a lesser offense, the commission of which is closely related to the offense with which the defendant is charged. Per the *Geiger* ruling, the bill, prior to an instruction on a lesser related offense, requires the court to determine that all of the following conditions have been met:

- The defendant relies on a theory of defense that is consistent with a conviction for the lesser offense.
- The evidence of the lesser offense is relevant to and admitted for the purpose of establishing whether the defendant is guilty of the charged offense.
- A basis exists, other than an unexplainable rejection of prosecution evidence, on which the jury could find the offense to be less than that charged.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/14/26)

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice (co-source)

Californians for Safety and Justice (co-source)

ACLU California Action

California Public Defenders Association

Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice

Courage California

Drug Policy Alliance

Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Felony Murder Elimination Project

Justice2Jobs Coalition

La Defensa

San Francisco Public Defender

Silicon Valley De-Bug  
Smart Justice California  
The W. Haywood Burns Institute

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/14/26)

California District Attorneys Association

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /  
4/15/26 19:55:20

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1175  
Author: Rubio (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/24/26  
Vote: 27 - Urgency

---

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/7/26  
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

---

**SUBJECT:** Lobbyist registration and termination

**SOURCE:** California Secretary of State Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D.

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires a lobbyist to file an amended lobbyist certification or a notice of lobbying termination directly with the Secretary of State (SOS), rather than with the lobbying firm or the lobbyist employer.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires lobbying firms and lobbyist employers to register with the SOS.
- 2) Requires each individual lobbyist to submit a lobbyist certification to the SOS. This certification shall include:
  - a) A recent photograph;
  - b) The full name, business address, and telephone number of the lobbyist;
  - c) A statement that the lobbyist understands the statutory gift limit; and
  - d) A statement that the lobbyist has completed an ethics course or will do so.
- 3) Requires, when any of the information in the lobbyist certification changes or if the lobbyist terminates all lobbying activity, the lobbyist to submit an amended certification or a notice of termination to the lobbying firm or lobbyist employer, who shall submit it to the SOS.

This bill requires the lobbyist to submit changes in certification or a notice of termination directly to the SOS.

## **Background**

Proposition 9, which appeared on the June 1974 ballot, created the California Political Reform Act (PRA) and established California's system of regulating lobbying activity, campaign finance, and conflicts of interest for public officials. Proposition 9 created the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) to implement, administer, and enforce the PRA. The PRA regulates lobbyists, including requiring lobbyists to register with the SOS and file periodic reports disclosing their activities.

## **Comments**

*Author's statement.* Transparency and accountability are foundational to public trust, and this is especially true for California's lobbyist registration system. Current law requires lobbyists to submit registration amendments or termination notices to their lobbying employer or firm if there are any changes in their certification information. The lobbyist's employer or firm then files with the SOS.

This current lobbyist registration system can create significant delays and transparency issues when lobbyists change employers or need to update their registration. Because employers have 20 days to file certification changes with the state, and because lobbyists can only be registered with one employer or firm at a time, lobbyists may have to wait weeks for their former employer to file termination paperwork before they can register with a new employer. This delay can result in lobbyists filing late disclosure reports through no fault of their own, and the lobbyist's relationship with their new employer remaining undisclosed to the public.

This bill modernizes our lobbying disclosure system by requiring lobbyists to file terminations, employment changes, and registration amendments directly with the SOS, instead of going through their employer or firm. In doing so, it eliminates unnecessary delays, and ensures Californians have clear and timely information about who is advocating before their government.

*Cal-Access and CARS.* In 2000, the SOS deployed, pursuant to SB 49 (Karnette, Chapter 866, Statutes of 1997), the California Automated Lobby Activity and Campaign Contribution and Expenditure Search System, or Cal-Access. Cal-Access replaced the paper-based system and provides on-line filing of reports and

statements required by the PRA. It also provides online access to these statements and reports for the public.

Due to its age and associated shortcomings, SB 1349 (Hertzberg, Chapter 845, Statutes of 2016) directed the SOS, in consultation with the FPPC, to replace Cal-Access with a new disclosure system, the Cal-Access Replacement System or CARS. The SOS expects to fully deploy CARS by the end of 2026.

*Same code section twice?* The PRA includes various sections that exist in two different versions with the same code section number. The existence of multiple versions of the code with the same code section number reflects a technical mechanism to allow certain changes to state law to go into effect when CARS is deployed.

In anticipation of the deployment of CARS, SB 1239 (Hertzberg, Chapter 662, Statutes of 2018) made numerous substantive and technical changes to provisions of the PRA governing the filing of campaign and lobbying reports. Because CARS was in development at the time, SB 1239 made changes to campaign and lobbying disclosure rules that were incorporated into the design of CARS but specified those changes would not go into effect until the SOS certified that CARS was functional and met the requirements of state law. As a result, various provisions of the PRA exist in two different versions: one version is operative now, and a second version becoming operative when the SOS certifies that CARS meets specified requirements of state law (at which point, the currently operative version of the section will become inoperative). As a result, this bill amends both the versions of Government Code Section 86107.

*Urgency.* Should it become law, this bill needs to take effect immediately so the change it makes to lobbyist certification can be incorporated into CARS before it is completed this fall. Without the urgency clause, the system would be built under outdated statutory requirements and require costly retrofitting after the launch.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/7/26)

California Secretary of State Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D. (source)  
California Political Treasurer's Association  
Fair Political Practices Commission

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/7/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

Writing as the sponsor of the bill, the SOS states that by “making this change, greater responsibility is placed directly on lobbyists for maintaining accurate registration status, allowing government efficiency and transparency to be upheld in the process for the public.”

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106  
4/8/26 16:35:55

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1177  
Author: Cortese (D)  
Introduced: 2/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 9-3, 4/7/26

AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Gonzalez, Grayson, Menjivar, Richardson, Wiener

NOES: Strickland, Seyarto, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** High-Speed Rail Authority: project update report

**SOURCE:** U.S. High Speed Rail Association

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires the California High-Speed Rail Authority's (Authority) biennial project update report (PUR) to include certain additional information about the budget, schedule, and planning of the high-speed rail project.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Creates the Authority in the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). (Public Utilities Code (PUC) § 185020)
- 2) Requires the Authority to direct the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail service. (PUC § 185030)
- 3) Requires the Authority to submit to the Legislature no later than March 1, 2017, and every two years thereafter, a PUR containing specified information that includes at a minimum, a program wide summary, as well as details by project

segment, including information about the progress of the project, budget projections, expenditures, and project schedule. (PUC § 185033.5)

This bill:

- 1) Requires the biennial PUR, in addition to existing statutory requirements, to include:
  - a) An explanation of the assumptions used for financing methods calculations;
  - b) A comparison of the current and projected work schedule to projected schedules in previous PURs;
  - c) An analysis of potential ancillary revenue sources; and,
  - d) A comparison and benchmarking of cost, scope, and timeline to international high-speed rail projects.

## Comments

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, “The High-Speed Rail Project has been a decades-long investment in our transit system, our environment, and our economy. It is essential that we maintain transparency into the project’s cost, scope, and progress. The High-Speed Rail PUR is published and submitted to the Legislature every two years and provides an important record of the Authority’s progress and their projections for the future. As the Authority completes its comprehensive review of the Project’s design criteria, scope, cost, procurement strategy, ridership, and schedule, SB 1177 will ensure that critical project information about the Projects implementation continues to be reported to the Legislature and made available to the public.”
- 2) *California High-Speed Rail.* Development of high-speed rail in California began nearly 30 years ago with the creatin of the Authority. However, the project did not gain steam until 2008 when voters approved Proposition 1A, the Safe, Reliable, High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act. This was a \$9.95 billion general obligation bond to fund the proposed California high-speed rail project and related improvements. As envisioned at the time of the ballot measure, the project was to consist of an 800-mile dedicated high-speed passenger rail system capable of speeds up to 220 miles per hour, initially serving the major metropolitan market of San Francisco through the Central Valley into

Los Angeles and Anaheim (Phase I), with service eventually extending to Sacramento, the Inland Empire, and San Diego (Phase II).

In July 2012, the Legislature approved SB 1029 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 152, Statutes of 2012), that appropriated nearly \$8 billion in federal and state funds to begin the construction between Madera and Bakersfield. Further, the 2014-15 state budget trailer bill SB 862 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 36, Statutes of 2014), continuously appropriated 25% of the revenues derived from the state's Cap-and-Trade program to the project. Additionally, the Legislature approved SB 198 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 71, Statutes of 2022), which required the Authority to focus its resources on finishing a usable high-speed segment from Merced to Bakersfield. Finally, in 2025, through AB 1207 (Irwin, Chapter 117, Statutes of 2025) and SB 840 (Limon and McGuire, Chapter 121, Statutes of 2025), the Legislature extended the Cap-and-Trade program through 2045, renaming it Cap-and-Invest. SB 840 also allocated \$1 billion of Cap-and-Invest funds annually to the Authority through 2045.

- 3) *Financial constraints.* Despite the large level of investment in high-speed rail over the past years, the project is still vastly short of its funding needs. When Proposition 1A bonds were approved in 2008, the cost for the project was estimated at \$45 billion, to be paid for by a mix of state bonds, federal grants, and private investments. Since then, the cost of the project has risen markedly, with the 2026 Draft Business Plan providing a price estimate for Phase I at just shy of \$128 billion. The same plan places the projected cost for the Merced-Bakersfield segment at \$34.8 billion. These estimates also include a number of cost-saving measures identified during a new "bottom-up cost review" that adjusted the Authority's overall financing assumptions. This review further included explicit and implicit scope changes to the project, such as moving the Merced and Bakersfield stations outside of the downtown area and reducing the amount of dual-track rail to 20 miles across the entire segment. Finally, these changes also come on the heels of the Authority dropping efforts to retain \$4 billion in disputed federal grant funds, effectively relinquishing the money.

Despite these challenges, the Authority projects that they currently have the funds to complete the Merced-Bakersfield segment. However, this funding does not mean that they have cash on hand to align with planned construction schedules. The Authority's most recent financial outlook assumes that they are able to secure these near-term funds through financing based on their ongoing

Cap-and-Invest appropriations. Additionally, this outlook requires that the Legislature approves the aforementioned scope changes to the plan that is currently outlined in SB 198. As noted, these changes include controversial decisions, including relocating the Merced station outside of the downtown area.

- 4) *Required reporting.* As part of its reporting and transparency requirements, the Authority is required to prepare, publish, and adopt a Business Plan every even numbered year outlining key required elements of the high-speed rail project. Those elements include project development information, including a description of the type of service being developed; the timing and sequencing of project phases and segments; estimated capital costs; ridership estimates; and a discussion of reasonable foreseeable risks and strategies to manage those risks. Additionally, the Business Plan is required to contain estimates and descriptions of the total anticipated federal, state, local, and other funds the Authority intends to access for the construction and operation of the system.

In addition to the Business Plan, the Authority is also required to prepare a PUR by March 1 of every odd numbered year that provides certain updated information including a program wide summary, as well as details by project segment, including information about the progress of the project, budget projections, expenditures, and project schedule.

- 5) *This bill requires more reporting consistency.* Both the Business Plan and PUR are required to contain specific, statutorily outlined information about the high-speed rail project. However, these reports commonly contain additional information beyond these requirements. This information is often helpful in providing additional context about the overall state and trajectory of the project, as well as to help track progress on the project over time. This bill proposes to mandate the inclusion of this additional information in future PURs. For example, recent reports have either directly contained or referred to other public documents that contain information about many of the items this bill would mandate. These include the financing assumptions made by the Authority in preparing its budget numbers, an analysis on potential ancillary revenue sources for the project, and certain types of comparisons to other international high-speed rail projects. Thus, this bill would help provide a consistency in the type of information provided that would enable better tracking of how the project has evolved over time.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

U.S. High Speed Rail Association (Source)

Climate Action California

Transbay Coalition

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

City of Burbank

Prepared by: Samuel Myers / TRANS. / (916) 651-4879

4/21/26 16:19:40

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1211  
Author: Gonzalez (D)  
Amended: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/14/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Criminal procedure: postconviction investigation

**SOURCE:** Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

---

**DIGEST:** This bill outlines parameters for district attorney offices that accept cases for postconviction review related to innocence claims and enables those offices to have access to materials that they would not otherwise have access to because the case is closed.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, in any case where a person has been arrested and no accusatory pleading has been filed, the person arrested may petition the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense to destroy its records of the arrest. Requires a copy of the petition to be served upon the prosecuting attorney of the county or city having jurisdiction over the offense. Requires the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense to seal its arrest records and the petition for relief for three years from the date of the arrest and thereafter destroy its arrest records and the petition, upon a determination that the person arrested is factually innocent. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 851.85, subd. (a).)

- 2) Requires the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense to notify the Department of Justice (DOJ), and any law enforcement agency that arrested the petitioner or participated in the arrest of the petitioner for an offense for which the petitioner has been found factually innocent, of the sealing of the arrest records and the reason. Requires DOJ and any law enforcement agency so notified to seal their arrest records and the notice of sealing for three years from the date of the arrest, and thereafter destroy their records of the arrest and the notice of sealing. Requires the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense and the DOJ to request the destruction of any records of the arrest which they have given to any local, state, or federal agency or to any other person or entity. Requires each agency, person, or entity within California receiving the request to destroy its records of the arrest and the request, unless otherwise provided in this section. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (a).)
- 3) Provides that after receiving a petition for relief, if the law enforcement agency and prosecuting attorney do not respond to the petition by accepting or denying the petition within 60 days after the running of the relevant statute of limitations or within 60 days after receipt of the petition in cases where the statute of limitations has previously lapsed, the petition is deemed to be denied. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (b).)
- 4) Authorizes any judicial determination of factual innocence to be heard and determined upon declarations, affidavits, police reports, or any other evidence submitted by the parties which is material, relevant, and reliable. Prohibits a finding of factual innocence and an order for the sealing and destruction of records from being made unless the court finds that no reasonable cause exists to believe that the arrestee committed the offense for which the arrest was made. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (b).)
- 5) Provides, in any court hearing to determine the factual innocence of a party, that the initial burden of proof rests with the petitioner to show that no reasonable cause exists to believe that the arrestee committed the offense for which the arrest was made. Provides that the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to show that a reasonable cause exists to believe that the petitioner committed the offense for which the arrest was made if the court finds that this showing of no reasonable cause has been made by the petitioner. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (b).)

- 6) Requires the court, if it finds the arrestee to be factually innocent of the charges for which the arrest was made, to order the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense, the DOJ, and any law enforcement agency which arrested the petitioner or participated in the arrest of the petitioner for an offense for which the petitioner has been found factually innocent to seal their records of the arrest and the court order to seal and destroy the records, for three years from the date of the arrest and to then destroy their records of the arrest and the court order to seal and destroy those records. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (b).)
- 7) Authorizes a defendant, in any case where a person has been arrested and an accusatory pleading has been filed, but where no conviction has occurred, to petition the court that dismissed the action for a finding that the defendant is factually innocent of the charges for which the arrest was made, at any time after dismissal of the action. Requires a copy of the petition to be served on the prosecuting attorney in which the accusatory pleading was filed at least 10 days prior to the hearing on the petitioner's factual innocence. Authorizes the prosecuting attorney to present evidence to the court at the hearing. Requires the hearing to be conducted as provided above. Requires the court to grant relief if the court finds the petitioner to be factually innocent of the charges for which the arrest was made. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (c).)
- 8) Authorizes the court, with the concurrence of the prosecuting attorney, to grant the relief described above, in any case where a person has been arrested and an accusatory pleading has been filed, but where no conviction has occurred, at the time of the dismissal of the accusatory pleading. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (d).)
- 9) Authorizes the court, whenever any person is acquitted of a charge and it appears to the judge presiding at the trial at which the acquittal occurred that the defendant was factually innocent of the charge, to grant the relief described above. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (e).)
- 10) Requires the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense or court, in any case where a person who has been arrested is granted relief, to issue a written declaration to the arrestee stating that it is the determination of the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the offense or court that the arrestee is factually innocent of the charges for which the person was arrested and that the arrestee is thereby exonerated. Provides that the arrest is

deemed not to have occurred and the person may answer accordingly any question relating to its occurrence. (Pen. Code, § 851.85, subd. (f).)

- 11) Authorizes the judge, whenever a person is acquitted of a charge and it appears to the judge presiding at the trial that the defendant was factually innocent of the charge, to order that the records in the case be sealed, including any record of arrest or detention, upon the written or oral motion of any party in the case or the court, and with notice to all parties to the case. Requires the court, if such an order is made, to give to the defendant a copy of such order and inform the defendant that he may thereafter state that he was not arrested for such charge and that he was found innocent of such charge by the court. (Pen. Code, § 851.85.)
- 12) Requires the judge, whenever a person is convicted of a charge and the conviction is set aside based upon a determination that the person was factually innocent of the charge, to order that the records in the case be sealed, including any record of arrest or detention, upon written or oral motion of any party in the case or the court, and with notice to all parties to the case. Requires the court, if such an order is made, to give the defendant a copy of that order and inform the defendant that the person may state they were not arrested for that charge and that they were not convicted of that charge, and that they were found innocent of that charge by the court. (Pen. Code, § 851.86.)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the district attorney to file a notice with the court notifying the court of intent to conduct a postconviction investigation of a claim of factual innocence, if the district attorney accepts a case for postconviction review.
- 2) Provides that “accepts a case for postconviction review” means that a conviction integrity unit or other formally designated unit of a district attorney’s office that is structurally independent from the trial, appellate, and habeas litigation divisions of the office, has formally accepted for internal review a claim of factual innocence at the request or initiation of the petitioner alleging factual innocence.
- 3) Requires the case, upon the filing of a notice described above, to be treated as if it were an open case for the purpose of investigating a claim of factual innocence. Specifies that the district attorney has the power to issue subpoenas

and compel the production of documents and testimony, as provided, and file motions necessary to investigate claims, as provided.

- 4) Requires the district attorney, to the extent the district attorney seeks otherwise confidential materials relating to the petitioner, to obtain a written waiver from the petitioner or the petitioner's counsel before the discovery is authorized.
- 5) Prohibits the authority granted by the provisions of this bill from being exercised if any direct appeal, habeas corpus proceeding, motion for new trial, or other collateral attack concerning the same conviction is pending in any state or federal court, unless the petitioner or petitioner's counsel agrees to the exercise of that authority.

## Background

A Conviction Integrity Unit (CIU) is a division of a prosecutor's office that works to prevent, identify, and remedy false convictions. They are also called Conviction Review Units (CRUs). Their purpose is described as follows:

“Conviction Integrity Review” or, more expansively “Case Integrity Review” or “Post-Conviction Integrity Review” ... were initially conceived (and as many still exist in their narrowest form) the focus was solely on actual innocence claims, often where the defendant was serving a life sentence or received the death penalty. Many of these earliest units operated internally ... Where a claim was substantiated, the office's response was generally limited to releasing that person from prison, and perhaps providing some monetary relief to the wrongfully convicted individual. (Fair and Just Prosecution, *Conviction Integrity Units and Internal Accountability Mechanisms* (Sept. 2017) <<https://fairandjustprosecution.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/FJPBrief.ConvictionIntegrity.9.25.pdf> .)

Several counties in the state have a district attorney office with a CIU, including Los Angeles, Santa Clara, Sacramento, San Diego, Contra Costa, among others. In 2023, Attorney General (AG) Bonta established the first-ever Post-Conviction Justice Unit (PCJU) within the Department of Justice. (<https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-establishes-first-ever-post-conviction-justice-unit>)

The AG's PCJU requires factual innocence in order to review a conviction. (<https://oag.ca.gov/pcju/conviction>) The PCJU generally requires that a request for conviction review is made in the county where the conviction was obtained. (*Ibid.*) The PCJU will only review cases after a referral has been made by another prosecution office or after a completed application has been submitted if the AG's Office prosecuted the case. (*Ibid.*) The PCJU webpage provides:

PCJU is guided by California Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3.8(f), which states that when a prosecutor knows of new, credible, and material evidence that shows a person was convicted of a crime they did not commit, the prosecutor must cause an investigation to determine whether somebody was wrongfully convicted. With this rule, PCJU will investigate cases where there is credible and material evidence currently available or can be reasonably obtained that shows a convicted person did not commit the crime for which they were convicted. A person does not need to fully investigate their case before applying for conviction review. (*Ibid.*)

This bill is designed to outline parameters for district attorney offices that accept cases for postconviction review and to enable these offices access to materials that they would not otherwise have access to because the case is closed.

First, this bill authorizes the district attorney to file a notice with the court notifying it of intent to conduct a postconviction investigation of a claim of factual innocence. "Accepts a case for postconviction review" is defined as a CIU or other formally designated unit of a district attorney's office that is structurally independent from the trial, appellate, and habeas litigation divisions of the office, that has formally accepted a claim of factual innocence at the request or initiation of the petitioner alleging factual innocence for internal review.

This bill provides that after notice is filed, the case is treated as if it were an open case for the purpose of investigating a claim of factual innocence. This bill specifies that the district attorney has the power to issue subpoenas and compel the production of documents and testimony, file motions necessary to investigate claims, including, but not limited to, motions for personnel records pursuant to *Pitchess v. Superior Court* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 531, motions for court-ordered appointment of counsel, and motions for removal of incarcerated individuals consistent with the district attorney's authority under existing law and consistent with the criminal discovery process.

This bill provides guardrails to protect confidential materials by requiring the district attorney to obtain a written waiver from the petitioner or the petitioner's counsel before discovery is authorized if the district attorney is seeking otherwise confidential materials relating to the petitioner, including, but not limited to, materials contained in the petitioner's central file or institutional records.

Finally, this bill limits its application if any direct appeal, habeas corpus proceeding, motion for new trial, or other collateral attack concerning the same conviction is pending in any state or federal court, unless the petitioner or petitioner's counsel agrees to the exercise of that authority.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

Los Angeles County District Attorney (source)  
California Civil Liberties Advocacy

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /  
4/21/26 9:20:04

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1229  
Author: Allen (D)  
Amended: 4/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-2, 4/7/26  
AYES: Becker, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Stern  
NOES: Seyarto, Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Coastal resources: coastal development permits: disaster exemption

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill prohibits the use of the coastal development permit exemption to rebuild a certain structure destroyed by a disaster if the property owner is not the property owner of record prior to the disaster and if certain additional conditions are met, such as being located in an environmentally sensitive area, as specified.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act) (Public Resources Code (PRC) §§30000 *et seq.*):
  - a) Establishes the California Coastal Commission (commission) in the California Natural Resources Agency.
  - b) Includes legislative findings and declarations that:
    - i) The coastal zone is a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people, the permanent protection of the state's natural and scenic resources is a paramount concern to present and future residents, and existing uses and future developments that are carefully

- planned and developed consistent with the Coastal Act are essential to the economic and social well-being of the people of the state (PRC §30001).
- ii) It is important for the commission to encourage the protection of existing and the provision of new affordable housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income in the coastal zone (PRC §30604).
  - iii) The basic goals of the state for the coastal zone include to:
    - (1) Protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and artificial resources;
    - (2) Ensure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources, taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state; and
    - (3) Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners, among other things (PRC §30001.5).
- c) Provides for the planning and regulation of development within the coastal zone, as defined.
- i) A person planning to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone is required to obtain a coastal development permit (CDP) from the commission or local government enforcing a certified local coastal program (LCP) (PRC §30600).
    - (1) Development means, among other things, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure on land or in water. Structure means any building, road, pipe, flume, conduit, and electrical power transmission and distribution line, among other things (PRC §30106).
    - (2) The coastal zone means the coastal land and waters of California, and includes the lands that extend inland generally 1,000 yards from the mean high tide line, as specified, with various exceptions, including the San Francisco Bay (PRC §30103).
- d) Provides a CDP exemption for certain types of development including, among others:

- i) Improvements to existing single-family residences, as specified;
- ii) Improvements to structures other than a single-family residence or a public works facility that do not involve a risk of adverse environmental effect, affect public access, or involve a change in use contrary to the Coastal Act, as provided;
- iii) Maintenance dredging of existing navigation channels;
- iv) Repair or maintenance activities that do not result in an addition to or enlargement or expansion of the object of those activities, as specified;
- v) Temporary development, as provided;
- vi) The replacement of a structure other than a public works facility destroyed by a disaster provided that the replacement structure conforms to applicable existing zoning requirements, is for the same use as the destroyed structure, does not exceed either the floor area, height, or bulk of the destroyed structure by more than 10%, and is sited in the same location, as provided (PRC §30610).
- e) Defines “environmentally sensitive area” to mean any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments (PRC §30107.5).

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits use of the CDP exemption for the replacement of a structure destroyed by a disaster where the structure conforms to existing zoning, is for the same use, sited in the same location, and is no more than 10% larger, as provided, if the property owner is not the property owner of record immediately preceding the disaster, and if the replacement structure would do any of the following:
  - a) Encroach upon a lateral or vertical public access easement or deed restriction.
  - b) Encroach upon an open space easement or deed restriction that has been recorded or offered for dedication, as provided.
  - c) Be located within an environmentally sensitive area or within a required buffer area adjacent to an environmentally sensitive area.

- d) Be sited within a bluff setback established by a certified LCP or the commission.
  - e) Be incompatible with the public trust, as applicable, or occupy, fill, or encroach upon state tide and submerged lands.
  - f) Block, impede, or restrict public access to or along the coast in a manner not present prior to the disaster.
- 2) Provides for reimbursement of mandated state costs, as provided, and makes additional minor technical amendments to statute.

## **Background**

The catastrophic Palisades Fire started on the morning of January 7, 2025, and grew rapidly to over 15,000 acres over the first day driven by strong Santa Ana wind gusts and falling humidity. The fire destroyed or damaged almost 8,000 structures, and tragically resulted in the deaths of 12 people. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, the fire burned 23,448 acres, and was not contained until January 31, 2025. Recent estimates by Redfin are that the Palisades Fire alone caused over \$50 billion worth of damage to residential property.

After a disaster, property owners may face multiple challenges when deciding whether to rebuild or sell their lot given delays in insurance payouts, underinsurance, and increases in labor and building materials costs. In the City of Malibu, the Palisades Fire destroyed 700 homes of which 300 were beachfront properties. As of early January 2026, only 22 building permits had been issued by Malibu to rebuild properties destroyed by the Palisades Fire. Some Malibu property owners opted to sell instead of rebuild, and some properties to the west of the Pacific Coast Highway have already been sold. According to Redfin, 44% of the burned lots in Malibu have been purchased by developers. This has raised concerns in the community. For example, developers from New Zealand have purchased 16 burned beachfront lots at a cost of nearly \$100 million and plan to build 16 luxury prefabricated homes to ship to California for installation. They anticipate completion by 2029.

In a series of six Executive Orders during and after the Palisades and Eaton Fires, Governor Newsom suspended the Coastal Act, the California Environmental Quality Act, sections of the California Building Standards Code, and sections of the California Energy Code for disaster rebuilds and repairs. These remain in effect.

[NOTE: See the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee’s bill analyses for detailed background regarding this bill.]

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

California Coastal Protection Network  
Sierra Club California  
Sonoma Land Trust  
Surfrider Foundation

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the author, “The devastating 2025 Palisades Fire destroyed approximately 10,000 homes and businesses in coastal areas, forcing residents to make difficult choices about whether and how to rebuild. The Coastal Act currently allows homes destroyed by disaster to be rebuilt without a new coastal development permit if the new structure is similar to the original. This exemption was intended to help homeowners quickly restore their residence after catastrophic events by accelerating the rebuilding process. Unfortunately, in practice, the exemption may be exploited by investors or developers interested in buying up properties at below-market value, with plans to redevelop them in ways that may limit public coastal access – all without review.”

“SB 1229 closes this loophole by ensuring speculative purchasers rebuilding after disaster cannot bypass the Coastal Act’s core resource protection and public access policies, while still prioritizing streamlined recovery for disaster victims as well as the preservation of our coastal environments and communities.”

Prepared by: Katharine Moore / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116  
4/21/26 16:19:40

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1234  
Author: Alvarado-Gil (R), et al.  
Amended: 4/8/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 4/14/26  
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, McNerney, Reyes, Stern,  
Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Durazo, Valladares

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 4-0, 4/20/26  
AYES: Becker, Niello, Laird, Weber Pierson  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Pérez

---

**SUBJECT:** Dependency: fentanyl testing

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires, whenever a juvenile court judge orders a parent or guardian of a child adjudged to be a dependent of the juvenile court to submit to testing for controlled substances, the testing panel to include testing for fentanyl.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the juvenile court, which has jurisdiction over minors who are suffering or at substantial risk of suffering harm or abuse and may adjudge the minor to be a dependent of the court. (Welfare (Welf.) & Institutions (Inst.) Code, § 300.)
- 2) Provides that the purpose of the juvenile court dependency system is the maximum safety and protection for children who are currently being abused, neglected, or exploited, and that the focus is on the preservation of the family,

as well as the safety, protection, and physical and emotional well-being of the child. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 300.2.)

- 3) Provides that the juvenile court may, after a dispositional hearing, order that a dependent child be removed from, or remain out of, the custody of their parent or guardian<sup>1</sup> if, on the basis of the evidence presented, the court determines that the child cannot safely remain in their parent's custody. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 358.)
- 4) Requires, whenever a child is removed from a parent's custody, that the juvenile court order the social worker to provide child welfare services and reunification services to the child and the child's mother and statutorily presumed father or guardians. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 361.5(a).)
- 5) Establishes a number of exceptions to the requirement to provide services to a parent under 4), including, but not limited to, circumstances wherein the parent has inflicted serious physical harm or sexual abuse upon the child or a sibling; where the parent's parental rights have already been terminated with respect to a sibling of the child, and the parent has not made a reasonable effort to treat the problems that led to the removal of that sibling; and where the parent has a history of extensive, abusive, and chronic use of drugs or alcohol and has resisted prior court-ordered treatment, as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 361.5(b).)
- 6) Permits the juvenile court to order direct any orders to the parent of a dependent child that the court deems necessary and proper to further the court's goals, including, but not limited to, ordering the parent to participate in a counseling or education program or ordering the parent to ensure the child's regular school attendance. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 362.)

This bill requires, whenever a juvenile court judge orders a parent or guardian of a child adjudged to be a dependent of the juvenile court to submit to testing for controlled substances, the testing panel to include testing for fentanyl.

## Comments

California's child welfare system is responsible for ensuring the protection and safety of children at risk of abuse, neglect, or abandonment. When it is necessary for the state to remove a child from their parent's custody, the primary objective of the child welfare system is to reunify the child with their family, if doing so is consistent with the best interests of the child. To that end, in most cases a juvenile

---

<sup>1</sup> Going forward, the term "parent" includes "guardian."

court orders reunification services—such as counseling for the family, and parenting classes or drug or alcohol treatment for the child’s parents—before making a final determination regarding parental rights. A juvenile court has broad discretion in what it can require of a parent with a child in the dependency system, including ordering the parent to submit to testing for controlled substances.

This bill requires, whenever a juvenile court judge orders a parent or guardian of a child adjudged to be a dependent of the juvenile court to submit to testing for controlled substances, the testing panel to include testing for fentanyl.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

Alpine County Probation Department  
Alpine County Sheriff’s Office  
Amador County Sheriff’s Office  
California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals  
Madera County Sheriff’s Office  
Mariposa County Probation Department  
Merced County Sheriff’s Office  
Mono County District Attorney’s Office  
Placer County Sheriff’s Office  
One individual

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers, Inc.  
Dependency Legal Services San Diego

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the Placer County Sheriff’s Office:

Fentanyl continues to be a significant driver of the opioid crisis, accounting for approximately 69 percent of overdose deaths nationwide, with nearly 73,000 deaths reported in 2023. Recent data also indicates a sharp rise in fentanyl poisonings among young children, including an increase of more than 900 percent among children under the age of 12 between 2015 and 2023. These trends underscore the growing presence of fentanyl in environments where children may be at risk.

Under current law, courts may order drug testing in dependency cases, but there is no requirement specifying which substances must be included. SB 1234 addresses this gap by ensuring fentanyl is included in testing panels when

testing has already been ordered. This targeted change would improve the effectiveness of existing court-ordered testing without expanding its scope.

Including fentanyl in these cases supports more informed decision-making by courts and child welfare professionals when assessing child safety, risk, and reunification. For counties like Placer, this is an important step in strengthening our ability to protect vulnerable children and respond to evolving substance use trends in our communities.

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** According to Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers, Inc., and Dependency Legal Services San Diego:

There is limited funding and resources available in the child welfare system. The system is overloaded as it currently exists. Imposing mandatory drug tests would require substantial funding which would be pulled away from necessary services designed to safely reunify families. While the idea is to add fentanyl testing only in those cases where drug testing is already occurring there is a cost associated with expanding the panel of a drug test and not every recovering addict is a risk for fentanyl use. Requiring every test of an alcoholic to include testing for fentanyl is a waste of resources. Failures of obtaining the test for fentanyl or errors in the lab including the test could result in delays to reunification based on the failure to complete an unnecessary test.

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113  
4/22/26 16:11:12

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1273  
Author: Cabaldon (D), et al.  
Introduced: 2/20/26  
Vote: 21

---

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Alcoholic beverages: tied-house restrictions: wine instructional  
events and promotional lectures: video advertisements

**SOURCE:** Napa Valley Vintners

---

**DIGEST:** This bill expands on provisions in the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (Act) related to advertisements for instructional events for consumers at a retailer's premises. This bill allows for the advertisements to contain videos that are up to 60 seconds long and removes the requirement that the specified information and any pictures, illustrations, or depictions in that advertisement be relatively inconspicuous in relation to the advertisement as a whole.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) and grants it the exclusive authority to administer the provisions of the ABC Act in accordance with laws enacted by the Legislature. This involves licensing individuals and businesses associated with the manufacture, importation, and

sale of alcoholic beverages in this state and the collection of license fees for this purpose.

- 2) Separates the alcoholic beverage industry into three component parts, or tiers, (referred to as the “tied-house” law or “three-tier” system), of manufacturer (including breweries, wineries and distilleries), wholesaler, and retailer (both on-sale and off-sale). The original policy rationale for this body of law was to: (a) promote the state’s interest in an orderly market; (b) prohibit the vertical integration and dominance by a single producer in the marketplace; (c) prohibit commercial bribery and to protect the public from predatory marketing practices; and, (d) discourage and/or prevent the intemperate use of alcoholic beverages. Generally, other than exceptions granted by the Legislature, the holder of one type of license is not permitted to do business as another type of licensee within the three-tier system.
- 3) Permits a winegrower, a winegrower’s agent, wine importer, or other specified parties to conduct or participate in, and serve wine at, an instructional event for consumers held at a retailer’s premises featuring wines produced by or for the winegrower or, imported by the wine importer if specified conditions are met. In this regard, these licensees may list certain information in advertisements for the event, but those advertisements are prohibited from including any video.
- 4) Prohibits a premium, gift, free goods, or anything of value from being given away in connection with the instructional event by the winegrower, California winegrower’s agent, wine importer, or retailer, except as authorized.
- 5) Provides that no alcoholic beverages may be sold at the instructional event, except that orders for the sale of wine may be accepted by the winegrower if the sales transaction is completed at the winegrower’s premises.
- 6) Provides that the name, address, telephone number, email address, internet website address, and any other electronic media of a winegrower, wine importer, or winegrower’s agent licensee, the brand names of wine being featured, and the time, date, location, and other identifying information of a wine promotional lecture at a retail premises may be listed in advance of the event in an advertisement of the off-sale or on-sale retail licensee.

This bill:

- 1) Expands on current provisions in the ABC Act related to advertisements by a winegrower, winegrower's agent, or wine importer for instructional events for consumers held at a retailer's premises by allowing that advertisement to contain videos that are up to 60 seconds long.
- 2) Removes the requirement that the specified information and any pictures, illustrations, or depictions in that advertisement be relatively inconspicuous in relation to the advertisement as a whole.
- 3) Provides that the advertisement may contain pictures, illustrations, videos, or depictions of the winegrower, wine importer, or winegrowers' agent.

## **Background**

*Author Statement.* According to the author's office, "SB 1273 provides a targeted modernization to California's tied-house laws, building on the Legislature's prior work in AB 2452 (2018) and SB 788 (2019) by allowing winegrowers and wine importers to use short-term video in advertisements promoting legally permitted consumer events like winemaker dinners and tastings. Social media has changed dramatically since the Legislature last addressed this issue, and platforms like Instagram, TikTok, and Facebook now overwhelmingly favor video content, leaving California vintners at a growing disadvantage in reaching their own customers. At a time when the industry is facing serious headwinds, with well-known wineries downsizing or closing in recent months, this bill gives vintners a more authentic way to meet consumers where they are, at no cost to the state."

*Tied-House Laws/Three-Tier System.* Existing law, known as the "tied-house" law or "three-tier" system, separates the alcoholic beverage industry into three component parts: manufacturer/supplier (the first tier), wholesaler (the second tier), and retailer (the third tier). The original policy rationale for this body of law was to: (1) promote the state's interest in an orderly market; (2) prohibit the vertical integration and dominance by a single producer in the marketplace; (3) prohibit commercial bribery and to protect the public from predatory marketing practices; and (4) discourage and/or prevent the intemperate use of alcoholic beverages. Tied-house laws generally prohibit suppliers and retailers from sharing common owners and legally restrict alcohol beverage suppliers' ability to gain control over retailers through indirect means. Generally, other than exemptions granted by the

Legislature, the holder of one type of license is not permitted to do business as another type of licensee within the three-tier system.

*Current Authorization.* Current law authorizes winegrowers, winegrower's agents, and wine importers to conduct and/or participate in instructional consumer tastings at a retailer's premises, subject to a number of conditions. Specifically, current law is clear that no premium, gift, free goods, or other things of value may be given away in connection with the instructional event, and no alcoholic beverages may be given away except for limited samples. Limited samples include minimal amounts of wine, taken from barrels or tanks and up to three one-ounce tastes per consumer from bottles of wine provided by the licensee.

Alcohol cannot be sold at the event itself, though licensees may take orders if the sale is completed at their own premises. Current law also allows limited advertising of the event by the licensee, including basic identifying information and still images, but prohibits listing retail prices, making laudatory references to the retailer, using video, or making the retailer's information overly prominent. This bill allows the advertisement to contain videos up to 60 seconds long and removes the requirement that the specified information and any pictures, illustrations, or depictions be relatively inconspicuous in relation to the advertisement as a whole. This bill would also authorize the advertisement to contain pictures, illustrations, videos, or depictions of the winegrower, wine importer or winegrower's agent.

These changes all seek to modernize these provisions of the ABC Act when it comes to advertisements by specified licensees for instructional events held at a retailer's premises. According to the author's office, "platforms like Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok have restructured their algorithms to heavily prioritize video content particularly short-term video. Research indicates that social video generates approximately 1,200% more shares than text and images combined. For practical purposes, this means that a winery attempting to promote a legally permitted consumer event through static images and text is operating at a severe and growing disadvantage compared to what the platforms' own design rewards."

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AB 2452 (Aguiar-Curry, Chapter 705, Statutes of 2018) revised various advertising prohibitions for alcohol licensees when conducting instructional events at a retailer's location to, among other things, allow for pictures, illustrations, and depictions of the retailer's premises and for the name, address, telephone number,

email address, Internet Web site address, and any other electronic media of the licensee upon whose licensed premises the event will be held.

AB 1891 (Levine, Chapter 273, Statutes of 2018) allows a licensed craft distiller to instruct consumers and conduct tastings on the premises of an on-sale and off-sale retailer, as long as certain specified conditions are met.

AB 780 (Williams, Chapter 408, Statutes of 2015) made clarifying and conforming changes relating to the listing of on-sale and off-sale retailers as a thing of value in order to enable licensees to connect with each other for normal commercial purposes.

AB 636 (Hall, Chapter 329, Statutes of 2013) permitted a winegrower, California winegrower's agent, importer, or other specified parties appearing at an instructional event, as specified, to provide autographs to consumers or consumer advertising specialties given by the person to a consumer or on any item provided by a consumer; and prohibited a requirement of the purchase of any alcoholic beverage in connection with such autographing.

SB 1101 (Wolk, Chapter 177, Statutes of 2010) clarified that winemakers who participate in instructional events or "meet the winemaker dinners," held at a retailer's licensed premises for consumers, may offer minimal samples, no more than three one-ounce tastes, of wine from "bottles."

AB 605 (Portantino, Chapter 230, Statutes of 2010) added new provisions to the Act authorizing the Department of ABC to issue to the holder of an "off-sale" retail license an "instructional tasting license" for the purpose of furnishing tastings of alcoholic beverages to consumers, subject to certain limitations.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, staff notes that the Department of ABC's activities are funded by regulatory and license fees and generally the department does not receive support from the General Fund. New legislative mandates, although modest in scope, may in totality create new cost pressures and impact the department's operating costs and future budget requests.

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

Napa Valley Vintners (Source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the Napa Valley Vintners, “SB 1273 further updates the changes to the Business & Professions Code that were made in 2018 through AB 2452 to allow for a winery event promotion using social media. The 2018 amendments represented a good-faith effort to align California’s tied-house advertising rules with the realities of social media promotion at that time by allowing for photos and social media handles to be used in promotions. However, the digital landscape has shifted dramatically in the intervening seven years in ways that the Legislature could not have fully anticipated. SB 1273 is a common-sense fix that modernizes tied-house restrictions to allow video content in supplier advertisements, while maintaining protections against undue retailer promotion.”

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530  
4/14/26 16:16:12

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

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1274  
Author: Archuleta (D)  
Amended: 4/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/22/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Industrial cities

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill defines the term industrial cities.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Allows cities and counties to make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.
- 2) Allows cities and counties that adopt charters to control their own municipal affairs, and makes these laws supreme over all laws inconsistent therewith.

This bill defines industrial city to mean a city:

- 1) With a resident population under 25,000;
- 2) A majority of the city's land area is zoned for, or primarily devoted to, industrial, manufacturing, logistics, warehouses, energy production, or other employment-generating commercial uses, rather than residential use; and
- 3) Supports a daytime workforce that exceeds its resident population.

## Background

Whether living in general law or charter cities, city residents receive a variety of municipal services including police and fire protection, libraries, parks and recreation, road maintenance, public transit, street trees, lighting and landscaping, water, sewers, planning and development. Full service cities provide these services themselves. Partial service and contract cities rely on special districts and counties to provide many of these services to their residents. Cities come in all shapes and sizes. The state's largest city is Los Angeles with nearly 3.9 million residents. The state's smallest city is Amador City with about 200 residents.

## Comments

*Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "California is home to a small number of unique cities that have a higher daytime workforce population than nighttime residential population. In these cities, the number of jobs exceeds the number of residents, industrial land use often dominates the municipal footprint, and freight and commercial traffic often represent a significant share of roadway demand. This phenomenon typically occurs when a city is primarily zoned for industrial use and is experiencing large numbers of workers commuting to and from the city every day. One of the many unique challenges faced by industrial cities is the lack of financial resources for infrastructure maintenance and transportation. Because many transportation funding formulas rely heavily upon a city's residential population, industrial cities in California are not receiving funding that reflects the reality of roadway wear, freight demand, and infrastructure usage in their jurisdictions."

*Necessary?* SB 1274 adds a definition of industrial city to state law, but does not do anything beyond define the term. The cities sponsoring the legislation indicate that this definition will allow them to craft future legislative efforts to consider their unique concerns. Is this sufficient to justify legislation?

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/23/26)

City of Industry

City of Santa Fe Springs

City of Vernon

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
4/24/26 11:07:15

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1285  
Author: Durazo (D)  
Introduced: 2/20/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/7/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** Juvenile court: procedure

**SOURCE:** California Youth Defender Center

---

**DIGEST:** This bill states that the Welfare and Institutions Code Section 782 is a general dismissal statute.

*Senate Floor Amendments of 4/16/26 add co-authors.*

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that a minor between 12 and 17 years of age, inclusive, who violates any federal, state, or local law or ordinance, and a minor under 12 years of age who is alleged to have committed murder or a specified sex offenses, is within jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge the minor to be a ward of the court. (Welfare (Welf.) & Institutions (Inst.) Code, § 602.)
- 2) Authorizes a juvenile court judge to dismiss a petition, or set aside the findings and dismiss the petition, if the court finds that the interests of justice and the welfare of the person who is the subject of the petition require that dismissal, or if it finds that they are not in need of treatment or rehabilitation. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(1).)

- 3) Provides the court has jurisdiction to order dismissal or setting aside of the findings and dismissal regardless of whether the person who is the subject of the petition is, at the time of the order, a ward or dependent child of the court. Specifies that nothing in existing law shall be interpreted to require the court to maintain jurisdiction over a person who is the subject of a petition between the time the court's jurisdiction over that person terminates and the point at which their petition is dismissed. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(1).)
- 4) Requires the court, when exercising its discretion at the time the court terminates jurisdiction or at any time thereafter, to consider and afford great weight to evidence offered by a person to prove mitigating circumstances are present, including, but not limited to, satisfactory completion of a term of probation, that rehabilitation has been attained to the satisfaction of the court, that dismissal of the petition would not endanger public safety, or that the underlying offense is connected to mental illness, prior victimization, or childhood trauma. Provides that proof of the presence of one or more mitigating circumstances weighs greatly in favor of dismissing the petition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(A).)
- 5) Defines "satisfactory completion of a term of probation" to mean the person has no new findings of wardship or conviction for a felony offense or a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude during the period of supervision or probation and if the person has not failed to substantially comply with the reasonable orders of supervision or probation that are within their capacity to perform. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 782, subd. (a)(2)(B), 786, subd. (c)(1).)
- 6) Defines "rehabilitation has been attained to the satisfaction of the court" to mean consistent with Section 781 which includes that the person has not been convicted of a felony or of any misdemeanor involving moral turpitude. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(C).)
- 7) Defines "mental illness" as a mental disorder identified in the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders excluding antisocial personality disorder, borderline personality disorder, and pedophilia. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(D); Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (c)(5).)
- 8) Provides that "childhood trauma" means that as a minor the person experienced physical, emotional, or sexual abuse, physical or emotional neglect. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(D); Penal (Pen.) Code, § 1385, subd. (c)(6)(A).)

- 9) Provides that “prior victimization” means the person was a victim of intimate partner violence, sexual violence, or human trafficking, or the person has experienced psychological or physical trauma, including, but not limited to, abuse, neglect, exploitation, or sexual violence. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(D); Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (c)(6)(B).)
- 10) Provides that “endanger public safety” means there is a likelihood that the dismissal of the enhancement would result in physical injury or other serious danger to others. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(D); Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (c)(2).)
- 11) Provides that the great weight standard set forth in this paragraph is not applicable in cases where an individual has been convicted in criminal court of a serious or violent felony. Specifies that “serious or violent felony” means any offense defined in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5, or in subdivision (c) of Section 1192.7, of the Penal Code. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(E), (a)(2)(F).)
- 12) Prohibits the absence of the great weight standard under the circumstances described above from affecting the court’s authority to dismiss a petition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(2)(G).)
- 13) Requires the reasons for a dismissal decision to be stated orally on the record. Requires the court to also set forth the reasons in an order entered upon the minutes if requested by either party or in any case in which the proceedings are not being recorded electronically or reported by a court reporter. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (b).)
- 14) Provides that the court has authority to exercise discretion to dismiss at any time after the filing of the petition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (c).)
- 15) Provides that the court has the authority to exercise discretion to dismiss regardless of whether a petition was sustained at trial, by admission or plea agreement. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (d).)
- 16) Provides that dismissal of a petition, or setting aside of the findings and dismissal of a petition, after the person was declared a ward, does not alone constitute a sealing of records as defined in Section 781 or 786. Provides that any unsealed records pertaining to the dismissed petition may be accessed, inspected, or used by the court, the probation department, the prosecuting

attorney, or counsel for the minor in juvenile court proceedings commenced by the filing of a new petition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (e).)

- 17) Provides that dismissal of the petition, or setting aside the findings and dismissal of the petition, does not relieve a person from the obligation to pay unfulfilled victim restitution ordered pursuant to a civil judgment. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (f).)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that the above provisions are a general dismissal statute.
- 2) Provides that an adjudication dismissed pursuant Section 782 shall be deemed to have not occurred and a person shall not suffer any future adverse consequences based on an adjudication dismissed pursuant to this section.

## **Background**

Under current law, the juvenile court may dismiss a juvenile delinquency petition if the court finds that dismissal serves the interests of justice and the welfare of the minor, or if the court finds that the minor does not need treatment or rehabilitation. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(1).)

Welfare and Institutions Code section 782 was substantially amended by the enactment of AB 2629 (Santiago, Chapter 970, Statutes of 2022), which required the court to consider and give great weight to evidence offered by the person to prove mitigating circumstances are present (e.g., satisfactory completion of probation, attainment of rehabilitation, the offense being connected to mental illness, prior victimization, or childhood trauma, or that dismissal would not endanger public safety). Section 782 provides that proof of one or more mitigating circumstances weighs greatly in favor of dismissing the petition. The court's authority to exercise its discretion to dismiss the petition applies at any time after the petition is filed and regardless of whether the petition was sustained at trial, admitted by the youth, or by plea agreement. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 782, subds. (c), (d).)

Prior to the amendments enacted in 2022, Welfare and Institutions Code section 782 was understood to be a general dismissal statute. (*In re David T.* (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 866.)

At the time the AB 2629 was introduced, proponents of the bill argued that Welfare and Institutions Code section 782 did not provide any guidance to judges in exercising the court’s discretion to dismiss juvenile petitions, and pointed out that similar criticism has been directed at Penal Code section 1385, the adult dismissal statute, prior to the passage of SB 81 (Skinner), Chapter 721, Statutes of 2021.

However, the understanding of Section 782 as a general dismissal statute was reversed when *In re Taylor C.* (2024) 101 Cal.App. 5th 492, was decided. In that case, the defendant sought to have his juvenile record for a sex offense sealed under Welfare and Institutions Code section 781—an offense categorically excluded from the sealing statute—following the dismissal of the petition under Section 782, and the juvenile court denied the motion to seal the record. In reviewing the juvenile court’s decision, the appellate court held:

In *David T.*, our colleagues concluded the then-current version of section 782 was a general dismissal statute; therefore, dismissal under that section was “intended to erase a prior adjudication—not merely reduce or mitigate it—and to thereby protect the person from any and all future adverse consequences based on that adjudication,” including relief from a limitation on sealing pursuant to section 781. (*David T.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.App.5th at p. 877.) Taylor’s reliance on *David T.* is unavailing because it interpreted an earlier version of section 782 that—unlike the current version—did not include any limitations on the relief offered by dismissal. (*David T.*, at pp. 873–874.)

The *David T.* court observed that, had the Legislature intended a dismissal under section 782 to have prospective adverse consequences for the person even after dismissal, it could have explicitly said so. (*David T.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.App.5th at p. 875.) After *David T.* was decided, that is precisely what occurred with the enactment of Assembly Bill 2629, which amended section 782 to state that dismissal of a petition under that section “does not alone constitute a sealing of records” under section 781. (§ 782, subd. (e); see Assem. Bill 2629, § 1.)  
(*In re Taylor C.*, *supra*, at pp. 497-498.)

Proponents of this bill, who also co-sponsored AB 2629, assert that the court’s interpretation of Section 782 following the 2022 amendments to the law misread

the purpose of AB 2629 and significantly reduced the value of the law. They assert that Welfare and Institutions Code section 782, subdivision (e)—the provision that states that dismissal of a petition does not alone constitute a sealing of records—was a clarifying amendment taken during the legislative process and was not intended to undo the then-understanding of the effect of Section 782 overall. They argue that this bill is necessary to correct the court’s interpretation of AB 2629 by codifying the holding of *In re David T.*

This bill explicitly states that Welfare and Institutions Code section 782 is a general dismissal statute, and that a petition dismissed under Section 782 is treated as if it never happened. The effect is that the individual will be protected from many of the collateral consequences of a sustained petition.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/16/26)

California Youth Defender Center (source)  
ACLU California Action  
Alianza for Opportunity  
All of Us or None Orange County  
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color  
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
California Public Defenders Association  
Californians for Safety and Justice  
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice  
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice  
Courage California  
East Bay Community Law Center  
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights  
Empowering Women Impacted by Incarceration  
Families Inspiring Reentry & Reunification 4 Everyone  
Felony Murder Elimination Project  
Fresh Lifelines for Youth  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
GLIDE  
Haywood Burns Institute  
Initiate Justice  
Justice2Jobs Coalition  
La Defensa  
Law Foundation of Silicon Valley

Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148  
MILPA Collective  
Rubicon Programs  
San Francisco Public Defender  
San Quentin SkunkWorks  
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition  
Smart Justice California  
Youth Forward  
Youth Law Center

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /  
4/21/26 16:19:41

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1288  
Author: Laird (D)  
Amended: 3/26/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 4/14/26  
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Caballero, Durazo, McNerney, Reyes, Stern,  
Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby, Valladares

---

**SUBJECT:** Property: nonprobate transfer of ownership

**SOURCE:** CalNonprofits  
San Diego Humane Society  
Valley Humane Society

---

**DIGEST:** This bill seeks to establish a streamlined process under the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act for a nonprofit corporation, a charitable trust, or an entity exempt from federal taxation pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. This bill clarifies that those entities can be named as beneficiaries on a beneficiary form and specifies what documentation can be provided to establish proof of death of an account owner; prohibits a registering entity from requiring a beneficiary to open an account to receive a security or from providing other specified information; and places a requirement on a registering entity to provide notice to beneficiaries upon receipt of credible proof of death, as provided.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Existing law, the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act, provides for the transfer of the ownership or proceeds of a security upon the death of the owner, without probate or estate administration. (Probate (Prob.) Code §§ 5500 et seq.)

- 2) Authorizes a registering entity offering to accept registrations in beneficiary form to establish the terms and conditions under which it will receive requests for:
  - a) registrations in beneficiary form; and
  - b) implementation of registrations in beneficiary form, including requests for cancellation of previously registered TOD beneficiary designations and requests for reregistration to effect a change of beneficiary. (Prob. Code § 5510(a).)
  
- 3) Authorizes the terms and conditions established under 2), above, to provide for:
  - a) proving death;
  - b) avoiding or resolving any problems concerning fractional shares;
  - c) designating primary and contingent beneficiaries; and
  - d) substituting a named beneficiary's descendants to take in the place of the named beneficiary in the event of the beneficiary's death. (Prob. Code § 5510(b).)
  
- 4) Provides that upon the death of a sole owner or the last to die of all multiple owners, ownership of securities registered in beneficiary form passes to the beneficiary or beneficiaries who survive all owners.
  - a) On proof of death of all owners and compliance with any applicable requirements of the registering entity, a security registered in beneficiary form may be reregistered in the name of the beneficiary or beneficiaries who survive the death of all owners. (Prob. Code § 5507.)
  
- 5) Provides that a registering entity is discharged from all claims to a security by the estate, creditors, heirs, or devisees of a deceased owner if it registers a transfer of the security in accordance with 4), above, and does so in good faith reliance on:
  - a) the registration;
  - b) the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act; and
  - c) information provided to it by affidavit of the personal representative of the deceased owner, or by the surviving beneficiary or the surviving beneficiary's representatives, or other information available to the registering entity. (Prob. Code § 5508(c).)
  
- 6) Specifies that the protections of the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act do not extend to a reregistration or payment made after a registering entity has received written notice from any claimant to any interest in the security

objecting to implementation of a registration in beneficiary form. (Prob. Code § 5508(c).)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes a nonprofit corporation, a charitable trust, or an entity exempt from federal taxation pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (26 U.S.C. Sec. 501(c)(3)) to be named in a beneficiary form under the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act.
  - a) The legal identity of an entity described above is established by providing the registering entity with a federal employer identification number (EIN), phone number, and mailing address. The registering entity is prohibited from requiring any individual associated with the beneficiary entity to provide personal identifying information.
  - b) The registering entity may require identifying information from a beneficiary, including a social security number for individual beneficiaries and an EIN for nonprofit or charitable beneficiaries, a phone number, and a mailing address to verify identity.
  - c) A registering entity must permit an entity described above to demonstrate its entitlement to the security by providing the following documentation:
    - i. proof of the decedent's death through provision of a death certificate, obituary, funeral invoice, or other reliable documentation;
    - ii. a copy of a nonprofit's IRS tax-exempt status letter, as applicable;
    - iii. the entity's EIN and contact information; and
    - iv. a completed IRS Form W-9 request for taxpayer identification number and certificate.
- 2) Requires a registering entity that receives notification of death of an owner from a credible source, and is provided with proof of death of all owners of the security, to initiate its beneficiary notification process.
  - a) Proof of death may be provided through a certified informational copy of a death certificate or other reliable documentation.
  - b) Only one such document from any party is required to begin the process.
- 3) Requires a registering entity, upon receipt of proof of death of all owners of the security, to make a reasonable and good-faith effort to notify each named beneficiary within 60 days.
  - a) The initial notification cannot disclose the account balance, transaction history, or other private financial information.

- b) The registering entity must disclose the percentage and amount of a beneficiary's designated share to the beneficiary after their identity is confirmed.
- 4) Prohibits a registering entity from requiring a beneficiary to open an account in order to receive ownership of the registered securities.
  - a) A registering entity must make reasonable efforts to streamline transfers of securities.
  - b) If there is more than one beneficiary, a registering entity cannot require the beneficiaries to submit claims simultaneously or impose coordination deadlines among co-beneficiaries. If there is more than one beneficiary, no more than one beneficiary can be required to submit proof of death of the owner or owners.
- 5) Requires a beneficiary that has provided all required documentation to receive their designated share upon completing the registering entity's process. A beneficiary cannot be required to wait for any other beneficiary to act before transfer, unless legally required due to outstanding liens, levies, or court orders affecting the estate or account. Any such legal impediment to transfer must be disclosed to the beneficiary upon inquiry.
- 6) Provides that a registering entity that originates or transfers securities in reliance on documentation that complies with this section shall be discharged from all claims to the security by the estate, creditors, heirs, or devisees of a deceased owner to the same extent, and subject to the same requirements, described in Section 5508 of the Probate Code.

## Comments

When a person dies, (referred to as the decedent) their assets are generally distributed through a will or by intestate succession and are usually subject to probate administration. Probate administration involves a court proceeding to administer the decedent's estate by: deciding if a will exists, and if so, if it is valid; who are the decedent's heirs or beneficiaries; how much the decedent's estate is worth; taking care of the decedent's unresolved debts; and transferring the decedent's property to the heirs or beneficiaries.<sup>1</sup> Existing law provides for various ways to transfer property outside of formal probate administration, including transfer-on-death or payable-on-death accounts under the Uniform TOD Security Registration Act (Act). This act authorizes a registering entity (entity that holds the security) to establish a process for designating beneficiaries and proving death,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Courts, *Guide to property after someone dies* (2026), available at <https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/probate>.

avoiding or resolving any problems concerning fractional shares, designating primary and contingent beneficiaries, and substituting a named beneficiary's descendants to take in the place of the named beneficiary in the event of the beneficiary's death. (Prob. Code § 5510(b).)

According to the author and sponsors of the bill, nonprofits have been encountering issues in receiving or claiming securities for which they are beneficiaries. One issue they identify is not being informed by a registering entity that they are a beneficiary on an account when the account owner dies. Another obstacle nonprofits have encountered is being required to provide inconsistent documentation and administrative hurdles. The sponsors note that registering entities may require a nonprofit to open an account with the registering entity in order to disburse the security to the nonprofit, and may request personally identifying information of nonprofit employees or board members in order to open such accounts. Another situation nonprofits have encountered is registering entities requesting duplicative or burdensome verification requirements. One example provided to Committee staff is when multiple nonprofits may be a beneficiary on an account and the registering entity requires each separate beneficiary to provide a death certificate for the account holder. The sponsors note that this serves no purposes as a registering entity can verify proof of death of an account owner when it receives a death certificate from any one beneficiary. They write that this bill “does not create new beneficiary rights or alter estate plans; it simply ensures that existing designations are administered transparently, efficiently, and consistent with donor intent.”

To address the issues identified above, the bill amends the Act to do several things. First, it specifically allows a nonprofit corporation, a charitable trust, or other entity exempt from federal taxation pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (26 U.S.C. Sec. 501(c)(3)), to be named in a beneficiary form. The bill requires registering entities to make a reasonable and good faith effort to notify named beneficiaries within 60 days of receiving proof of death from a credible source – whether a charitable entity or other type of beneficiary. This can be a certified informational copy of a death certificate or other reliable documentation. A registering entity can only require one document from any party to begin the beneficiary notification process. The bill allows a nonprofit or charitable beneficiary to provide their federal employer identification number (EIN) and mailing address for identification purposes and prohibits requiring any individual associated with the beneficiary entity to provide personal identifying information.

The bill requires a registering entity to make reasonable efforts to streamline transfers of securities and prohibits requiring beneficiaries to submit claims simultaneously or imposing coordination deadlines among co-beneficiaries. A beneficiary that has provided all required documentation is to receive their designated share upon completing the registering entity's process, and cannot be required to wait for any other beneficiary to act before transfer, unless legally required due to outstanding liens, levies, or court orders affecting the estate or account. A registering entity is also prohibited from requiring a beneficiary to open an account to receive the security. If a registering entity has already received proof of death of an account owner, it cannot request this documentation from any other beneficiaries. Under the bill, a registering entity that originates or transfers securities in reliance on documentation that complies with this bill is discharged from all claims to the security by the estate, creditors, heirs, or devisees of a deceased owner to the same extent as a registering entity already is under the Act when they act in good faith reliance. (*See Prob. Code § 5508(c).*)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/16/26)

CalNonprofits (Co-source)

San Diego Humane Society (Co-source)

Valley Humane Society (Co-source)

Alan Hu Foundation

Animal Legal Defense Fund

Animal Save Movement

Animal Shelter Assistance Program

Aspira Philanthropy Lab

Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education

Association of California Symphony Orchestras

Autism Society Inland Empire Inc.

Berkeley-east Bay Humane Society

Best Friends Animal Society

Calaveras Humane Society

California Academy of Sciences

California Community Living Network

Cameo Network

Camp Ocean Pines, Inc.

Cancer Support Community San Francisco Bay Area

Center for Living and Learning

Chicas Mom, Inc.

Children's Fund  
Chrysalis  
Community Environmental Council  
Creative Alternatives  
Crop Swap LA  
East Bay SPCA  
Equality California  
Foothill Family  
Habitat For Humanity California  
High Desert Community Foundation  
Hospice Help Network  
Humane Animal Services  
Inland Valley Humane Society & SPCA  
Joybound People & Pets  
Kitchens for Good  
Los Padres ForestWatch  
Lumina Alliance  
MAAC  
Marin Shakespeare Company  
Meals on Wheels Orange County  
Media Alliance  
Microenterprise Collaborative of Inland Southern California  
Monterey Bay Aquarium  
Nature for All  
Newport Beach Public Library Foundation  
Oceanside Ivey Ranch Park Association  
Orange County Coastkeeper  
Pasadena Humane  
PathPoint  
Pets Lifeline  
Sacramento Philharmonic & Opera  
Sacramento SPCA  
Santa Barbara Humane Society  
Santa Ynez Valley Humane Society  
Sonoma Land Trust  
SPCALA  
Starting Over Inc.  
Starting Over Strong  
The Impact Fund  
Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural

Tracy Community Connections Center  
Tuleyome  
Union Station Homeless Services  
Woods Humane Society  
YMCA of Silicon Valley

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/16/26)

Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The author writes:

When someone names a beneficiary, whether a family member, loved one, or nonprofit they believe in, they're expressing their values and the legacy they hope to leave behind. We have a responsibility to honor that dying wish. Senate Bill 1288 ensures that beneficiaries are made aware of funds left to them, sets reasonable verification standards, and streamlines administrative barriers to ensure gifts reach loved ones and the communities they were intended to serve without unnecessary hurdles or delays.

The sources of the bill, CalNonprofits, the San Diego Humane Society, and the Valley Humane Society, write in support stating that this bill will:

[...] protect donor intent and ensure that charitable beneficiary designations are honored efficiently and without unnecessary administrative barriers.

Each year, Californians designate nonprofit organizations as beneficiaries of retirement accounts, brokerage accounts, and other transfer-on-death or payable-on-death assets with the expectation that those gifts will pass directly and outside of probate. These nonprobate transfers are intentionally structured to avoid court supervision, reduce costs, and ensure timely distribution. Yet, under current law, there is no clear requirement that financial institutions notify charitable beneficiaries when an account holder dies. As a result intended gifts may sit dormant, face prolonged delays, or ultimately transfer to the state as unclaimed property despite clear beneficiary designations. [...]

SB 1288 establishes clear, reasonable standards to modernize California law and ensure nonprobate transfers function as donors intended. [...]

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** The Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA) writes in opposition unless amended stating:

[...] SB 1288, and similar bills across the country, seek to streamline the transfer process, which is an admirable goal. We agree that the process can be cumbersome and sometimes take much longer than everyone would like. We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on how to improve the process without triggering fraud, tax, and compliance concerns.

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113  
4/20/26 9:40:34

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1307  
Author: Jones (R)  
Amended: 4/20/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/14/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

---

**SUBJECT:** False or forged instruments

**SOURCE:** San Diego County District Attorney's Office

---

**DIGEST:** This bill authorizes a defendant who was convicted of knowingly filing, registering, or recording a false or forged instrument to stipulate to the voiding of the false or forged instrument in lieu of a hearing on a motion to void the false or forged instrument.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that every person who knowingly procures or offers any false or forged instrument to be filed, registered, or recorded in any public office within this state, which instrument, if genuine, might be filed, registered, or recorded under any law of this state or of the United States, is guilty of a felony. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 115, subd. (a).)
- 2) Provides that each instrument which is procured or offered to be filed, registered, or recorded constitutes a separate violation. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (b).)
- 3) Generally prohibits probation from being granted probation or suspending the execution or imposition of sentence, for any of the following persons:

- a) Any person with a prior conviction for knowingly filing a false or forged instrument who is again convicted of a violation in a separate proceeding.
  - b) Any person who is convicted of more than one violation of knowingly filing a false or forged instrument in a single proceeding, with intent to defraud another, and where the violations resulted in a cumulative financial loss exceeding \$100,000. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (c).)
- 4) Provides that each act of procurement or of offering a false or forged instrument to be filed, registered, or recorded is considered a separately punishable offense. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (d).)
  - 5) Requires the court, after a person is convicted of a violation, or a plea is entered whereby a charge alleging a violation is dismissed and waiver is obtained pursuant to *People v. Harvey* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 754, upon written motion of the prosecuting agency, to issue a written order, after a hearing, that the false or forged instrument be adjudged void ab initio if the court determines that an order is appropriate under applicable law. Requires the order to state whether the instrument is false or forged, or both, and describe the nature of the falsity or forgery. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (e)(1).)
  - 6) Provides that if the order pertains to a false or forged instrument that has been recorded with a county recorder, an order must be recorded in the county where the affected real property is located. Requires the order to also reference the county recorder's document recording number of any notice of pendency of action recorded. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (e)(2)(A).)
  - 7) Specifies the procedures a prosecuting agency must follow in filing a motion to void the false or forged instrument. (Pen. Code, § 115, subd. (f).)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that instead of holding the hearing to void the false or forged instrument, a defendant charged with knowingly filing a false or forged instrument may stipulate to the voiding of the false or forged instrument.
- 2) Requires the court, after the prosecution has established by clear and convincing evidence that there are no interested parties that would be adversely affected by voiding the instrument, to issue a written order that the false or forged instrument be adjudged void ab initio if the court determines that an order is appropriate under applicable law.

## Background

Penal Code section 115 makes it a felony to knowingly procure or offer any false or forged instrument to be filed, registered, or recorded in any public office within this state. The purpose of Section 115 is to preserve the integrity of public documents. (*People v. Denman* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 800, 808.) The statute differentiates between false and forged documents but clearly proscribes either kind of instrument. (*Generes v. Justice Court* (1980) 106 Cal.App.3d 678, 682.)

A forgery is a “writing which falsely purports to be the writing of another, . . .” made with the “intent to defraud.” (*Wutzke v. Bill Reid Painting Service, Inc.* (1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 36, 41-42.) A false instrument is one that has “the effect of defrauding one who acts on the instrument as genuine.” (*Generes, supra*, at p. 682.) In the context of a deed, the court explained the notion of a false deed:

Here the lack of an ownership interest in the land goes to the deception itself. If *Generes* did not own the interest she purported to convey, the instrument she filed was clearly false. Having no right to grant or convey an easement, her recording of a deed transferring an easement would establish a cloud on the title of those persons who lawfully owned interests in the land. A title searcher encountering the spurious document who acted upon it as genuine would of course be materially deceived. (*Ibid.*)

Penal Code Section 115 outlines a process for a false or forged instrument to be declared void after a person is convicted of knowingly filing, registering, or recording a false or forged instrument. Section 115 requires the prosecutor to file a motion within 10 calendar days of filing a criminal complaint or indictment for a violation of Section 115, alleging an instrument is false, forged, or both. The prosecutor must send written notice by certified mail to all those who may have an interest in the property. If the instrument sought to be declared void is real property, interested parties include, but are not limited to, all parties who have recorded with the county recorder in the county where the affected property is located: a deed, lien, mortgage, deed of trust, security interest, lease, or other instrument declaring an interest in the property affected by the false or forged instrument.

The notice must inform the parties of their right to be heard when the motion is brought and give a description of the property. The prosecutor is also required to

file a notice in the county where the real property is located. If the case is adjudicated or dismissed without obtaining an order to void the false or forged instrument, the prosecution must withdraw the notice to the county within 10 calendar days. Failure to provide notice does not prevent the prosecution from seeking the motion but is grounds for the court to grant additional time to interested parties.

The court must set a hearing for the motion no earlier than 90 calendar days from the date the motion is made. At the hearing, the prosecutor, defendant, and interested parties have a right to be heard and present information to the court. If the court determines that in the interest of justice, the matter should be more appropriately settled in a civil proceeding, the court may decline to make a determination on the motion. The court may also consider any quiet title action filed prior to the hearing as an additional but not dispositive factor in making its determination. However, a final judgment previously entered in that quiet title action must be followed to the extent required by law.

This bill authorizes a defendant who was convicted of knowingly filing, registering, or recording a false or forged instrument to stipulate to the voiding of the false or forged instrument in lieu of a hearing on a motion to void the false or forged instrument.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

San Diego County District Attorney's Office (source)  
California District Attorneys Association  
District Attorney of Orange County  
Fidelity National Title Company  
Riverside County District Attorney  
San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /  
4/21/26 16:19:41

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1311  
Author: Wahab (D)  
Amended: 3/26/26  
Vote: 27 - Urgency

---

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 3/23/26  
AYES: Wahab, Choi, Archuleta, Caballero, Grayson, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas,  
Strickland, Umberg  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arreguín, Menjivar

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Licensed Professions

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This is an urgency bill that makes various conforming changes to existing requirements for unlicensed dental assistants (DAs) to complete an infection control course and makes technical changes to the Licensed Physicians from Mexico Program, board appointments under the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, and contract requirements under the Private Investigator Act.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Regulates the practice of dentistry and establishes the Dental Board of California (DBC) to administer and enforce the Dental Practice Act. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 1600-1976)
- 2) Defines a Dental Assistant (DA) as an individual without a license who may perform basic supportive dental procedures under the supervision of a licensed dentist that has technically elementary characteristics, are completely reversible and are unlikely to cause potentially hazardous conditions for the patient being treated. (BPC § 1750 (a))

- 3) Requires the supervising licensed dentist to be directly responsible for determining the competency of the DA to perform the basic supportive dental procedures, and responsible for ensuring the DA has successfully completed a board-approved eight-hour course in infection control prior to performing any basic supportive dental procedures involving potential exposure to blood, saliva, or other potentially infectious materials. (BPC § 1750 (b-c))
- 4) Defines “direct supervision” to mean the supervision of dental procedures based on instructions given by a licensed dentist who shall be physically present in the treatment facility during the performance of those procedures. (BPC § 1741 (k))
- 5) Defines “general supervision” to mean supervision of dental procedures based on instructions given by a licensed dentist but not requiring the physical presence of the supervising dentist during the performance of those procedures. (BPC § 1741 (l))
- 6) Authorizes a DA to perform specified duties under the direct supervision and pursuant to the order, control, and full professional responsibility of a licensed dentist. (BPC § 1750.1 (b) (1-18))
- 7) Defines an infection control course as providing theory and clinical application in infection control practices and principles where the protection of the public is its primary focus. An unlicensed DA not enrolled in a board-approved program for registered dental assisting or an alternative dental assisting program shall complete either a board-approved eight-hour course, with six hours being didactic instruction and two hours being laboratory instruction or a board-approved eight-hour course, with six hours of didactic instruction and at least two hours of laboratory instruction using video or a series of video training tools, all of which may be delivered using asynchronous, synchronous, or online learning mechanisms. (BPC § 1755)
- 8) Establishes the Medical Practice Act to regulate the practice of medicine by the Medical Board of California (MBC) within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA). (BPC §§ 2000-2529.8.1)
- 9) Establishes the Licensed Physicians from Mexico Program, which authorizes up to 30 licensed physicians from Mexico to practice medicine in California for a period not to exceed three years and requires applicants to submit an applicant to the MBC between October 1, 2020, and December 1, 2025, except that the MBC may accept up to 15 applications after December 31, 2025, and before January 1, 2028. (BPC § 2125 (g)(1)(C))

- 10) Establishes the Veterinary Medicine Practice Act to be administered by the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) within DCA and specifies the VMB be comprised of nine members – four licensed veterinarians, two registered veterinary technicians, and three public members. (BPC §§ 4800-4920.8)
- 11) Requires a veterinary technician to furnish satisfactory evidence of minimum education, as specified. (BPC § 4841.5(a)(4)(B))
- 12) Establishes the Private Investigator Act (Act), which vests with the director of the DCA, and by delegation, the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS), the responsibility to administer and enforce the provisions of the Act. (BPC §§ 7512-7573.5)
- 13) Requires every agreement to provide a service regulated by the Act, including, but not limited to, contract agreements and investigative agreements, to be in writing and include specified information, including the approximate state and completion dates of the work to be provided. (BPC § 7254 (a)(3))

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes unlicensed DAs, in order to comply with infection control course completion requirements, to complete either the Dental Assisting National Board's Infection Control examination or:
  - a) a Dental Board-approved infection control course provided by a board-approved registered dental assisting education program
  - b) a Dental Board-approved infection control course that complies with existing Dental Board regulations
  - c) an asynchronous, synchronous, or online learning mechanism course offered by either the California Dental Association or a provider approved by the California Dental Association; the American Dental Association's Continuing Education Recognition Program or; the Academy of General Dentistry's Program Approval for Continuing Education
- 2) Specifies that laboratory instruction means, for purposes of laboratory learning via an asynchronous, synchronous, or online learning mechanism course, instruction in which students perform procedures using study models, mannequins, or other simulation methods.
- 3) Extends the application period for the Licensed Physicians from Mexico program to between October 1, 2025, and July 1, 2026, except that 15 applications may be accepted after July 1, 2026, and before January 1, 2028.
- 4) Makes technical changes to the VMB composition and appointing authorities.

- 5) Adds education provided by a California public school as acceptable evidence of minimum education competency for registration as a veterinary technician.
- 6) Clarifies that a private investigator master agreement for frequently contracted services over a specified period of time shall be exempt from including beginning and termination dates of the work to be performed.
- 7) States that this bill is urgent and necessary to take effect immediately to allow the MBC to timely accept applications from eligible participants for the Licensed Physicians from Mexico Program pursuant to AB 2860 (Chapter 246 of the Statutes of 2024), to provide clarity for licensing enforcement and services required to be rendered only through a written contract under the Act pursuant to SB 1454 (Chapter 484 of the Statutes of 2024), to ensure the CVMB has a complete composition pursuant to AB 1502 (Chapter 195 of the Statutes of 2025), and to further ensure the CVMB has timely and complete requirements to evaluate applicants to become a registered veterinary technician, it is necessary that this bill go into immediate effect. Unlicensed DAs are currently required to take an eight-hour course prior to performing any basic supportive dental procedures that would have potential exposure to infectious materials. There have been issues preventing the establishment of the eight-hour course virtually and the eight-hour course is not readily available in many parts of the state, especially remote and rural areas already experiencing access and workforce shortage issues. To mitigate these outcomes, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.

## **Background**

The DBC licenses an estimated 112,000 dental professionals, of which 43,000 are fully licensed dentists; 46,000 are registered DAs; and 2,300 are registered dental assistants in extended functions. The DBC is also responsible for setting the duties and functions of an estimated 50,000 unlicensed DAs.

DAs are unlicensed, thus not registered with the DBC or directly regulated by the DBC. These individuals work under the direct supervision of a licensed dentist and assist that dentist with basic supportive procedures that are reversible and not likely to cause hazardous conditions for the patient being treated. Although unlicensed, these individuals are required to complete training and courses aimed at ensuring patient safety.

In 2024, DBC was subject to the Legislature's sunset review oversight process, which culminated in the passage of SB 1453 (Ashby, Chapter 483, Statutes of 2024), the DBC sunset bill. SB 1453 made significant changes to unlicensed DA practice. In response to concerns about dental workforce shortages, AB 481

(Carrillo of 2023) would have created new licensure pathways and expanded the duties of DAs. Proponents cited data from DBC showing that half of the state's 58 counties are experiencing a shortage of dental assistants and noted a 2021 survey that found 44% of providers indicated that trouble filling vacant positions limited their practice's ability to treat more patients. SB 1453 incorporated provisions of AB 481 that DBC could effectively implement, including various changes to the education, scope of practice, and regulation of dental auxiliaries, including DAs.

SB 1453 established the requirement that all unlicensed DAs who are not enrolled in a DBC-approved or alternative dental assisting program must complete an infection control course prior to the unlicensed DA performing any basic supportive dental procedures involving potential exposure to blood, saliva, or other potentially infectious materials. The bill specified that the course must be comprised of six hours of didactic instruction and two hours of laboratory instruction and authorized the course to be offered either in-person or using a video or a series of video training tools, all of which may be delivered using asynchronous, synchronous, or online learning mechanisms. SB 1453 took effect on January 1, 2025.

In the months before SB 1453 took effect, despite being involved in every single aspect of the bill and having opportunities to weigh in about barriers to effective implementation of the measure, including language surrounding the infection-control course, DBC began to publicly discuss issues that DBC staff said prevented key provisions of SB 1453 from taking effect. While the statute clearly and intentionally outlined a separate set of standards for the unlicensed DA infection control course, DBC staff expressed concerns at DBC meetings that this course would not meet the same standards as other courses required for DBC licensees and registrants. It should be noted, unlicensed DAs only perform basic supportive dental procedures, defined as those procedures that have technically elementary characteristics, are completely reversible, and are unlikely to precipitate potentially hazardous conditions for the patient being treated. Despite this fact, DBC cited additional concerns.

DBC staff said that the hours in the infection control course could not be met by existing DBC-approved course providers, despite the likely ability for course providers to update content to comply with the statutory requirements and receive updated approval to offer this specific course.

DBC also took umbrage with the fact that DBC was not provided authority to approve, deny, or withdraw approval for the SB 1453-created course, authority DBC has in regulations for oversight of programs created for registered DAs. Rather than explore alternatives to ensure program integrity for this one specific,

statutorily prescribed course, DBC said it could not be implemented because DBC didn't have a process the same as its process for other courses.

SB 1453 authorized two hours of instruction to be delivered using asynchronous, synchronous, or online learning mechanisms or a combination thereof, but DBC said that is not enough and said it needed to meet requirements for the existing infection control course that requires hands-on laboratory activities like hand washing and glove use, despite the statute clearly establishing a different course and different course pathway for unlicensed DAs.

DBC also noted that there are no examination requirements, despite the intended course participants being unlicensed DAs who are not required to demonstrate competency through formal examination prior to performing their duties, as their competency is determined at the discretion of the supervising dentist.

This bill is intended to respond to DBC's determination that provisions of SB 1453 are not implementable, and among other changes, codify DBC regulations related to course approval, instruction, oversight, examinations, and more. The bill also updates current law to specify that a DA must complete the infection control course on or before 60 days from the first day of employment and specifies that, prior to the DAs exposure to any potentially infectious materials, a bloodborne pathogen training is required to be provided by the employer.

*MBC, CVMB, and BSIS Amendments.* The amendments to: 1) extend the timeframe for the MBC to accept applications from participants in the Mexico Pilot Program for a few months in case anything goes awry with the visa process or to allow for other contingencies; 2) make necessary and technical changes to the CNMB's composition and appointing authorities; and 3) clarify provisions for private investigators to provide contracts in the event of an investigation, while technical in nature, are time-sensitive and critical to the effective operations of each program and thus, are appropriate and necessary for inclusion in this urgency measure.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/14/26)

California Association of Licensed Investigators  
California Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons  
California Association of Orthodontists  
California Dental Association

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/14/26)

California Dental Assisting Alliance

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The California Dental Association (CDA) notes that, “The limited availability of in-person courses, especially in rural and underserved areas, already struggling with workforce shortages, creates significant hiring delays. As a result, some candidates pursue jobs in other industries, further reducing the dental workforce. This challenge not only worsens staffing shortages in dental practices but also limits patient access to care.”

The California Association of Licensed Investigators writes, “The California Association of Licensed Investigators [CALI] appreciates the provision added to SB 1311 on March 26 to clarify Business and Professions Code Section 7524 and we support the measure as amended. SB 1311 would acknowledge and address the master agreements licensed private investigators have with many of their clients for frequently contracted services over extended periods of time.”

The California Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons writes, “This bill provides a reasonable and balanced update to existing law by allowing dental assistants to meet infection control requirements through either a board-approved course or by successfully completing the Dental Assisting National Board’s Infection Control examination. It also introduces flexibility in course delivery by permitting a portion of required instruction to be completed through video-based training tools, while preserving hands-on laboratory components.”

The California Association of Orthodontists writes that, “At a time when dental practices continue to face workforce challenges, SB 1311 provides sensible flexibility without compromising patient safety or professional standards. Supporting multiple pathways to demonstrate infection control competency will help maintain a well-trained dental workforce that continues to meet California’s high standards of patient care.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** The California Dental Assisting Alliance believes the bill conflicts with and undermines the Dental Board’s mission. They say that the bill removes DBC from the regulatory process; replaces course requirements with examination only; eliminates hands-on training and creates inconsistency between pathway options.

Prepared by: Yeaphana La Marr / B., P. & E.D. / 916-651-4104  
4/14/26 16:16:13

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1347  
Author: Niello (R)  
Amended: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/8/26  
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

---

**SUBJECT:** Pupil health: emergency stock albuterol inhalers

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill extends the authorization for school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and charter schools to provide and administer emergency stock albuterol inhalers, to apply to childcare programs operated by or under contract with a local educational agency (LEA), as specified, as well as their trained employees.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes school districts, COEs, and charter schools to provide emergency stock albuterol inhalers, including, if necessary, single-use disposable holding chambers, to school nurses or trained personnel who have volunteered, as specified. Authorizes school nurses or trained personnel to use as emergency stock albuterol inhaler to provide emergency medical aid to persons suffering, or reasonably believed to be suffering, from respiratory illness. (Education Code (EC) § 49414.7)
- 2) Authorizes private elementary and secondary schools in the state to voluntarily determine whether or not to make emergency stock albuterol inhalers and trained personnel available at its school. Specifies that in making this determination, a school shall evaluate the emergency medical response time to the school and determine whether initiating emergency medical services is an

acceptable alternative to stock albuterol inhalers and trained personnel. (EC § 49414.7)

- 3) Authorizes each public school and private elementary and secondary school in the state to designate one or more volunteers to receive initial and annual refresher training based on the standards, as specified, regarding the storage and emergency use of a stock albuterol inhaler from the school nurse or other qualified person designated by an authorizing physician and surgeon. (EC § 49414.7)

This bill:

- 1) Adds childcare programs that are operated by or contracted under an LEA, as well as their employees who have volunteered and received appropriate training, to the existing list of entities authorized to receive emergency stock albuterol from an LEA and use said emergency stock albuterol to provide emergency medical aid to persons suffering, or reasonably believed to be suffering, from respiratory distress.
- 2) Changes references from “school district, COE, or charter school” to “local educational agency.”
- 3) Defines “childcare program” to mean “a state or federally subsidized childcare program operated by, or under contract with, an LEA, including, but not limited to, a California state preschool program or Head Start program pursuant to Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 8200) of Part 6 of Division 1 of Title 1, or a childcare program, including, but not limited to, general childcare and development programs pursuant to Part 1.8 (commencing with Section 10207) of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.”
- 4) Changes references from “private elementary and secondary school” to “private school.”
- 5) Amends the definition of volunteer or trained personnel, authorized to administer stock albuterol under specified conditions, to include employees of a childcare program who have volunteered, received training, and are subject to liability limitations pursuant to existing law.
- 6) Authorizes childcare programs operated by or under contract with an LEA to designate one or more volunteers to receive initial and annual refresher training, as specified.

- 7) Adds childcare programs to the existing entities to which LEAs electing to utilize stock albuterol inhalers for emergency aid must distribute specified biannual notices.
- 8) Recasts the requirement for a qualified supervisor of health of a LEA electing to utilize stock albuterol inhalers for emergency aid to obtain from an authorizing physician and surgeon a prescription for stock albuterol inhaler for each site, to include childcare programs.
  - a) Requires those prescriptions to, at a minimum, include appropriate doses of available stock albuterol inhalers for the ages and weights of individuals at each site including any childcare programs.
- 9) Adds childcare programs operated by or contracted under LEAs to the existing provisions regarding liability for civil damages resulting from any act or omission, other than an act or omission constituting gross negligence or willful and wanton misconduct, in the emergency administration of an albuterol inhaler by any of its school nurses or trained volunteers who have volunteered, as specified.
- 10) Adds employees of childcare programs that are operated by or under contract with an LEA to the type of employees that shall be provided defense and indemnification by an LEA for any and all civil liability, as specified.

## Comments

*Need for the bill.* According to the author, “In 2023, the Legislature passed on a *bi-partisan* basis AB 1283 (Chen), which authorized stock albuterol in public schools. This measure has helped safeguard children and has ensured our school health professionals have the necessary medication on hand at school to provide lifesaving treatment.

“Albuterol is a prescribed medicine used to prevent and treat wheezing, difficulty breathing, chest tightness, and coughing caused by lung diseases such as asthma. Albuterol is in a class of medications called bronchodilators and works by relaxing and opening the air passages to the lungs to make breathing easier.

“Since the passage of AB 1283 (Chen, 2023), the state has made access to preschool a priority and is now expanding to Universal Preschool. This prioritization means the traditional definitions of “school” hasn’t always been clear in the education code whether it included preschool. Some school districts have expressed confusion if they are supposed to be providing the stock albuterol in their preschool programs. Clarity in statute is needed for schools to ensure they do

not have any exposed liability for their preschool students. This is consistent with the passage of SB 568 (Niello) in 2025 which clarified the stock epinephrine in schools program also applied to preschool.”

*Asthma prevalence in children.* According to Tracking California, a program of the Public Health Institute partnered with California Breathing, in 2021-2022, an estimated 9.9% of California children ages 0-17 had been diagnosed with asthma at some point in their lives. For those aged 0-4, that number stands at an estimated 2.9%. While asthma does not result in hospitalization for most children, there were 6822 hospitalizations for asthma among children ages 0-17 statewide in 2023, with roughly 3223 of those involving children ages 0-4.

Asthma is one of the most common chronic diseases among children in the U.S. and a leading cause of pediatric hospitalization. It is also the top reason for missed school days, accounting for more than 5.2 million absences annually. Asthma rates vary by region, demographics, environment, physician diagnostic practices, and access to care. Although identifying the impact of independent risk factors for asthma is difficult, children of color and those from low-income families are disproportionately at high risk for severe symptoms, missed school days, and hospital visits.

*The management of asthma in California schools.* The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) “Guidelines for the Management of Asthma in California Schools” and “Asthma Action Plan for Schools and Families” assist schools in effectively managing this chronic disease. The “Guidelines for the Management of Asthma in California Schools” were developed jointly by health professionals in the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Asthma Public Health Initiative in statewide collaboration with asthma experts and stakeholders.

Further, the CDPH, in partnership with the CDE and the Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI), has issued a statewide standing order for albuterol to provide emergency medical aid to persons suffering, or reasonably believed to be suffering, from respiratory distress in California schools. Using the online form, LEAs can generate a standing order to use as a prescription for albuterol to ensure the safety and well-being of persons experiencing respiratory distress in schools or during school activities. CDPH states in its Albuterol Standing Order Frequently Asked Questions page that existing law authorizes some preschools to develop a stock albuterol program if they are co-located on a TK-12 site.

Finally, according to its website, CalRx, in partnership with the CDPH Office of School Health, has announced plans to launch a centralized ordering system to supply California's TK–12 schools with albuterol inhalers and single-use disposable spacers at no cost over a three-year period beginning in Summer 2026.

*Dosage considerations for small children.* This bill expands the stocking and provision responsibilities of an LEA that elects to utilize emergency stock albuterol inhalers, to include provisions for childcare programs that it operates or contracts with. Among these responsibilities is the requirement to obtain the necessary prescriptions from an authorizing physician or surgeon for stock albuterol inhalers that, at a minimum, include appropriate doses of available inhalers for the ages and weights of individuals at each site including any childcare programs.

Albuterol dosage is typically determined based on a combination of factors, including age, weight, dosage forms, and strength of medicine. By extending existing authorizations that LEAs have to the childcare setting, this bill inherently extends the age ranges of children who may be administered emergency stock albuterol inhalers by a school nurse or trained volunteer if they are suffering, or reasonably believed to be suffering, from respiratory distress. This bill requires that the prescriptions retained by the LEA, at a minimum, include appropriate doses of available stock albuterol inhalers for the ages and weights of individuals at each participating childcare site.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/8/26)

American Medical Response West  
California School Nurses Organization  
California Society for Allergy, Asthma and Immunology  
California Society for Respiratory Care  
Small School Districts Association

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105  
4/10/26 12:30:54

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1369  
Author: Reyes (D)  
Amended: 3/26/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 4/7/26  
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg  
NOES: Choi

---

**SUBJECT:** Recall petitions

**SOURCE:** California and Hawaii Chapters of the American Board of Trial Advocates

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires a person who is being paid to gather signatures to qualify an initiative, referendum, or recall for the ballot to disclose orally to potential signers that they are being paid. For the recall of a superior court judge, this bill sets the time period for getting the required number signatures on a recall petition at 80 days in all jurisdictions.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Declares in the California Constitution that “recall is the power of the electors to remove an elective officer.”
- 2) Provides in the California Constitution for superior court judges to be elected in their counties to six-year terms. These elections are nonpartisan and occur during the general election in November of even numbered years. When a vacancy occurs, the governor shall appoint a judge to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term.
- 3) Creates in the California Constitution the Commission on Judicial Performance to investigate allegations of judicial misconduct and, when warranted, impose discipline, including removal from office.

- 4) Prescribes the processes for qualifying a recall to appear on a ballot and for scheduling the election resulting when a recall qualifies through the collection of signatures on a recall petition. State law specifically prescribes the form, content, and presentation of a recall petition, including disclosure of the top funders of the recall.
- 5) Requires on a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition above the space for voters' signatures a public notice in 11-point font that reads: "THIS PETITION MAY BE CIRCULATED BY A PAID SIGNATURE GATHERER OR A VOLUNTEER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO ASK."
- 6) Sets the number of days that a recall petition for a local officer may circulate for signature gathering based on the number of voters in the jurisdiction. For an electoral jurisdiction with fewer than 1,000 registered voters, it is 40 days, which is the minimum. The maximum time for signature gathering is 160 days for jurisdictions of 50,000 or more registered voters.

This bill:

- 1) Requires those who are being paid to gather signatures on a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition to tell each person, without being asked and before providing the petition, that they are being paid to circulate the petition.
- 2) Sets the signature gathering period for a recall petition for a superior court judge at 80 days, regardless of the number of voters in the electoral jurisdiction.

### Comments

- 1) *Author's statement.* California is one of eight states in the country that allows judges to be recalled. This system of checks and balances for judges is meant to be a tool of direct democracy allowing voters to hold corrupt judges accountable, but there is growing concern the recall process is increasingly being used in ways for which it was not intended, including to politically target judges based on unfavorable rulings.

Judges serve a unique role in our democracy. Unlike other elected officials, they are prohibited from campaigning or publicly defending their rulings. That ethical constraint protects impartiality, but it also makes judges uniquely vulnerable to politically motivated recall efforts. When recall efforts are driven by disagreement with case outcomes, rather than ethical misconduct, they raise serious concerns about attempts to influence judicial decision-making through political pressure instead of the established appellate process.

At the same time, gaps in our current recall process can leave voters without the information they need to make informed decisions. Individuals gathering signatures are not required to disclose that they are being paid, and recall petitions may lack sufficient accountability regarding the stated reasons for the recall. Recent recall campaigns targeting multiple sitting judges and the rise in threats and harassment surrounding judicial decisions highlight the need for reasonable safeguards.

This bill preserves the constitutional right of recall while strengthening transparency and accountability. It establishes a uniform 80-day signature-gathering period for superior court judges and requires paid circulators to disclose they are being compensated. Together, these measures ensure that judges can decide cases based on law and evidence, and not on fear of organized political retaliation.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/10/26)

California and Hawaii Chapters of the American Board of Trial Advocates (source)  
American Board of Trial Advocates  
Association of Defense Counsel of Northern California and Nevada  
Association of Southern California Defense Counsel  
California Defense Counsel  
California Judges Association  
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO  
Consumer Attorneys of California  
San Bernardino – Riverside Chapter of the American Board of Trial Advocates

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/10/26)

California Chamber of Commerce  
Family Business Association of California  
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

The California Judges Association writing in support of this bill notes that judicial recall petitions are exceedingly uncommon and asserts that this reflects the long-standing recognition that the judiciary plays a distinct constitutional role. The Judges Association additionally points out that:

...complaints about judicial actions are referred to and heard by the Commission on Judicial Performance, which holds judicial officers accountable for their actions and has the authority to discipline or remove them. This is unlike any other elected official in California. Maintaining appropriate safeguards in the recall process helps ensure that judges are able to make decisions based solely on the law and the facts presented in each case, without fear that routine or unpopular rulings will trigger politically motivated recall campaigns.

### **ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:**

The California Chamber of Commerce, Family Business Association of California, and the Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce oppose this bill because the bill's "oral disclosure requirement is unnecessary, duplicative, and fraught with practical and constitutional concerns." Specifically, they note:

Requiring an oral disclosure before every single interaction imposes a substantial logistical burden on petition circulators. Petition gathering is inherently fast-paced and dependent on brief, momentary interactions (often occurring in crowded public spaces where circulators have only seconds to engage a passerby). Mandating a verbal script before each engagement slows the process, reduces efficiency, and increases costs. In high-traffic public settings, where circulators may engage hundreds of individuals in a short period, this requirement would substantially diminish productivity and undermine the viability of lawful petition efforts.

The opponents further raise constitutional concerns, noting that petition circulation is core political speech protected by the First Amendment. They point out that courts have recognized burdens on petition circulation, which reduce the size of the audience proponents can reach, as restrictions on political expression.

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106  
4/13/26 16:09:55

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1408  
Author: Arreguín (D)  
Amended: 4/14/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 9-2, 4/7/26

AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Gonzalez, Grayson, Menjivar,  
Richardson, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Strickland, Dahle

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 4-1, 4/22/26

AYES: McNerney, Ashby, Becker, Grayson

NOES: Alvarado-Gil

---

**SUBJECT:** Contra Costa Transportation Authority: transactions and use tax

**SOURCE:** Contra Costa Transportation Authority

---

**DIGEST:** This bill would authorize, until January 1, 2045, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) to impose or extend a transactions and use tax (TUT), as specified, for the support of countywide transportation programs at up to 1% even if it exceeds the combined countywide rate limit of 2%.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each county, within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), to develop a transportation plan for the county, together with the cities and transit operators within the county.
- 2) Requires every county that includes an urbanized area to develop, adopt, and update a congestion management program consistent with the regional transportation improvement program.

- 3) Authorizes a county board of supervisors to create a local transportation authority (authority) to operate within the county.
- 4) Provides that a county that chooses to create an entirely new entity as an authority shall determine the membership of the authority with the concurrence of a majority of the cities having a majority of the population in the incorporated area of the county and provides for the board membership of the authority.
- 5) Requires an authority to prepare and adopt an annual report each year on progress made to achieve the objective of improving transportation conditions related to priority highway operation and local transportation needs.
- 6) Authorizes an authority to impose a retail TUT ordinance applicable in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of a county if the tax ordinance is adopted by a two-thirds vote of the authority and imposition of the tax is subsequently approved by the electors voting on the measure, or by any otherwise applicable voter approval requirement, at a special election called for that purpose by the board of supervisors, at the request of the authority, and a specified county transportation expenditure plan is adopted.
- 7) Requires the authority, in the ordinance, to state the nature of the tax to be imposed, to provide the tax rate or the maximum tax rate, to specify the period during which the tax will be imposed, and to specify the purposes for which the revenue derived from the tax will be used. The tax rate may be in .25% (1/4-cent) increments and shall not exceed a maximum rate of 1%. Provides election procedures for the adoption of the ordinance.
- 8) Authorizes the revenues from an imposed tax to be allocated by the authority for construction and improvement of state highways, the construction, maintenance, improvement, and operation of local streets, roads, and highways, and the construction, improvement, and operation of public transit systems.
- 9) Requires a county transportation expenditure plan to be prepared for the expenditure of the revenues expected to be derived from the tax, together with other federal, state, and local funds expected to be available for transportation improvements, for the period during which the tax is to be imposed. A county transportation expenditure plan shall not be adopted until it has received the approval of the board of supervisors and the city council representing both a majority of the cities in the county and a majority of the population residing in

the incorporated areas of the county. Requires the expenditure plan to be adopted prior to the call of the election.

- 10) Authorizes the authority to annually review and propose amendments to the expenditure plan to provide for the use of additional federal, state, and local funds, to account for unexpected revenues, or to take into consideration unforeseen circumstances.
- 11) Authorizes various local governmental entities, subject to certain limitations and approval requirements, to levy a TUT, in accordance with the procedures and requirements of TUT law, including a requirement that the combined rate of all taxes that may be imposed in accordance with that law in the county not exceed 2%.

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes, until January 1, 2045, CCTA to impose or extend a TUT for the support of countywide transportation programs at up to 1% even if it exceeds the combined rate limit of 2%, if the following requirements are met:
  - a) CCTA adopts an ordinance proposing the TUT by any applicable voting approval requirement.
  - b) The ordinance proposing the TUT is approved by voters in accordance with the California Constitution.
  - c) The TUT conforms to state TUT law, other than the combined rate limit, as specified.
- 2) Allows a TUT rate imposed pursuant to this bill will not be considered for purposes of the 2% combined rate limit.
- 3) Makes legislative findings and declarations that a special statute for the County of Contra Costa is necessary.

### **Comments**

*Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "SB 1408 would allow the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to place a sales tax measure on the ballot that would be subject to voter approval by residents of Contra Costa County. The

revenue would continue the County's investment in transportation solutions, including public transit, biking and pedestrian infrastructure, highway and local street improvements, and programs that expand mobility options.”

*Who is CCTA?* CCTA is a public agency formed by Contra Costa County voters in 1988 to manage the county's transportation sales tax program and oversee countywide transportation planning efforts. CCTA manages a multibillion-dollar suite of projects and programs and is responsible for planning, funding, and delivering transportation infrastructure projects. Some major projects, primarily on state highways, are being developed directly by CCTA. Others are administered by cities, the county, or transit districts with funds provided by CCTA.

CCTA is also responsible for developing and updating the transportation plan for the county which contributes to the development of MTC's regional transportation plan and sustainable communities' strategies. Additionally, CCTA serves as the county's designated Congestion Management Agency, and is responsible for developing, adopting, and updating the county's congestion management program.

*What is Transaction and Use Tax?* State law allows cities, counties, and specified special districts to increase the sales and use tax applicable in their jurisdiction, also known as district taxes or TUTs. Generally, the combined TUT tax rate imposed within a local jurisdiction cannot exceed 2%. To determine whether a county has reached this rate limitation, all countywide taxes and the highest combined rate imposed by a city within the county are counted towards the county's rate limit. For example, if a county imposes three 0.5% countywide taxes and two cities within the county each impose a 0.5% tax, the combined rate in those two cities would be 2%. In such a circumstance, the two cities could not impose another TUT, and the county could not impose another countywide TUT, absent special authority to exceed the rate limitation.

Prior to 2003, cities lacked the ability to place TUTs before their voters without first obtaining approval by the Legislature to bring an ordinance before the city council, and, if approved at the council level, to the voters. This was remedied by SB 566 (Scott, Chapter 709, Statutes of 2003), which imposed the uniform 2% countywide cap.

As of January 1, 2026, local agencies impose 484 district taxes for general or special purposes: 407 imposed citywide, 71 imposed countywide, and six imposed in unincorporated county areas. Generally, local agencies impose these taxes throughout the entire area of a single county, the entire unincorporated area within

a single county, or a single incorporated city. However, three transportation operators in the Bay Area have regional district taxes: the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, which covers Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco; the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), which covers San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties; Sonoma-Marín Rail Transit District, which includes Sonoma and Marin counties.

*Measure C and Measure J.* In 1988, Contra Costa County voters approved Measure C, a countywide sales tax measure for transportation. Measure C provided for a 0.5% sales tax for 20 years, through March 2009, to pay for transportation projects and programs included in a voter-approved expenditure plan. The measure was estimated to generate \$1 billion over 20 years for projects such as a BART extension, freeway improvements, better bus service, enhanced bicycle facilities and more transportation options for senior citizens and people with disabilities. Measure C also created the county's first Growth Management Program to link planning for growth and development with transportation.

In November 2004, voters approved Measure J with a 71% vote. The measure provided for the continuation of Measure C's 0.5% for 25 more years beyond the original expiration date of 2009. As with Measure C, the tax revenues are used to fund a voter-approved expenditure plan of transportation programs and projects. Measure J is estimated to provide approximately \$2.5 billion for countywide and local transportation projects and programs through the year 2034. CCTA worked with local governments, stakeholders, and residents to develop the expenditure plan. According to CCTA, the sponsors of SB 1408, "Over its lifespan, Measure J has supported critical freeway and interchange improvements, including key corridors such as Interstate 80, Interstate 680, and State Route 4, and played a significant role in funding the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. It has also enabled investments in expanded bus and rail service and the extension of BART to Antioch, as well as enhancements for active transportation like pedestrian and bicycle bridges. Measure J supports essential programs such as paratransit services for seniors and people with disabilities, transportation demand management initiatives, and youth transportation programs. The measure also provides direct funding to local jurisdictions for street maintenance and repair."

*SB 1408 allows CCTA to impose a new TUT or extend the current TUT and exceed the 2% cap.* According to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration data, as of January 1, 2026, Contra Costa County has 24 TUTs levied within its borders, including three countywide taxes and 21 citywide taxes. In addition to Measure J at 0.5%, Contra Costa County currently imposes a

countywide tax of 0.5% and a 0.5% tax is also imposed as part of BART service territory. The BART tax is exempt from the 2% cap. Therefore, the total countywide tax rate for the Contra Costa County is 1%.

Additionally, the Cities of El Cerrito and Pinole have the highest city TUT tax rates in the county at 1.5%. However, the additional 0.5% tax imposed by each city is excluded from the 2% combined rate limitation. Therefore, the highest city rate subject to the limitation is 1%, meaning Contra Costa County has reached the 2% combined rate limitation.

As noted, Measure J, which is 0.5%, is set to expire in 2034. SB 1408 would authorize CCTA to impose or extend, with voter approval, a TUT at a rate of up to 1% for the support of countywide transportation programs. It is unclear if CCTA is pursuing an extension of the existing Measure J at 0.5% rate or may pursue an additional 0.5% TUT.

Additionally, as authorized by last year's SB 63 (Wiener, Chapter 740, Statutes of 2025), Contra Costa County will join neighboring counties in supporting a regional TUT to fund Bay Area transit on the November 2026 ballot. As with the BART measure, this potential 0.5% TUT would be exempt from the 2% cap.

*We've done this before.* The Legislature has, on numerous occasions, granted specific statutory authority to exceed the general 2% rate limitation. Specifically, such authority has been granted to the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Monterey, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, and Ventura. This authority has also been granted to the cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Campbell, El Cerrito, Lancaster, Palmdale, Pinole, Santa Fe Springs, any cities in the County of Solano, Victorville, and to BART and Caltrain.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/23/26)

Contra Costa Transportation Authority (source)  
California Special Districts Association  
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority  
Choice in Aging  
City of Concord  
County of Contra Costa  
East Bay Leadership Council  
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority

San Francisco Bay Ferry  
Town of Danville  
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/23/26)

Alameda County Taxpayers' Association, INC.  
California Taxpayers Association  
Contra Costa Taxpayers Association  
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** Writing in support, the California Special Districts Association states, “As the State navigates difficult conversations around budget priorities, opportunities to provide congestion management agencies with the ability and authority to diversify locally generated revenue streams serve dual purposes: these opportunities reduce the need for state funding while also enhancing the ability of these agencies to continue executing their mission of supporting countywide transportation programs. SB 1408 would achieve this by providing the Contra Costa Transportation Authority with the authority to pursue alternative, locally generated revenue for the support of its countywide transportation programs.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** Writing in opposition, the California Taxpayer Association states, “SB 1408 would undermine taxpayer protections and make California’s affordability crisis worse by paving the way for regressive tax increases in Contra Costa County – where the combined state and local sales tax rate is already over 10 percent in some cities.”

Prepared by: Melissa White / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121  
4/24/26 11:07:16

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1416  
Author: Wahab (D)  
Introduced: 2/20/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 3/23/26  
AYES: Wahab, Choi, Archuleta, Caballero, Grayson, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas,  
Strickland, Umberg  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arreguín, Menjivar

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Physicians and surgeons: dentists: unprofessional conduct

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill revises the timeframe from 30-days to 21-days by which a patient must be refunded payment for services, if a physician or dentist receives duplicate payment for those services from a third-party payor.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes various practice acts in the Business and Professions Code (BPC) governed by various boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) which provide for the licensing and regulation of health care professionals including dentists (under the Dental Practice Act), physicians and surgeons (under the Medical Practice Act by the Medical Board of California), and osteopathic physicians and surgeons (under the Osteopathic Medical Practice Act by the Osteopathic Medical Board of California), among others.
- 2) Requires a physician and dentist to refund any amount a patient has paid for services that has subsequently been paid to that provider by a third-party payor which constitutes a duplicate payment. Specifies that if a patient requests a

refund, it must be paid within 30 days following the request (if the duplicate payment has been received by the provider) or within 30 days of the provider receiving the duplicate payment. Specifies that if a patient does not request a refund but a provider knows, or should have known, they received a duplicate payment, the provider must, within 90 days of the date they knew or should have known, notify that patient of the duplicate payment and refund the patient within 30 days, unless the patient requests a credit balance be retained. (Business and Professions Code § 732)

This bill changes the refund timeframe from 30-days to 21-days.

## **Background**

Current law says that if a doctor or dentist gets paid twice for the same service, once by a patient and again by an insurance company or other third-party payer, they must return the extra payment. If the patient asks for a refund, the doctor or dentist must return the duplicate payment within 30 days. Even if the patient does not ask for a refund, the doctor or dentist still has a responsibility to fix the mistake. If, within 90 days, they know or reasonably should know that they received a duplicate payment, they must notify the patient and issue the refund within 30 days. However, if the patient prefers, they can ask the doctor or dentist to keep the amount as a credit on their account for future services instead of receiving a refund.

Duplicate payments often occur when a patient pays upfront for care, such as a copay, coinsurance estimate, or the full cost of a visit, but the doctor or dentist later receives payment for the same service from an insurer or other third-party payer. When BPC § 732 was enacted in the early 1990s, billing reconciliation and claims processing were largely manual. Today, most medical and dental practices rely on electronic health records, automated billing software, and even insurer remittance systems that quickly identify duplicate payments or credit balances. While not all providers utilize them, modern practice-management systems can generate credit-balance reports in real time, and electronic refunds can be processed quickly. The obligation to refund duplicate payments under BPC § 732 is still largely triggered by a patient request, meaning the consumer must first ask for the refund.

According to a 2025 report from the Public Policy Institute of California *Californians and Their Economic Well-Being*, affordability challenges across the state extend beyond housing and reflect widespread strain on household finances, as rising costs for essentials like food, health care, and everyday expenses continue to impact residents' ability to get ahead. The report finds that many Californians are experiencing real financial hardship, with three in ten reporting they cut back

on food to save money, more than one in five delaying medical care or struggling to pay bills, and about one in five saying they would have difficulty covering a \$1,000 emergency expense. These findings underscore that affordability pressures are cumulative across multiple sectors of daily life, leaving many households “just getting by” or financially stressed despite being employed.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/14/26)

California Association of Oral & Maxillofacial Solutions

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/14/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** The California Association of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgeons writes in support, “By expediting refunds, the bill promotes timely financial reconciliation for patients and enhances transparency and trust in the health care system.”

Prepared by: Anna Billy / B., P. & E.D. /  
4/14/26 16:16:14

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1417  
Author: Pérez (D), et al.  
Amended: 4/23/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ENERGY, U. & C. COMMITTEE: 13-2, 4/13/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Becker, Caballero, Gonzalez, Hurtado,  
McNerney, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Stern, Wahab

NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Grove

---

**SUBJECT:** Mutual water companies: assessments and water charges: notice

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill includes various provisions to provide greater transparency regarding rate and assessment increases by mutual water companies.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes and vests the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) with regulatory over public utilities, including electrical corporations. (Article XII of the California Constitution)
- 2) Provides that any person, firm, or corporation, their lessees, trustees, receivers or trustees appointed by any court whatsoever, owning, controlling, operating, or managing any water system within this State, who sells, leases, rents, or delivers water to any person, firm, corporation, municipality, or any other political subdivision of the State, whether under contract or otherwise, is a public utility, and is subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the CPUC, except as otherwise provided. (Public Utilities Code §2701)

- 3) Provides that any corporation or association which is organized for the purpose of delivering water solely to its stockholders or members at cost, and which delivers water to others than its stockholders or members, or to the state or any department or agency thereof or any school district, or to any other mutual water company, for compensation, is a public utility and is subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the CPUC. (Public Utilities Code §2702)
- 4) Provides that any corporation or association that is organized for the purposes of delivering water to its stockholders and members at cost, including use of works for conserving, treating, and reclaiming water, and that delivers water to no one except its stockholders or members, or to the state or any agency or department thereof, to any city, county, school district, or other public district, or any federal agency that provides fire protection or operates park facilities, or to any other mutual water company, at cost, is not a public utility, and is not subject to the jurisdiction, control or regulation of the CPUC. Authorizes a mutual water company to perform specified acts without becoming a public utility and becoming subject to the jurisdiction, control or regulation of the CPUC, including delivering water at cost to any lessee of its stock or shares or other evidence of membership where the lease is in writing signed by the owner of the stock or shares or other evidence of membership and the lessee thereof and approved by the mutual water company. Requires all leases and contracts to be preserved for a period of 10 years by a mutual water company and subject to inspection by the CPUC. Defines the term “cost” as used in this to mean without profit. (Public Utilities Code §2705)
- 5) Authorizes a mutual water company organized for or engaged in the business of selling, distributing, supplying, or delivering water for irrigation purposes, and requires a mutual water company organized for or engaged in the business of selling, distributing, supplying, or delivering water for domestic use, to provide in its articles or bylaws that water shall be sold, distributed, supplied, or delivered only to owners of its shares and that those shares are appurtenant to certain lands, as specified. (Corporations Code §14300)
- 6) Authorizes a mutual water company that is not a public utility to levy assessments upon its shares, whether or not they are fully paid, unless otherwise provided in its articles or bylaws. Provides that the right to receive water or dividends may be denied and may be sold and transferred without those lands as if not appurtenant, if any shares of the corporation that have been made appurtenant to any land become delinquent in the payment of assessments. Requires the purchaser to acquire the right to receive water as provided in the

articles or bylaws of the corporation, or they may be forfeited to the corporation. (Corporations Code §14303)

- 7) Requires, pursuant to the Mutual Water Company Open Meeting Act, a board of directors of a mutual water company that operates a public water system to allow an eligible person, as defined, to personally attend a meeting of the board, if the eligible person gave the board at least 24 hours' advance written notice of their intent to personally attend the meeting. Authorizes the board to allow an eligible person who was denied attendance at a meeting for failure to provide this notice, or because the number of eligible persons having already provided notice of attendance exceeds the room capacity of the place of the meeting, to attend the meeting by teleconference. Requires the board to provide an eligible person attending a meeting by teleconference a copy of the documents to be discussed at the meeting, except as specified. (Corporations Code §14305)
- 8) Defines "eligible persons" for purposes of the Mutual Water Company Open Meeting Act to include, among others, shareholders of the mutual water company, a person who is an occupant, pursuant to a lease or rental agreement, of commercial space or a dwelling unit to which the mutual water company sells, distributes, supplies, or delivers drinking water, and an elected official of a city or county who represents people who receive drinking water directly from the mutual water company, as specified. (Corporations Code §14305(o))
- 9) Requires a mutual water company that operates a public water system to make certain records promptly available upon written request to an eligible person, as defined, upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, including, among other documents, agendas and minutes of board meetings and copies of the mutual water company's annual budget and accounting report. (Corporations Code §14307)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a mutual water company from charging, issuing a bill, or otherwise seeking to hold tenants of shareholders responsible for the costs of water or its delivery, except for tenants, as provided in Section 2705 of the Public Utilities Code, where the tenant is a lessee of the corporation's shares or stock, or the tenant is a lessee of land of a shareholder, and the corporation has approved the lease.

- 2) Requires all notices of charges for water to be sent to the last known address of the shareholder or tenant, as applicable.
- 3) Requires a mutual water company that operates a public water system and that proposes to levy an assessment or to increase the charge for water to shareholders by more than 20% to comply with specified notice and public meeting requirements at least 30 days before it seeks to collect the assessment or increase the water charge. Requires the mutual water company to prepare a written proposal to collect an assessment or to increase a water charge, as specified, and to convene a public meeting regarding the proposal, as provided. Requires the mutual water company to send a copy of the written proposal and the notice of the public meeting to specified persons, along with other information, and to also send a copy of the written proposal and the notice of the public meeting to certain newspapers and radio stations.
- 4) Requires a mutual water company to make available to eligible persons, upon request, a copy of the current list of shareholders, including all contact information, and a copy of a written proposal to levy an assessment or to increase a water charge. Includes as an eligible person, for purposes of all of the above-described provisions, the chief administrative officer for each city, county, and government water agency in the mutual water company's service area, as specified. Prohibits a mutual water company that provides the requested records in digital form from charging for any duplication costs, as provided.

## **Background**

*Mutual water companies.* Mutual water companies are private not-for-profit organizations of shareholder-owned water systems organized under Corporations Code Section 14300 *et seq.* and serving 1.3 million Californians in rural and pockets of urban areas. Some of these water companies date back to the 1800's when they constructed irrigation channels and installed pumps to distribute water to shareholder-owned properties, at the time in largely rural areas, while others date back to the mid-1900's as housing was being built in formerly rural areas. Over time, mutual water companies gave way to municipally owned water departments and investor-owned water utilities, that are regulated by the CPUC. However, mutual water companies are governed by their shareholders, via a board (often of volunteers). Shareholders are property owners who receive service and hold shares and liability for the integrity of the water system, including assessments to cover the costs to maintain the systems.

*Eaton Fire impacts on mutual water companies.* The Southern California January 2025 Eaton Fire killed 31 people and forced more than 200,000 to evacuate the area, destroyed 18,000 homes and structures, and burned nearly 60,000 acres of land. The fire also impacted water systems serving the community, including three mutual water companies in Altadena: Las Flores Water Company, Lincoln Avenue Water Company, Rubio Canyon Land and Water Association, who serve most residents and businesses in Altadena. These water companies had varying degrees of insurance to help them rebuild the infrastructure to restore service. Though the continued ability of the water system to provide service may also rest on the pace of the return of the customer base to the impacted area, as the ability to recover costs rests on continuing to provide service to customers.

## Comments

*Mutual water companies seek rate increases to recover from the Eaton Fire.* In order to restore service, each of the mutual water companies have sought rate increases to financially recover from the Eaton Fire. The author's office contends they have done so without consistent timelines of outreach to shareholders. For instance, the advanced notification, which would include a public forum to discuss proposed charges, is not always clear. The author's office provided the following information concerning rate and assessment increases:

Las Flores Water Company:

- Applied a \$3,000 fee for standing homes, and to destroyed homes once rebuilt.<sup>1</sup>
- The charge appeared to be presented in the October 2025 and January 2026 board meetings, which discussed plans for wildfire recovery, but no advanced notice of a prospective rate increase to advertise these meetings was provided in advance to shareholders.<sup>2</sup> Ultimately, nearly 200 shareholders demanded answers and expressed frustration and concern over these proposed charges.<sup>3</sup>
- A written notification dated March 2026 indicated that the charge was adopted by the board on their February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to be applied on April 1, 2026.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://laist.com/brief/news/climate-environment/las-flores-water-company-altadena-whats-happening-and-why>

<sup>2</sup> <https://lasfloreswaterco.com/documents/lfwc-Fire-Assessment-Letter-2026.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.sgvtribune.com/2026/02/13/in-the-pipeline-altadena-utility-customers-to-see-water-rate-increases-in-2026-amid-fire-recovery/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://lasfloreswaterco.com/documents/lfwc-Fire-Assessment-Letter-2026.pdf>

Rubio Cañon Land and Water Association:

- Proposed an 11% rate increase, and fire recovery fee of up to \$30 a month.<sup>5</sup>
- A March 18<sup>th</sup> notice indicated that charge will be applied May 1<sup>st</sup> with reference to rate adjustments being discussed at a February 3<sup>rd</sup> special meeting, but no advanced notification for shareholders to know that a rate increase would be discussed appeared to be found.<sup>6</sup>

Lincoln Avenue Water Company:

- Adopted a \$15 rate increase that took effect in March 2026 and considered imposing an additional fee.<sup>7</sup>
- No advanced notification to specifically highlight or discuss the rate increase appeared to be found but a letter was reportedly sent after the decision was made, and the company's website did not provide further details about any forum or agenda.<sup>8</sup>

*Bill seeks greater notification and transparency concerning proposed increases to rates and assessments.* This bill proposes greater notification of proposed rate and assessment increases by mutual water companies. The author's office has shared that survivors from the Eaton Fire are dealing with increased costs to rebuild their homes, and communities, including costs from the rebuilding of the mutual water company systems. They share the need for more transparency as residents have been surprised by the increased costs being placed on them by the mutual water companies. The author's office notes there is a lack of more visible and advanced notifications about proposed rate changes.

*Opponents raise concerns about bill's prescriptive requirements.* In opposition to this bill, the California Association of Mutual Water Companies (Cal Mutuals) states they support aspects of this bill to provide greater explanation of significant rate increases; however, they have concerns with the prescriptive nature of some of the requirements in the bill. Specifically, they raise concerns about the disclosure of shareholder names and contact information, the identification of board members who voted for a rate increase, and prescriptive notice and meeting mandates (such as requiring notices are publicized in newspapers and other media) or requiring the use of facilities with specific room capacity (at least 100 people). Cal Mutuals

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.pasadenastarnews.com/2026/02/13/in-the-pipeline-altadena-utility-customers-to-see-water-rate-increases-in-2026-amid-fire-recovery/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.rclwa.org/uploads/files/LatestNews/2026%20Rate%20Increase.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://pasadenanow.com/main/another-altadena-water-company-calls-shareholder-meeting-to-address-eaton-fire-financial-woes>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.sgvtribune.com/2026/02/13/in-the-pipeline-altadena-utility-customers-to-see-water-rate-increases-in-2026-amid-fire-recovery/>

notes that the identification of board votes may discourage volunteer board service. They argue that board votes are already reflected in meeting minutes under existing governance practices, and requiring individual vote attribution in a formal statutory notice raises significant policy concern. Cal Mutuals also contends that the most important notices are those sent directly to their customers, as opposed to publicizing them in other media. Moreover, Cal Mutuals believes the required disclosure of shareholder information raises significant privacy concerns which could create tension with established privacy protections and exposing shareholders to unwanted solicitation, harassment, or misuse of personal information without proper safeguards.

*Tenant/occupant billing.* Under current law in both the Public Utilities Code and Corporations Code, mutual water companies are limited in who they can bill for services, largely restricted to their shareholders, or else they may risk becoming a public utility subject to the regulatory authority of the CPUC. However, there are exceptions where a mutual water company is authorized to provide water at cost without becoming a public utility, such as in the instance of addressing a fire or other emergencies. An additional exception provides that where a shareholder enters into a lease agreement with an occupant and the lease agreement is provided to the mutual water company, the mutual water company can bill the occupant. The law requires the mutual water company to maintain the lease agreements for 10 years and makes them subject to the inspection of the CPUC. The bill prohibits billing tenants for water service. However, amendments taken in the policy committee attempt to address the authorized exception in the law, by authorizing billing of tenants where they are authorized by Public Utilities Code Section 2705. Given the need to help the community rebuild, the continued ability of utility providers to collect charges for water service, including from tenants who agreed to these arrangements, can support efforts to restore service more quickly, while protecting customers who have not agreed to these arrangements from being unfairly billed.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

SB 1291 (Gonzalez) of 2026, requires specified actions of mutual water companies and their boards, including providing teleconferencing for certain companies, and adopt an annual budget, among other requirements. The bill is pending in the Senate Banking and Financial Institutions Committee.

AB 240 (Rendon, Chapter 633, Statutes of 2013) required mutual water companies to comply with open meeting, public record, audit, and budget requirements and allows them to impose liens to collect unpaid charges.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/24/26)

County of Los Angeles

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/24/26)

California Association of Mutual Water Companies

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the author's office:

In a joint meeting facilitated by the Altadena Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, the companies fielded questions about these water rate increases among other charges facing fire survivors. Some residents have still received water service charges from the time of the Eaton Fire although their property was destroyed. This dynamic underscores the need for state law to ensure consistent requirements for how mutual water companies provide advanced notification and a meeting for shareholders specifically if they are proposing a rate increase to ensure appropriate shareholder notice and feedback prior to adoption.

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** According to Cal Mutuals, "...SB 1417 as drafted includes requirements that do not appear reasonably related to achieving the bill's intended purpose. The bill raises several significant policy and legal concerns." They express concerns with the prohibition on tenant billing, requiring board vote identification, prescriptive requirements in the bill, and disclosure of shareholder information.

Prepared by: Nidia Bautista / E., U. & C. / (916) 651-4107  
4/24/26 10:52:37

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

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1418  
Author: Cervantes (D)  
Amended: 3/24/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/21/26  
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

---

**SUBJECT:** Elections officials: meetings

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill increases from three to four per year the maximum number of meetings the Secretary of State (SOS) may convene with election officials in California.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides the SOS is the chief elections officer of the state.
- 2) Permits the SOS, on written call, to convene a maximum of three meetings in any calendar year with county election officials, city election officials, and registrars of voters to discuss matters affecting the administration of election laws and to promote uniformity of procedure in those matters. Any deputy of a county elections official, city elections official, or registrar of voters designated by their principal may attend these meetings.

This bill:

- 1) Increases the maximum number of meetings the SOS may convene with California's election officials from three to four meetings in a calendar year.
- 2) Makes technical changes.

## Comments

*Author's Statement.* Under existing law, the SOS can summon elections officials to meet to discuss state elections laws to ensure uniformity in the administration of those laws. The number of these meetings is limited to three per calendar year. In order to better promote uniformity in elections administration across California, this bill would increase the number of meetings the SOS may call from three to four per calendar year.

*Election Administration in California.* Elections in California are conducted at the local level. This task is typically completed by county elections officials who also serve as registrars of voters, though city election officials (i.e., city clerks) can administer city elections. Jurisdictions must follow state laws, but interpretation and implementation of these laws may vary. To bring more uniformity when implementing the Elections Code, as California's chief elections official, the SOS can promulgate regulations, provide guidance to local election officials, and/or call up to three formal meetings every calendar year with election officials.

*Communication between the SOS and Election Officials.* The SOS and election officials meet periodically and communicate frequently throughout the year. While not a formal meeting, the SOS and election officials meet at conferences throughout the year, and the SOS convenes a monthly call with county election officials to update them on various election-related matters.

## Related/Prior Legislation

SB 1842 (John F. McCarthy, Chapter 1883, Statutes of 1955) added the ability for the SOS, on written call, to convene a maximum number of three meetings with election officials in a calendar year.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

Prepared by: Scott Matsumoto / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106  
4/22/26 16:11:13

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

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1429  
Author: Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments  
Introduced: 3/5/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/21/26  
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

---

**SUBJECT:** Elections

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This omnibus bill makes various changes to the Elections Code.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires local districts, cities, or other political subdivisions to file a resolution with the board of supervisors and a copy with the county elections official containing information about the local jurisdiction's election at least 88 days prior to the date of the election. This resolution must include a request that the district, city, or other political subdivision election be consolidated with the statewide election.
- 2) Permits the governing body of local districts, cities, or other political subdivisions to authorize the board of supervisors to canvass the returns of an election.
- 3) Requires county election officials to provide between six and 12 instruction cards to each polling location for the guidance of voters in obtaining and marking their ballots.
- 4) Requires the precinct board to proclaim aloud that the polls have opened and closed.

- 5) Defines “precinct board” as “the board appointed by the elections official to serve at a single precinct or a consolidated precinct,” and a “precinct board member” as “a member of the precinct board and includes an election officer.”

This bill:

- 1) Permits local districts, cities, or other political subdivisions to file the resolution with only the elections official if, at least 88 days before the date of the election, either of the following requirements are met:
  - a) The elections official provides the resolution to the board of supervisors.
  - b) The board of supervisors authorizes the elections official to receive resolutions and consolidate elections without seeking new approval by the board of supervisors for each election.
- 2) Provides that the county elections official, instead of the board of supervisors, is authorized to canvass the returns of a local bond election. A local jurisdiction's governing body may authorize the county elections official, instead of the board of supervisors, to canvass the returns of an election for the jurisdiction that is consolidated with an election held in the county.
- 3) Removes the limitation of 12 instruction cards to be at each polling location.
- 4) Specifies that a precinct board member, instead of the precinct board, is required to proclaim aloud that the polls have opened and closed.
- 5) Makes technical and conforming changes.

## **Background**

*Canvassing an Election.* Current law allows entities to authorize county boards of supervisors to canvass the returns of the election. This conflicts with other provisions of the Elections Code relating to the canvass and the duties of county election officials. For example, the elections official is required to report the final results of an election to the governing board. If a county board of supervisors is the governing board being elected, the county elections official has the responsibility for conducting the canvass, as the governing board cannot report to itself. This could lead to confusion and unnecessary involvement of boards of supervisors in the election canvass process.

*Polling Place Materials and Instruction Cards.* In addition to instruction cards, current law requires the Secretary of State or the county elections official to provide specific informational and administrative materials to each polling place. Some of the materials sent to a polling place include an accessible copy of the voter list, an American flag, a ballot container, a sufficient number of cards on how to obtain information about a voter's polling place, name badges, ballots, facsimile copies of the ballot, translated materials for voters, a roster, and various notices relating to election and voting procedures.

Each instruction card is required to have specified instructions and provisions of the Elections Code related to obtaining and marking a voter's ballot. Provisions on the instruction card include Election Day procedures, issuing a ballot, instructions for marking and submitting a ballot, procedures following the closure of a polling place, and Penal Code provisions related to electioneering, vandalism, and voting.

AB 586 (Robertson, Chapter 580, Statutes of 1945) set the range of at least six and not more than 12 instruction cards. Since 1945, while the range of six to 12 instruction cards has remained the same, the wording for where these instruction cards are sent was changed through subsequent legislation to "polling places" and includes polls, polling locations, and vote centers. Vote centers, in particular, may house more than 12 voting stations at a location.

## **Comments**

*Committee Bill.* This bill is one of the Senate Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments' committee bills. This bill contains changes requested by the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials and by committee staff.

*Filing Resolutions.* Current law requires that a jurisdiction calling for an election do so by filing the original resolution with the board of supervisors and a copy with the elections official. Some jurisdictions may only deliver the resolution to one of the two entities. A jurisdiction delivering a resolution to only one of the two locations could be legally challenged even if accepted by an elections official.

*Precinct Boards.* A member of the precinct board proclaims aloud that fact when the polls open and close. This bill clarifies that the entire precinct board does not need to announce the opening or closing of a polling location since it is typically announced by an individual board member.

*Senate Bill 851.* A version of SB 851 (Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments) of 2025 contained the provisions in this bill. In the days leading up to the bill's final passage, it was amended in the Assembly to reflect another elections-related topic relating to interference in elections. This bill is nearly identical to the language in SB 851 prior to the measure being amended.

### **Related/Prior legislation**

SB 851 (Cervantes, Chapter 238, Statutes of 2025) made various changes to state law to protect California's elections from interference. Prior to SB 851 being amended to reflect the language that was ultimately chaptered, it contained many provisions in this bill, SB 1429.

SB 729 (Glazer) of 2021 would have removed the limitation of 12 instruction cards. The bill passed by the Senate, but was not heard by the Assembly.

SB 696 (Umberg) of 2019 would have removed the limitation of 12 instruction cards. The bill was amended in the Assembly to another elections-related subject.

AB 586 (Robertson, Chapter 580, Statutes of 1945) required the county clerk to furnish each precinct with not less than six nor more than 12 instruction cards.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

Prepared by: Scott Matsumoto / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106  
4/22/26 16:11:13

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SB 1430  
Author: Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments  
Amended: 4/8/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/21/26  
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

---

**SUBJECT:** Elections

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill conforms the Education Code and the Elections Code to provide the same 125-day deadline to adopt a resolution specifying the date and the purpose of an election and requires the resolution to be delivered to the county superintendent of schools and the officer conducting the election.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Requires, pursuant to the Education Code, when an election for governing board members of a school district or community college district is ordered, the governing board of the district, or the board or officer authorized by law to make such designations, to adopt a resolution specifying the date and the purpose of the election. The resolution must be delivered, not fewer than 123 days before the election, to the county superintendent of schools and the officer conducting the election.
- 2) Requires, pursuant to the Elections Code, on the 125th day prior to the day fixed for the general district election, the secretary of the governing body or a person designated by them, to deliver a notice to the county elections official.

This bill:

- 1) Conforms the Education Code and the Elections Code to have the same 125-day deadline to adopt a resolution specifying the date and the purpose of the election and require the resolution to be delivered to the county superintendent of schools and the officer conducting the election.
- 2) Makes technical and clarifying changes.

## **Background**

*Voter's Choice Act.* SB 450 (Allen, Chapter 832, Statutes of 2016) created the California Voter's Choice Act (VCA). The VCA, among many other changes, created vote centers. At least one vote center has to be open for every 50,000 registered voters from the 10th day to the fourth day prior to the election. Counties that opt into the VCA must have vote centers open 10 days prior to Election Day and through Election Day.

## **Comments**

*Committee Bill.* This bill is one of the Senate Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments' committee bills and makes changes to the Elections and Education codes. This bill contains changes requested by the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials and by committee staff.

*Same Day Deadline.* When a general district election is called, on the 125th day prior to the election, a notice of the election is delivered to the county elections official. When a school board calls an election for governing board members, on the 123rd day prior to the election the resolution is to be delivered to the county superintendent of schools and the elections official. The two days make a difference when it comes to preparing notices and getting things ready for nominations. This bill conforms the Elections Code and Education Code to have the same 125-day deadline.

*Clarifying Changes.* Current language in the Elections Code covers how public buildings and school buildings should operate as polling places and vote centers. After the passage of SB 450, which took effect in 2018, election officials had a difficult time finding public buildings that could be used as vote centers for 10 days. AB 2540 (Mullin, Chapter 343, Statutes of 2018) thus required public and school buildings to serve as vote centers if requested by election officials. As AB 2540 added the word vote centers into the code section, the language became more complicated and confusing, such as making it seem like schools used as vote centers could be closed for 10 days. This bill rewrites the code section to clarify

how schools and public buildings should operate when used as polling places or vote centers.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Rida Shaikh / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106

4/22/26 16:11:14

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

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1437  
Author: Committee on Revenue and Taxation  
Introduced: 3/11/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/22/26  
AYES: McNerney, Alvarado-Gil, Ashby, Becker, Grayson

---

**SUBJECT:** Property taxation: intercounty pipeline: right-of-way assessment:  
full cash value

**SOURCE:** State Board of Equalization

---

**DIGEST:** This bill extends the sunset dates for the specific valuation methodology for intercounty pipeline rights-of-way for five years, through the 2030-31 fiscal year.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that all property is taxable and shall be assessed at the same percentage of fair market value, unless explicitly exempted by the Constitution or federal law (California Constitution, Article XIII, Section One).
- 2) Requires that property be assessed in the county, city, or district in which it is situated (California Constitution, Article XIII, Section 14).
- 3) Establishes the Board of Equalization (BOE) to equalize rates and assessment practices among counties (California Constitution, Article XIII, Sections 17 and 18).
- 4) Directs BOE to value property owned by railways, companies selling gas and electricity, or telephone companies, as these companies own property that crosses county lines, and allows the Legislature to authorize BOE assessment of

property owned or used as “public utilities” (California Constitution, Article XIII, Section 19).

- 5) Enacts a specific valuation methodology for intercounty pipeline rights-of-way based on a tiered dollars-per-mile schedule, based on the property’s density classification, adjusted annually for inflation, which is entitled to the presumption of correctness.
- 6) Sunsets the methodology after the 2025-26 fiscal year.

This bill extends the specific valuation methodology for intercounty pipeline rights-of-way for five years, through the 2030-31 fiscal year.

### **Background**

After years of litigation, an appellate court decision transferred the duty for assessing intercounty pipeline rights-of-way from the BOE to County Assessors in 1993 (*Southern Pacific Pipe Lines, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization*, 14 Cal.App.4th 42 (1993)). The decision directed BOE to refund its previously imposed assessments, while instead providing that county assessors were to levy escape assessments retroactively to the 1984-85 tax year based on their own determinations as to the value of those interests. To avoid additional litigation based on local valuations, assessors and pipeline owners negotiated an agreement, which the Legislature codified (AB 1286, Takasugi, Chapter 76, Statutes of 1996). The Legislature has extended the methodology four times, but it’s set to expire again on January 1, 2027 (AB 2612, Brewer, Chapter 607, Statutes of 2000; SB 1494, Committee on Revenue & Taxation, Chapter 654, Statutes of 2010; SB 803, Committee on Governance & Finance, Chapter 454, Statutes of 2015; SB 825, Committee on Governance & Finance, Chapter 433, Statutes of 2021). Without it, assessors will default to fair market valuation, which will increase workload and could result in significant variance in values across counties.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/23/26)

California State Board of Equalization (source)

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/23/26)

None received

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the BOE, “The BOE respectfully requests that the Committee support SB 1437 (Committee on Revenue and Taxation) to authorize another five-year extension for RTC 401.10. RTC Section 401.10 prescribes a valuation methodology for the local assessment of intercounty pipeline rights-of-way. The methodology, which involves a series of tiered dollars-per-mile schedules based on a property’s density classification, applies to assessments made for the 1984-85 through 2025-26 tax years. The law is currently scheduled to sunset on January 1, 2027. The pipeline rights-of-way value methodology was codified in 1996 after a settlement agreement between County Assessors and rights-of-way owners. The sunset date for the valuation methodology has been extended four times – for 10 years in 2000 and for 5 additional years in 2010, 2015, and 2021. If an extension is enacted, BOE staff will work with the County Assessors and interested parties to revisit whether the tiered system needs to be updated.”

Prepared by: Colin Grinnell / REV. & TAX. / (916) 651-4117  
4/24/26 11:12:55

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

---

CONSENT

---

Bill No: SB 1438  
Author: Committee on Local Government  
Amended: 4/13/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/22/26  
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

---

**SUBJECT:** Local government: investments and deposits

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill makes various changes to local government investment laws.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Limits the percentage that local agencies can invest in many types of investments.
- 2) Allows local agencies to invest in commercial paper programs offer notes of varying short-term maturities not to exceed 270 days, but typically between one to 90 days. In addition to the maximum maturity of 270 days, state law includes additional safeguards to ensure that commercial paper programs operate effectively. Commercial paper must have the highest ranking or the highest letter and number rate as provided by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization. Entities issuing commercial paper must either be (1) general corporations with total assets in excess of \$500 million and have debt, other than commercial paper, that is rated “A” or equivalent; or (2) special purpose corporations, trusts, or limited liability companies that have program-wide credit enhancements, such as overcollateralization, letters of credit, or surety bonds, and have commercial paper rated “A-1” or higher.
- 3) Allows local agencies to invest in medium-term notes are securities with a maximum remaining maturity of five years or less. Local agencies may invest

up to 30% of their surplus funds in medium term notes, which must be issued by corporations or depository institutions licensed in the United States, with at least an “A” rating. Medium-term investments provide greater liquidity compared to longer-term investments, which may not mature for decades.

This bill:

- 1) Makes various changes to local government investment laws to recast and reorganize provisions authorizing local agencies to invest their surplus funds, among other changes.
- 2) Clarifies that cities, counties, and local agencies may purchase commercial paper issued by a federally or state-licensed branch of a foreign bank and a federally or state-chartered bank.
- 3) Allows local agencies to invest in obligations issued by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Invest, allowing agencies to invest in the full range of issuances offered by the Inter-American Development Bank Group.
- 4) Allows counties and the City of Los Angeles to accept letters of credit that are drawn on accept letters of credit from a bank’s own regional Federal Home Loan Banks (FHLB).
- 5) Removes the January 1, 2031, sunset date on some of the provisions authorizing additional local agency investments.

## **Background**

Since 1913, state law has authorized local officials to invest a portion of local agencies’ temporarily idle funds in a variety of financial instruments. Originally, state law limited the instruments to government bonds, but over time the laws governing local agency investments have been amended to keep pace with changing investment opportunities and current market offerings. California law allows local officials to deposit money in state or national banks, savings associations, federal associations, credit unions, or federally insured industrial loan companies in the State of California.

When investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling, or managing public funds, state law outlines local agencies’ investment objectives, also known as the prudent investor standard. The primary objective is to safeguard the principal of the funds under its control. The secondary objective is to meet the liquidity needs of the depositor. The final objective is to achieve a return on the funds under its control.

State law limits the percentage that local agencies can invest in many types of investments. This encourages local agencies to diversify their investment portfolios, which limits the risk to the local agency if any investment does not have the expected return. Local agencies make investments with different maturity dates, which refer to the date when the borrower must make the final payment due on an investment. To limit risk, the Government Code places limitations on the types and terms of investments that local governments can make, including to limit the term to maturity for certain types of investments.

### **Comments**

*Purpose of this bill.* Local agencies' ability to invest their temporarily idle funds helps local agencies manage their cash flow, maintain liquidity necessary to pay their bills, and make sound investments that provide a return but protect taxpayer funds. Many of the statutes authorizing local agencies to invest their surplus funds have been in place since at least 1949, some were updated in 1995, but many remain untouched. They reflect outdated drafting practices that comingled definitions, powers, and procedures. This can lead to confusion over local government investment powers and procedures and can lead to local agency investment portfolios falling out of compliance, which can put taxpayer dollars at risk. The only substantive policy changes reflected in the measure are also included in the Committee on Local Government's Annual Omnibus bill, SB 1439 of the current legislative session. To the extent both measures move forward, these changes will remain only in SB 1438 to avoid chaptering issues. To avoid confusion associated with provisions having multiple operative dates, the measure also removes a January 1, 2031, sunset on certain local agency investment tools. This measure is not intended to expand, contract, or change investment tools. It is intended to make investment practices clearer so that taxpayer dollars remain protected.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/23/26)

California Association of County Treasurers and Tax Collectors

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/23/26)

None received

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119  
4/24/26 11:07:16

\*\*\*\* **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 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** \*\*\*\*

---

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 129  
Author: Cortese (D), et al.  
Amended: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 12-0, 4/7/26

AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Gonzalez, Grayson,  
Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Valladares, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

---

**SUBJECT:** Rusty Areias Highway

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill designates the portion of State Route (SR) 152 from Cedar Creek BR# 37-30R/L to Sidehill Viaduct BR# 37-398 in the County of Santa Clara as the “Rusty Areias Highway,” as specified.

**ANALYSIS:**

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

This resolution:

- 1) Provides background on the life of Rusty Areias, as specified.
- 2) Designates the section of SR 152 between Cedar Creek BR# 37-30R/L (postmile R28.163) to Sidehill Viaduct BR# 37-398 (postmile R31.656) in the County of Santa Clara as the “Rusty Areias Highway.”

- 3) Requests Caltrans to determine the cost of appropriate signs consistent with the signing requirements for the state highway system showing this special designation and, upon receiving donations.

### **Comments**

*Purpose of this resolution.* According to the author, “Rusty Areias is a dedicated public servant who has made a lasting impact on my district, and on our state. As an Assemblymember who served the 25th and 28th districts for 12 years, Rusty had over 100 pieces of legislation signed into law under two Republican Governors. He secured critical funds for numerous key projects, including Martial Cottle Park, a one-of-a-kind agricultural park surrounded by urban development in Santa Clara County. Rusty also helped obtain \$150 million for key improvements to Highway 152 that made the road from the South Bay to the San Joaquin Valley safer and more accessible for all Californians. That legacy, coupled with his time as Director of Parks and Recreations under Governor Jerry Brown, where he expanded the number of visitors to our state parks by 23 million people, is what makes Rusty so deserving of recognition. SCR 129 will designate a portion of Highway 152 as the “Rusty Areias Highway” in his honor.”

*Background.* Born on September 12, 1949, in Los Banos California, Rusty graduated from California State University Chico and completed Executive Leadership programs at the Harvard Kennedy School. Serving in a number of public service positions / roles, Rusty served as a California Assemblymember from 1982-1994, Director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation from 1998-2001, as a member of the California Coastal Commission for four years, including two as Chair. Currently, Rusty co-owns the Bird Ranch at San Luis Creek with his wife and has two children.

*Consistent with committee policy.* This resolution is consistent with committee policy.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

Congressman John Garamendi, 8th District  
Willie L. Brown, Jr. - Former Speaker, California State Assembly  
Will Kempton, Individual

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Manny Leon / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121  
4/21/26 16:19:44

**\*\*\*\* 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 131  
Author: Blakespear (D), et al.  
Amended: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 8-0, 4/15/26  
AYES: Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson,  
Padilla  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Ochoa Bogh

---

**SUBJECT:** Housing: unsheltered homelessness

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution urges the Governor, relevant state agencies, and all local governments to adopt an urgent and coordinated approach to both end and prevent unsheltered homelessness statewide through the full activation of interim and permanent strategies, as well as interventions to prevent individuals and families from falling into unsheltered homelessness, and fund all interventions and reforms that prioritize housing unsheltered Californians.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Creates the California Interagency Council on Homelessness (Cal-ICH) and requires it to set and measure progress toward goals to prevent and end homelessness in California.
- 2) Establishes the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention Program (HHAPP) to provide jurisdictions with one-time grant funds to support regional coordination and expand or develop local capacity to address their immediate homelessness challenges informed by a best-practices framework focused on moving homeless individuals and families into permanent housing and supporting the efforts of those individuals and families to maintain their

permanent housing. Directs the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to administer HHAPP.

- 3) Requires that a regionally coordinated homelessness action plan (Regional Plan) include:
  - a) Identification and analysis of the specific roles and responsibilities of each participating jurisdiction in the region as specified.
  - b) A list of the most recent system performance measures for the region, which shall include age, racial, and ethnic disparities, as specified.
  - c) A system performance and improvement plan (Improvement Plan) with a description of key actions the region intends to take to improve system performance measures. May include key actions from small jurisdictions in the region that elect to engage in the regionally coordinated homelessness action plan.
- 4) Requires HHAPP applicants to demonstrate how the region will use available resources to sustain all existing and proposed interim housing investments within the region, as specified.
- 5) Requires HCD to approve a plan when it determines that the plan includes specified components, including certain performance measures (SPMs) for the region as well as age, racial, and ethnic disparities for specified information, and a system performance and improvement plan.
- 6) Requires HHAPP to be used for evidence-based solutions that address and prevent homelessness among eligible populations, as specified.

This resolution urges the Governor, relevant state agencies, and all local governments to adopt an urgent and coordinated approach to both end and prevent unsheltered homelessness statewide through the full activation of interim and permanent strategies, as well as interventions to prevent individuals and families from falling into unsheltered homelessness, and fund all interventions and reforms that prioritize housing unsheltered Californians.

## **Background**

*Homelessness: stats and causes.* According to the most recent point in time (PIT) count, 187,084 people were experiencing homelessness in California—representing 24% of the nation’s homeless population. Two-thirds of the homeless population in California is unsheltered. Over half (51%) of all unsheltered people

in the United States were in California. A lack of affordable housing is the biggest contributor to homelessness. As housing costs continue to rise, rent becomes less affordable for lower-income households, who are forced to live beyond their means (paying more than 30% of income on housing costs) or are pushed out of their homes, leading to rapid increases in homelessness. Variation in rates of homelessness cannot be explained by variation in rates of individual factors such as poverty or mental illness; conversely, cities with higher rents and lower rental vacancy rates (i.e., tighter housing markets) *are* directly linked to higher per capita rates of homelessness.

The lack of affordable housing plays a significant role in causing individuals to become homeless and creates obstacles for individuals experiencing homelessness to transition into stable housing. The need for and costs of housing have consistently outpaced the development of affordable housing for over 30 years. As of 2022, working at the minimum wage of \$15/hour, a renter has to work 83 hours each week to afford a modest one-bedroom rental home at Fair Market Rent in California. The lack of supply is the primary factor underlying California's housing crunch. To keep up with demand, HCD estimates that California must plan for the development of more than 2.5 million homes over the next eight years, and no less than one million of those homes must meet the needs of lower-income households (more than 640,000 very low-income and 385,000 low-income units are needed). For decades, not enough housing was constructed to meet need, resulting in a severe undersupply of housing. New construction of housing, both single family homes and apartments, continues to lag behind historical averages, and lags further behind the number of new units needed to meet housing demand.

## Comments

*Author's statement.* "It is the duty of the State of California to protect the health and welfare of all its residents, including those experiencing homelessness. More than 123,000 Californians sleep unsheltered each night on sidewalks, in public parks, under freeway overpasses, and in riverbeds with no access to privacy, safety, or sanitation. The longer a person remains unsheltered, the more difficult it becomes for them to stabilize and enter permanent housing, and the more likely they are to suffer preventable illness, trauma, or death. The Interagency Council on Homelessness set a goal to increase the share of unsheltered individuals entering shelter or housing from 42% to 70% by 2027, with the aim of ensuring all unsheltered people access housing pathways. This goal cannot be reached without scaling up state investments for flexible funding, such as the Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention program, to pair with other state, federal, and local funding that serves people experiencing unsheltered homelessness. State, regional,

and local governments must coordinate limited resources to fund long-term and interim solutions to ensure that our streets are no longer the landing place for people experiencing housing insecurity.”

*How to Solve California’s Homelessness Crisis.* The overwhelming evidence shows that the solution to homelessness is providing more habitable, stable, and permanent housing at all income levels, and in particular, more housing affordable to the lowest income earners. While increasing the supply of affordable housing is the priority solution to the homelessness crisis, there can be a spectrum of housing interventions that different levels of governments could offer, depending on the specific needs of the individual or family experiencing homelessness. These interventions range from short-term and interim interventions (such as emergency shelters, tiny home communities, and low barrier navigation centers), to long-term, permanent housing interventions (such as housing choice vouchers, rental subsidies and rapid rehousing, landlord incentives, and permanent housing), to homelessness prevention altogether (such as rapid rehousing and diversion programs). All of these interventions play a role in a homeless response system.

For example, many families merely require temporary rental assistance to maintain their housing or rapid rehousing to reconnect to permanent housing. Some populations require more intensive services in conjunction with permanent housing options. For those living on the streets or in encampments, emergency shelter can provide short-term, temporary respite. However, shelters can impose requirements that present barriers to entry (such as restrictive hours, only offering congregate settings, or disallowing pets), which mean working families and marginalized community members may not be able to or feel comfortable using them. Shelters also have very low success rates at connecting people to permanent housing (in California from 2018-2024, the rate was 22%<sup>1</sup>). Interim solutions, such as bridge housing communities, low barrier navigation centers, and tiny home communities typically offer non-congregate housing and healthcare services, particularly to marginalized communities, families, and those with pets. These interventions may play a stabilizing role before a more permanent solution (such as rental assistance or the construction of a new unit) can be attained. However, interim housing interventions similarly have high rates of returns to homelessness without access to permanent housing.

While each jurisdiction or region must evaluate existing resources and identify the appropriate means to address unique needs, research shows that creating more shelter beds and interim beds *alone* do not decrease the number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Lauren Helper. *Calmatters: A Volunteer Jail: Inside the Scandals and Abuse Pushing Californians Homeless Out of Shelters*. Accessible here: <https://calmatters.org/housing/2025/02/california-homeless-shelters-purgatory/>

people experiencing homelessness. In fact, people residing in emergency shelters or interim housing (including low barrier navigation centers or tiny homes) are still considered homeless by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The goal of any effective homelessness response system should be to maximize every shelter or interim bed as a means to connect a homeless individual or family to permanent housing. To do so, communities must typically invest far more in permanent housing and homelessness prevention than in short-term and interim interventions.

*Recent state investments.* Traditionally, homelessness responses in California were considered the responsibility of the federal and local governments (cities, counties, and CoCs). This included financing, land use policies, tenant protections, physical and behavioral health services, social services, and more. Within the past decade, the State began playing a more active role in the homelessness response system by investing more heavily in prevention and response programs, streamlining the production of affordable housing, and facilitating greater coordination across state and local/regional sectors. Between Fiscal Years 2018-19 and 2020-21, California increased its investment in affordable housing and homelessness-focused programs by more than \$1.5 billion; between Fiscal Years 2018-19 and 2020-21, the state directed \$9.6 billion in affordable housing and homelessness programs. The state did so by funding, administering, and/or implementing 35 programs administered by nine state agencies and departments aimed at expanding access to housing, health, and social services for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness. More recently, however, California has reduced its one-time investments due to challenging budget years. In 2024-25, the state provided over \$1 billion for homelessness, and in 2025-26, this was reduced to about \$650 million.

*HHAPP: Overview, Accountability, and Coordination.* The HHAP Program was created to provide jurisdictions with one-time grant funds to expand or develop local capacity to address immediate homelessness challenges informed by a best-practices framework focused on moving homeless individuals and families into permanent housing and supporting the efforts of those individuals and families to maintain their permanent housing. Program funds can be used for services for those experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness, such as rapid rehousing, operating subsidies, street outreach, services coordination, delivery of permanent and innovative housing solutions, and homelessness prevention. Beginning with round four, HHAPP included robust accountability provisions, including the requirement that applicants develop a Regional Plan and performance goals. In addition, beginning with HHAPP round five, regions must submit a joint application and Regional Plan, and set outcome goals that prevent and reduce homelessness over a three-year period, informed by the findings from a local

landscape analysis and the jurisdiction's base system performance measure from 2020 calendar year data in the state Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS).

*Seeing results.* Despite the sobering data, California's state investments and policy decisions are working. From 2023-2024, the nation as a whole experienced an increase in homelessness eight times larger than the increase in California. During the same period, California had the largest reduction in the number of veterans experiencing homelessness in the nation, with 1,279 fewer veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night in January in 2024 than in 2023 (8% reduction year over year). Furthermore, California had the largest reduction in the number of unaccompanied youths experiencing homelessness in the nation, with 1,121 fewer unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2024 than in January 2023. Individual jurisdictions also reported decreases in homelessness numbers:

- Riverside County: 19% decrease in unsheltered homelessness
- Los Angeles County: 9.5% decrease in unsheltered homelessness, 4% decrease total
- San Bernadino County: 10.2% decrease in total homelessness
- San Diego County: 7% decrease in total homelessness
- City of Los Angeles: 7.9% decrease in unsheltered homelessness, 3.4% decrease total
- Bakersfield's Continuum of Care: 2.3% decrease in total homelessness

According to the UCSF Benioff Homelessness and Housing Initiative (UCSF Benioff), the reason for the reduction in veteran homelessness in California is because California has adequately scaled the evidence-based responses which include Housing First and housing subsidies paired with appropriate services. The same conclusion can be reached for the reduction in homeless youth numbers, given consistent youth set asides in key programs (HHAPP and Homekey) for this population. UCSF Benioff notes that while the overall increase in homelessness numbers is lower than the national trend, the enormous number of people experiencing homelessness in California reflects the ongoing crisis caused by the lack of affordable housing in California.

That said, state funds have allowed California's homeless response providers to serve more people than ever before. In 2024, providers served 356,660

Californians, over 20,000 more Californians than in 2023. In the first half of 2025, providers served 265,716 Californians, including: 176,101 individuals and 88,373 people in families with children, of which 38,496 were unaccompanied youth.

*No ongoing funding.* Homelessness is not static: as people exit homelessness, additional Californians become homeless. Between 2023 and 2024, over 185,000 Californians fell into homelessness for the first time. Similarly, people transition in and out of shelters frequently. For most communities, people exit shelter beds/interim housing most commonly through returns to the streets/unsheltered homelessness. For this reason, homelessness policy must include a spectrum of interventions that include not only housing for those currently experiencing homelessness, but also programs and policies to prevent homelessness from occurring. Advocates, providers, and local governments have long advocated for ongoing funding at a greater scale from the state. California generally provides one-time investments in housing and homelessness programs with a few exceptions.<sup>53</sup> Unlike capital funding, which can be offered one-time to build housing, housing for people who are experiencing homelessness requires ongoing funding to pay for the operating costs of capital projects after they are built and to pay for the costs of the services people need if they live in supportive housing. Operating funding is necessary in these projects because, among other reasons, formerly homeless tenants cannot afford to pay sufficient rent for maintenance and utility costs.

Many tenants who are formerly homeless do not live in “single site projects” built with state, federal and local dollars, but rather live in “scattered site” market rate units of housing owned by private landlords. For these tenants, government subsidies in the form of rental assistance enable them to remain stably housed, either through time-limited subsidies from rapid rehousing (for people without disabilities who are not living on fixed incomes) or through supportive housing (for people with disabilities or other barriers to housing stability).

Operating costs, services, and rental assistance to private-market landlords require ongoing commitments of funds. One-time funding for homelessness programs either incentivizes local grantees to build shelters or outreach services only, or requires local governments receiving state funds to make risky ongoing funding commitments when the state often cuts funding in bad budget years, or cutting subsidies for formerly homeless tenants who have moved into housing. One-time funding also results in precarity for nonprofit service providers who struggle to create budgets from year to year, not knowing whether they will receive funding in the future and be able to fund longer-term programs.

*Doubling down.* This resolution urges the Governor, relevant state agencies, and all local governments to adopt an urgent and coordinated approach to both end and prevent unsheltered homelessness statewide through the full activation of interim and permanent strategies, as well as interventions to prevent individuals and families from falling into unsheltered homelessness, and fund all interventions and reforms that prioritize housing unsheltered Californians. California has demonstrated that its investments and policies are working to not only reverse the trends in increasing homelessness rates, but even reduce homelessness, including unsheltered homelessness. Continued and ongoing investments and greater coordination between regions and between the state and local governments to fill gaps in housing and homelessness service delivery will create greater certainty for locals and service providers to not only connect unsheltered populations to housing quickly, but prevent the inflow into homelessness in the first place.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/16/26)

Bay Area Council  
Leadingage California

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/16/26)

None received

Prepared by: Alison Hughes / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124  
4/20/26 9:49:32

\*\*\*\* **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 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 148  
Author: Padilla (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/19/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** GM1 Gangliosidosis Awareness Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares May 23, 2026, as GM1 Gangliosidosis Awareness Day in California.

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

- 1) GM1 Gangliosidosis is a rare inherited disease that results in neurodegeneration and a progressive loss of abilities until death, leaving children, adolescents, and adults impaired with significant physical and developmental disabilities.
- 2) GM1 Gangliosidosis is severely underdiagnosed and misdiagnosed and occurs in only one in every 100,000 to 200,000 live births. Lack of public awareness and visibility of GM1 Gangliosidosis contributes to underdiagnosis and difficulties in accessing specialized services and proper rehabilitation and support.
- 3) Early diagnosis of GM1 Gangliosidosis is important to ensure timely management of clinical complications, genetic counseling, and, when available, treatment and therapeutic remedies.
- 4) The goal is to raise awareness and increase the accurate and timely diagnosis of this rare inherited lysosomal disorder known as GM1 Gangliosidosis.

This resolution declares May 23, 2026, as GM1 Gangliosidosis Awareness Day in California.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 33 (Padilla, Resolution Chapter 112, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 106 (Padilla, Resolution Chapter 34, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 68 (Padilla, Resolution Chapter 112, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/1/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/1/26)

None received

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

4/8/26 14:53:08

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 151  
Author: Umberg (D)  
Introduced: 3/25/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Anterior Cruciate Ligament Injury Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) Injury Awareness Month in California.

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

- 1) ACL injuries are among the most common and debilitating musculoskeletal injuries affecting physically active individuals and youth athletes, constituting a major and growing public health concern. An estimated 400,000 ACL tears occur annually in the United States.
- 2) The National ACL Injury Coalition, convened through Project Play, has established a nationally recognized, evidence-based framework to reduce ACL injuries among youth athletes across multiple sports by promoting standardized education, neuromuscular injury prevention training, and implementation resources for youth sports organizations, coaches, athletes, and parents.
- 3) It is imperative that there be greater public awareness of ACL injuries as a serious and preventable public health issue with long-term health, economic, and equity implications, and that California promote education, injury surveillance, research, and evidence-based prevention efforts statewide.

This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) Injury Awareness Month in California.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/1/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/1/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/8/26 14:53:10

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 153  
Author: Grove (R), et al.  
Introduced: 4/6/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** National Day of Prayer

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes May 7, 2026, as the National Day of Prayer.

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

- 1) The National Day of Prayer is observed each year on the first Thursday of May as a time when Americans are invited to come together in prayer and seek God's guidance for our communities, our state, and our nation.
- 2) California's diverse faith communities continue to strengthen neighborhoods by supporting families, caring for the vulnerable, and fostering a spirit of service and hope.
- 3) The National Day of Prayer encourages individuals and communities to set aside time to seek God's direction for the future of our state and nation and to pray for the well-being of those who serve in positions of leadership and public trust.
- 4) This day provides all Californians with an opportunity to recognize the nation's enduring ties to faith and to ask for God's protection, wisdom, and peace.

This resolution recognizes May 7, 2026, as the National Day of Prayer.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/15/26 13:55:41

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 154  
Author: Umberg (D), et al.  
Introduced: 4/8/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Green Star Veterans and Families Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution designates May 4, 2026, as Green Star Veterans and Families Day.

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

- 1) Many veterans who have bravely served continue to face significant mental health challenges upon returning home, including invisible wounds that can profoundly impact their daily lives.
- 2) Mental health conditions, including post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and traumatic brain injury, often intensify over time and, without adequate support, can increase the risk of suicide.
- 3) An estimated 22 veterans are tragically lost to suicide every day, 6,407 veterans took their lives in 2022, and over 140,000 veterans have died by suicide since September 11, 2001. Despite these alarming numbers, Green Star Veterans, veterans who have lost their lives to suicide in connection with their military service, are not formally recognized in our state.
- 4) Green Star Families serve an essential role in sharing their loved ones' stories, spreading public awareness of the toll service-related mental health challenges have on a veteran, and advocating for stronger prevention and support initiatives to protect future veterans and their families.
- 5) The Green Star Service Banner serves as a symbol to honor our veterans who have lost their lives to suicide in connection with their military service and should be recognized in our state.

This resolution honors veterans whose lives were lost to suicide to recognize the resilience and dedication of the families they leave behind and to raise awareness of the ongoing mental health and suicide crisis affecting those who have served.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/15/26 13:55:41

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 156  
Author: Dahle (R), et al.  
Introduced: 4/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** National Stroke Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution declares the month of May 2026 as National Stroke Awareness Month.

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

- 1) Stroke is a neurological emergency caused by sudden blockage of an artery in the brain or sudden bleeding in the brain that is both preventable and treatable. One in three Americans cannot name any of the signs or symptoms of a stroke, and more than one-half of Americans do not know if they are at risk for a stroke.
- 2) The B.E.F.A.S.T. warning signs of stroke include the sudden onset of the following symptoms: Balance-loss of balance or coordination; Eyes-vision loss or double vision; Face-face drooping; Arm-arm weakness; Speech-speech difficulty; and Time-time to call 9-1-1; and beyond B.E.F.A.S.T., additional stroke warning signs and symptoms include sudden numbness or weakness of the face, arm, or leg, especially on one side of the body; sudden confusion; sudden trouble speaking or difficulty understanding; sudden trouble walking; sudden dizziness; and sudden severe headache with no known cause.
- 3) The American Heart Association urges people to lower their risk of heart disease and stroke by focusing on “Life’s Simple 7” key health factors and behaviors: managing blood pressure, controlling cholesterol, reducing blood sugar, getting active, eating better, losing weight, and stopping smoking.

This resolution urges all Californians to familiarize themselves with the risk factors associated with stroke, to recognize the warning signs and symptoms of stroke,

and, at the first signs of a stroke, to dial 9-1-1 immediately in order to begin to reduce the devastating effects of stroke on our population

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 40 (Dahle, 2025) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/22/26 14:04:19

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 157  
Author: Cortese (D), et al.  
Introduced: 4/9/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** School Bus Drivers' Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution designates April 28, 2026, as School Bus Drivers' Day in California, in order to draw special public attention to school bus drivers for their continued and excellent services to pupils in California.

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

- 1) Annually, on the fourth Tuesday of April, the People of California officially recognize all school bus drivers for their continued and excellent services to the youth of the state, and these drivers are deserving of special public recognition and the highest commendations.
- 2) School bus drivers exhibit patience and kindness toward pupils, parents, and school staff in the performance of their duties.
- 3) Personal time and energy are expended by school bus drivers in their initial training, maintaining a current license, perfecting their driving skills, and accruing added knowledge of school bus laws through continuing education classes.
- 4) The safety of our children rests in the hands of trained school bus drivers for up to six or seven hours each school day. School bus drivers perform their services for thousands and thousands of accident-free miles, year after year.

This resolution designates April 28, 2026, as School Bus Driver's Day in California, in order to draw special public attention to school bus drivers for their continued and excellent services to pupils in California.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 60 (Cortese, Resolution Chapter 118, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 57 (Alanis, Resolution Chapter 65, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

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

4/22/26 14:04:20

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SCR 161  
Author: Weber Pierson (D), et al.  
Introduced: 4/15/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Maternal Mental Health Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims May 2026 as Maternal Mental Health Awareness Month.

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

- 1) Maternal mental health affects about one in five women during or after pregnancy, but all women are at risk of suffering from maternal mental health disorders. Specifically, in California, one in three mothers suffers from pregnancy-related depression or anxiety.
- 2) Untreated maternal mental health disorders significantly and negatively impact the short- and long-term health and well-being of affected women and their children; untreated maternal mental health disorders cause adverse birth outcomes, impaired maternal-infant bonding, poor infant growth, childhood emotional and behavioral problems, and significant medical and economic costs.
- 3) Lack of understanding and the continual social stigma of mental health disorders prevent women and families from understanding the signs, symptoms, and risks involved with maternal mental health and disproportionately affect women who lack access to social support networks.

This resolution proclaims May 2026 as Maternal Mental Health Awareness Month.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 78 (Patel, Resolution Chapter 102, Statutes of 2025)  
SCR 63 (Hurtado, Resolution Chapter 101, Statutes of 2023)

ACR 70 (Pellerin and Cervantes, Resolution Chapter 94, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

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

4/22/26 14:04:21

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

---

Bill No: SJR 7  
Author: Cervantes (D), et al.  
Amended: 2/26/26 in Assembly  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 8-3, 6/30/25  
AYES: Ashby, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas,  
Umberg, Weber Pierson  
NOES: Choi, Niello, Strickland

SENATE FLOOR: 26-9, 7/17/25  
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero,  
Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón,  
McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas,  
Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener  
NOES: Choi, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland,  
Valladares  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Becker, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-13, 4/20/26 - See last page for vote

---

**SUBJECT:** Tariffs

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution urges President Donald J. Trump to rescind the increase in tariffs that he has imposed since taking office in January 2025 and refund the American people for the costs passed on to them by his tariffs and urges the United States Congress to enact a joint resolution to rescind President Trump's tariffs oppose all future unilateral and arbitrary tariff increases imposed by President Trump.

*Assembly Amendments* of 2/26/26 urge President Trump to refund the American people for tariff costs passed on to them. Add declarations related to the powers of

Congress, the consumer costs related to tariffs, and the Supreme Court decision related to tariffs. Make technical changes and add coauthors.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law authorizes the president, via the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), to regulate international commerce after declaring a national emergency in response to any unusual and extraordinary threat to the United States which has a foreign source. It further authorizes the president to block transactions, freeze assets, and restrict imports and exports of certain goods or technologies to deal with the threat and requires the president to report to Congress every six months on the circumstances, threats and actions taken. In the event of an actual attack on the United States, the president can also confiscate property connected with a country, group, or person that aided in the attack. The act falls under the provisions of the National Emergencies Act and must be renewed annually to remain in effect. (Public Law 95-223; 50 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 1701-1705)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) for the purpose of serving as the lead state entity for economic strategy and marketing of California on issues relating to business development, private sector investment and economic growth. (Government Code (GC) §§ 12096 – 12098.7)
- 2) Specifies that GO-Biz is the primary state agency authorized to attract foreign investments, cooperate in international public infrastructure projects, and support California businesses in accessing markets, and requires the Director of GO-Biz to develop an international trade and investment program (ITI Program) attracting employment-producing direct foreign investment to the state and providing support for California businesses in accessing international markets and increasing exports. (GC § 13996.41)

This resolution:

- 1) Urges President Donald J. Trump to rescind the increase in tariffs that he has imposed since taking office in January 2025 and refund the American people for the costs passed on to them by his tariffs and urges the United States Congress to enact a joint resolution to rescind President Trump's tariffs and to

oppose all future unilateral and arbitrary tariff increases imposed by President Trump.

- 2) Makes declarations related to the constitutional authority granted to Congress and its authority to “regulate commerce with foreign nations” and state that the constitutional power to tax and regulate foreign commerce is among the most consequential powers of Congress.
- 3) Makes various declarations about consensus relating to free trade and statements from Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan about free trade.
- 4) Highlights a 2022 address by Donald J. Trump to the Heritage Foundation and Heritage Foundation produced 2025 Presidential Transition Project, commonly known as Project 2025, which argues for the imposition of severe tariffs on foreign trade.
- 5) States that President Trump declared a national emergency on April 2, 2025, pursuant to IEEPA which allowed him to impose a 10% base tariff on all foreign goods imported from foreign countries into the United States and imposed even higher tariffs on 57 countries. States that after the tariff announcement, stock markets around the world engaged in panic selling, which caused the largest decline in global stock markets since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 6) States that low-income and middle-class American households have been hit hardest by the price increases caused by President Trump’s tariffs, with the price of essential goods like bananas, coffee, and toilet paper rising.
- 7) States that while California faces an ongoing housing crisis, the increase in prices caused by President Trump’s tariffs will raise the price of building materials, which will in turn make the cost of a new home rise by about \$9,200 according to the National Association of Home Builders based on data from March 2025.
- 8) States that California farmers exported more than \$23 billion worth of food in 2022, with almonds topping the list, followed by dairy products, pistachios, and wine. According to a 2024 study by the University of California Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, if the United States imposed a 10% tariff on all goods from all countries and those countries responded similarly,

estimated annual export losses would be between \$3.1 billion and \$4.8 billion for California agribusiness.

- 9) States that due to the imposition of tariffs, shipping volume in May 2025 at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach fell by up to 40 percent, imperiling the supply chain of goods from Asia into the United States, a development which President Trump called “a good thing.”
- 10) States that American consumers paid more than \$231 billion in tariff costs between February 2025 and January 2026, an average of approximately \$1,751 per household nationwide, with California households projected to lose between \$1,900 and \$2,000 due to the disproportionate impact of tariffs on the state.
- 11) States that President Trump’s tariffs have caused global chaos and threaten the strength of the United States’ longstanding relationships with foreign nations and longtime American allies like the United Kingdom, the European Union, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.
- 12) States that on February 20, 2026, in a 6 to 3 decision written by Chief Justice John Roberts, the United States Supreme Court ruled that President Trump exceeded his constitutional authority by wrongfully claiming emergency powers from the IEEPA to impose sweeping tariffs on nearly every trading partner of the United States, and illegally imposing the largest tax increase on working families and small businesses in our lifetime; and despite this rebuke by the Supreme Court, President Trump has invoked alternative statutory authority to continue imposing sweeping tariffs without congressional authorization, thereby prolonging the economic uncertainty plaguing the American and global economies, and further straining the limits of the separation of powers.
- 13) States President Trump’s agenda to impose tariffs on imports will harm working families by increasing the costs of everyday goods, increase inflation and derail the nation’s economic recovery from the recession caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, leave small businesses reeling from unpredictable periods of tariffs being imposed then paused without warning, and dangerously undermine the standing of the United States on the global stage.

## Background

Currently, GO-Biz administers an International Affairs and Business Development Unit, which serves as California's primary point of contact for expanding international trade and investment relations. This unit focuses on foreign direct investment (services for foreign investors, foreign investment technical assistance, and the EB-5 Investor Visa Program), international trade promotion (STEP program, trade missions, export assistance, and the California-China Trade Office), and international agreements.

GO-Biz currently has authority for undertaking international trade and foreign investment activities. The *International Affairs and Trade Program* report prepared by GO-Biz in 2023 notes that the International Affairs and Trade team (IAT) advises the Governor on international affairs and trade issues, implements strategies to develop and grow partnerships and engagement with foreign partners, and provides recommendations to promote and expand California's trade and foreign direct investment. According to the report, IAT works with a robust network of international partners to promote California exports, support small businesses in accessing global markets, and attract inward investment that brings high-quality jobs to Californians. IAT executed several major international events, including a Clean Energy Trade Mission to Japan with over 100 delegates from California's public and private sectors, a climate-focused gubernatorial visit to China, and a California pavilion at the annual Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit. IAT also successfully implemented trade missions to key markets such as Mexico, China, Japan, and Germany in a variety of strategic sectors, among other efforts and activities.

According to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, industrial goods encompass all non-agricultural goods and include products such as machinery, autos and transportation equipment, information technology products, minerals and metals, petroleum, chemicals, textiles and clothing, leather and footwear, consumer goods, wood products, and fish and fish products. Industrial tariffs are customs duties on non-agricultural merchandise imports, levied either as a percentage of the value or on a specific basis (e.g., \$1 per 100 pounds).

According to February 2025 information from the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), "In 2024, California's total merchandise trade reached \$675 billion—close to 16% of state GDP. California imports 2.7 times more goods than it exports, reflecting the purchasing power of the state's market. However, imports also include intermediate goods used in the manufacturing of California products

that could eventually be exported. In this way, tariffs on imported goods may have direct effects on consumers, producers, and exporters in the state. Manufactured goods dominate California exports at 87% (\$159 billion)—computer equipment, semiconductors, instruments, and aerospace products and parts are at the top of manufacturing exports. The state also leads the nation in agricultural exports (\$15 billion), with products like nuts, processed and fresh fruits, and processed vegetables generating an important revenue stream for California farmers.

PPIC noted that “tariffs imposed in 2018 and 2019 led to higher prices across the country for consumer goods—like washing machines and solar panels, and for intermediate goods—like aluminum and steel. Higher costs were largely paid by American consumers and firms. At the time, these higher prices didn’t necessarily impact overall prices—that is, inflation—in a major way. In manufacturing sectors, such as aluminum production and household appliances, lower employment and output in the short-term were due to rising costs of imported materials necessary for production and retaliatory tariffs.”

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

**ASSEMBLY FLOOR:** 60-13, 4/20/26

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

**NOES:** Chen, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Castillo, Davies, Flora, Patterson, Celeste  
Rodriguez, Ward

Prepared by: Elissa Silva/Anna Billy/Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. /916-651-4104  
4/21/26 16:29:43

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SJR 13  
Author: Padilla (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/24/26  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/22/26  
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Allen, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

---

**SUBJECT:** Transboundary flow pollution: United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution urges the United States to secure specified commitments regarding transboundary pollution at the 2026 United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) joint review.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing federal law:

- 1) Authorizes the President of the United States to enter into a trade agreement, as specified, with foreign countries providing for the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion, as specified, and the prohibition or limitation on the imposition of such barrier or other distortion. (19 United States Code (USC) § 4202(b))
- 2) Approves and implements the USMCA between the United States, the United Mexican States, and Canada. (19 USC § 4501 et seq.)
- 3) Requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) to carry out the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of high-priority treatment works in the portion of the Tijuana River watershed that is in the United States to treat wastewater, nonpoint sources of pollution, and related

matters resulting from international transboundary water flows originating in Mexico. (19 USC § 4731)

This Resolution:

1) Makes the following findings:

- a) The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) marked a major shift in trade and economic engagement among the United States, Mexico, and Canada, that led to rapid expansion of manufacturing facilities in northern Mexico.
- b) The rapid concentration of industrial and residential activities in northern Mexico placed increasing demands on wastewater, stormwater, and environmental infrastructure, and contributed to transboundary pollution flows into the Tijuana River Valley and New River.
- c) The transboundary pollution flows have forced beach closures, harmed local tourism and small businesses, jeopardized the health of residents, and disrupted United States Navy training operations in the County of San Diego.
- d) The contamination from transboundary pollution raises serious environmental justice concerns, as pollution impacts border communities that are disproportionately composed of working-class communities and communities of color.
- e) The USMCA was negotiated to update and modernize the trade framework under NAFTA, including provisions related to environmental protection and cross-border cooperation.
- f) Despite commitments under the USMCA, transboundary pollution has continued, with more than 100 billion gallons entering the United States in the last five years.
- g) The USMCA includes a six-year joint review mechanism, with the first review scheduled in 2026, presenting an opportunity to ensure that existing commitments resolving transboundary pollution are fully realized.
- h) The transboundary sewage crisis undermines the environmental integrity and enforceability of the USMCA and threatens the health, economic stability, and environmental well-being of Californians.
- i) The Trump administration signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Mexico in 2025, concluded International Boundary and Water Commission Minute 333, and pledged a “100% solution” to stop transboundary pollution.
- j) The USMCA presents an opportunity for the Trump administration to secure that solution through enforceable commitments.

- 2) Resolves, on behalf of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, that:
  - a) The Legislature urges the United States to secure and publicly adopt measurable and sustained commitments to eliminate transboundary sewage discharges into the Tijuana River watershed and New River at the 2026 USMCA joint review.
  - b) The measurable and sustained commitments secured and adopted at the 2026 USMCA joint review include at minimum:
    - i) Specific numeric discharge-reduction benchmarks;
    - ii) Investment into—and enforceable timelines for—completion of wastewater infrastructure projects; and
    - iii) Annual public reporting on compliance.
  - c) The United States commit to automatic nonrenewal of the USMCA if there is a failure of establishing commitments, benchmarks, and timelines.

## Background

- 1) *United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA)*. The USMCA is a free trade agreement that outlines rules for duty-free trade and establishes commitments on non-tariff issues, including labor, environment, investment, digital trade, and services. USMCA created a more balanced, reciprocal trade, benefitting American workers, farmers and agriculture, and the economy through new protections.<sup>1</sup> The Agreement became effective in July 2020 and replaced the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which was established in 1994. NAFTA was a comprehensive free trade agreement that lowered trade barriers and accelerated trade with Mexico and Canada.<sup>2</sup>
- 2) *Addressing transboundary pollution*. For decades, millions of gallons of untreated sewage and stormwater runoff have frequently polluted the Tijuana River Valley and the New River near the United States-Mexico border. Rapid population growth, industrial development, and urbanization driven by foreign investment in Mexico, which was exacerbated by the establishment of NAFTA, have overwhelmed aging and underfunded sewage infrastructure leading to structural failures. These failures and the limited capacity of the systems have resulted in cross-border, or transboundary flows consisting of raw sewage, industrial chemicals, stormwater, pesticides, and trash that spill into

---

<sup>1</sup> Office of the United States Trade Representative. (n.d.). [United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement](#).

<sup>2</sup> Congressional Research Service. (2017). [The North American Free Trade Agreement \(NAFTA\)](#).

California's coastal waters, decimate the environment, disrupt local and regional economies, and impact the public health of border communities. Over the years, there have been binational efforts to implement infrastructure improvements.

Chapter 24 of USMCA aimed to promote high levels of environmental protection and effective enforcement of environmental laws in addressing trade-related environmental issues.<sup>3</sup> In alignment with these objectives, the provisions of Section 821 of USMCA require the Administrator of the U.S. EPA to carry out the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of high priority treatment works to treat transboundary pollution in the Tijuana River watershed within the United States.<sup>4</sup>

Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars through the provisions of USMCA Section 821 to fund and administer the Border Water Infrastructure Program (BWIP), which facilitates infrastructure implementation along the border to address drinking water and sanitation issues.<sup>4,5,6,7,8</sup>

In 2021, the U.S. EPA developed a Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution, focused primarily on the Tijuana River Valley, that would guide efforts for years to come. This included a suite of binational infrastructure improvement projects that could significantly improve the conditions in the Tijuana River Valley.<sup>9</sup> In 2022, the U.S. EPA and its Mexican counterpart signed the Statement of Intent, which created a framework for implementing a Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution that specified near-term (2022-2027) and long-term projects, and identified resources.<sup>10</sup> The International Boundary and Water Commission, which has worked to address water quality and sanitation issues across the border since 1944, has issued a series of "Minutes" since its inception, outlining actions to meet their obligations. Most recently issued in December 2025, Minute 333 demonstrates a commitment to continue implementing the projects within the Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution and additional actions to mitigate the impacts of transboundary pollution. The

---

<sup>3</sup> United States Trade Representative. (2020). [USMCA Chapter 24: Environment](#).

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2025). [Tijuana River Watershed Provisions in United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement \(USMCA\)](#).

<sup>5</sup> Jennewein, C. (2019). [New USMCA Trade Deal Includes \\$300 Million to Stop Tijuana River Pollution](#).

<sup>6</sup> Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, H.R.4665, 118<sup>th</sup> Congress 2023-2024 Session, (2023).

<sup>7</sup> [Water Resources Development Act, H.R.8812](#), 118<sup>th</sup> Congress 2023-2024 Session.

<sup>8</sup> [American Relief Act, H.R.10545](#), 118<sup>th</sup> Congress 2023-2024 Session.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2021) [EPA Announces Holistic Approach to Address Water Pollution from the Tijuana River Watershed](#).

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Comisión Nacional del Agua. (2022). [Statement of Intent](#).

Trump administration has also reaffirmed its commitments under previous Minutes and additional obligations through a July 2025 MOU with Mexico.

Throughout the implementation of the Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution, projects have experienced funding shortfalls and delays. However, both the United States and Mexico have continued to make progress and commit funding to complete the projects that would help resolve the severity of the transboundary pollution. Nevertheless, it is a long road ahead.

- 3) *USMCA joint review.* As outlined in Article 34.7 of the USMCA, the Agreement is set to terminate in 2036, unless each participating party confirms that it wishes to continue the Agreement for a new 16-year term, in accordance with specified procedures.<sup>11</sup> As part of the procedure, the Free Trade Commission (FTC), composed of government representatives of each party, is required to meet on the sixth anniversary of the establishment of the USMCA to conduct a “joint review” of the operation of the USMCA and decide on any recommendations for action.

The first joint review is scheduled to take place on July 1, 2026. Parties may provide recommendations for the FTC to take action at least one month before the joint review takes place. Additionally, each party is to confirm if it wishes to extend the USMCA for another 16-year period, and if extended, another joint review will take place six years after the extension is granted. If any party does not confirm its wish to extend the USMCA, then the FTC is required to conduct a joint review every year for the remainder of the 16-year term of the Agreement.<sup>11,12</sup>

The establishment of the joint review provision was controversial. Members of Congress were concerned that conducting joint reviews would create uncertainty that could discourage private investment and harm U.S. businesses. Other Members argued that the joint review provision would allow Congress to exert greater oversight with periodic review.<sup>12</sup>

This resolution urges the United States to secure and adopt measurable and enforceable commitments within USMCA to eliminate the flow of transboundary sewage into the Tijuana and New River watersheds at the joint review. The proposed revisions to the USMCA outlined in this resolution are likely a few of many desired revisions to the USMCA, and the joint review

---

<sup>11</sup> United States Trade Representative. (2020). [USMCA Chapter 34: Final Provisions](#).

<sup>12</sup> Congressional Research Service. (2026). [USMCA Joint Review: Process and Role of Congress](#).

does provide an opportunity for the United States to revise the USMCA in negotiation with the other parties and for Congress to provide input.

## Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, “Trade agreements must not ignore environmental harm and the real public threat increased economic activity has on our border communities. Ensuring renewal of the USMCA must depend on measurable progress. Our federal government must secure real and meaningful protection for our community. By halting all discussion of extensions until we have clear commitments from Mexico to address this crisis, we can finally take real steps towards ending this generations long injustice. Economic prosperity cannot come at the expense of California’s environment and communities’ health.”
- 2) *Time is of the essence.* As described in the background section above, the first 6-year joint review is scheduled for July 1, 2026. The United States will need to provide recommendations to the FTC at least one month prior to this date for the recommendations to be considered. Considering the steps of the legislative process this resolution must still go through, it would likely not be transmitted in time to be formally considered by any of its federal recipients ahead of the joint review.

Even if this resolution is not formally adopted in time, federal advocacy informed by its contents can still happen prior to these deadlines. Regardless, the resolution may still have a tangible impact, as it is possible that a party to the USMCA may not decide to extend the USMCA. In that case, the next joint review would likely be scheduled for July 1, 2027, which would present another opportunity to more formally include the proposed commitments in the USMCA. *Depending on the timing of this resolution and the actions taken at the 2026 joint review, the author may wish to consider amending the resolution accordingly.*

- 3) *Adopting measurable commitments.* This resolution urges the United States to ensure measurable commitments to eliminate transboundary sewage are part of the revisions made to the USMCA during the joint review. Some of the measurable commitments include, at minimum, specific numeric discharge-reduction benchmarks and enforceable timelines for completion of wastewater infrastructure projects. If these commitments are not adopted, the United States is urged to commit to automatic nonrenewal of the USMCA.

The request for these revisions merits careful consideration. If the commitments are considered unrealistic by the federal government, the Legislature risks denial of the request proposed by this resolution. For instance, adopting a specific numeric discharge-reduction benchmark could be considered challenging. The extent of discharge is dependent on the condition of the wastewater infrastructure, which is contingent on the progress made with the Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution as well as the ability to sufficiently perform operation and maintenance, all of which requires substantial amounts of funding. Targeted reductions could be estimated in broad ranges to account for this, but the benchmarks would also need to take into account local climate and weather patterns, which introduces a higher level of uncertainty. Heavy rain events tend to lead to 10's of billions of gallons of transboundary pollution in a short period of time. Any numeric benchmark adopted may best be measured for dry-weather flows.

Timelines for infrastructure improvements may be a more reasonable commitment, but these timelines are already indicated in the Minutes issued by the IBWC and other previous agreements. And as with any capital improvement project, progress may be impeded by delays or unexpected funding constraints. This may present issues if these timelines are to be enforceable. What would the consequences be if a deadline isn't met and to whom would they apply? If penalties were established, would they be established against a certain party in the Agreement or with other entities? Would there be implications for the other provisions of USMCA? What would be the broader implications of enforcement? The need for accountability is understandable, but the cost at which that accountability comes needs to be understood.

Future renewal of the USMCA could be called into question if the federal government decided to pursue these measurable commitments as proposed and they could not be achieved for any reason. This has broader implications beyond these two crises, which signals how high this issue should be prioritized, yet it may not be. But it might also be of consideration to ensure such proposed commitments could ultimately be agreed on first domestically, then internationally.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

AJR 16 (Alvarez, 2025) urges Congress and the United States President to fully fund the Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution and take additional specified

actions to address ongoing transboundary pollution. This bill is awaiting hearing in this committee.

SJR 18 (Padilla, Chapter 175, Statutes of 2024) made a number of declarations regarding health impacts associated with pollution in the Tijuana River, and requests that the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) investigate health concerns raised by this pollution.

AJR 12 (Alvarez, Chapter 201, Statutes of 2024) urged Congress and the United States President to fully fund the Comprehensive Infrastructure Solution and address ongoing transboundary pollution impacting the New River and urged the United States President to declare a national emergency due to the impacts of transboundary pollution.

SB 867 (Allen, Chapter 83, Statutes of 2024) enacted the Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024 authorizing the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$10 billion to finance projects including, but not limited to drought, flood, and water resilience, coastal resilience, park creation, outdoor access, and clean air programs.

AB 1597 (Alvarez, 2023) would have authorized funds made available to the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) for North American Development Bank for loans, grants, and expenditures to address water quality problems arising in the California-Mexico cross-border watersheds. This bill was placed on the suspense file in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

SJR 22 (Hueso, Chapter 241, Statutes of 2018). Urges the federal government and the U.S. Section of the IBWC to take immediate action to adequately address cross-border pollution in the Tijuana River Valley.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/22/26)

Alianza Coachella Valley  
Boys & Girls Club of South County  
California Outdoor Recreation Partnership  
Coastal Defenders  
Environmental Center of San Diego  
Imperial Valley Equity & Justice Coalition  
LA Cooperativa Campesina De California  
Latino Outdoors  
Los Amigos De LA Comunidad, INC.

Outdoor Outreach  
Project Kolika  
San Diego State University  
Sandiego350  
Sierra Club  
Sierra Service Project  
Stop the Sewage  
Surfrider Foundation San Diego Chapter  
Tijuana River Coaliton  
Un Mar De Colores  
Wildcoast  
YMCA of San Diego County

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108  
4/22/26 16:26:28

\*\*\*\* **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 94  
Author: Becker (D)  
Introduced: 4/6/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Myositis Awareness Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution observes the month of May 2026 as Myositis Awareness Month in California, and encourages all citizens of California to come together, learn more about all the forms of myositis and its symptoms, and support the families in our community who will benefit from greater awareness of these rare diseases.

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

- 1) Idiopathic inflammatory myopathies, collectively referred to as myositis, are rare, chronic, autoimmune muscle wasting diseases. Myositis often features debilitating muscle inflammation and other symptoms, including pain, fatigue, and trouble swallowing. Myositis can result in myositis-associated interstitial lung disease.
- 2) More research is needed to identify the causes of, and modes of treatments for, the myositis group of diseases, including anti-MDA5 autoantibody positive myositis, anti-synthetase syndrome, dermatomyositis, juvenile dermatomyositis, immune-mediated necrotizing myopathy, inclusion body myositis, and polymyositis.
- 3) All who suffer with myositis experience reduced quality of life, especially as no cure has been found and life expectancy is shortened, especially for those with inclusion body myositis.
- 4) The Myositis Association is the leading international patient advocacy organization serving the myositis community, focusing on patient services,

education, research, and public awareness, so as to achieve a world without myositis.

This resolution observes the month of May 2026 as Myositis Awareness Month in California, and encourages all citizens of California to come together, learn more about all the forms of myositis and its symptoms, and support the families in our community who will benefit from greater awareness of these rare diseases.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 43 (Becker, 2025) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/15/26 13:55:45

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

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 95  
Author: Niello (R), et al.  
Amended: 4/21/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month.

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month, and calls upon all Americans to join in supporting ALS research, advocating for increased funding, and standing in solidarity with those affected by this relentless disease.

*Senate floor amendments* of 4/21/26 add coauthors and make a non-substantive technical change.

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

- 1) Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), also commonly referred to as Lou Gehrig's disease, is a progressive fatal neurodegenerative disease in which a person's brain loses connection with their muscles, slowly reducing a person's ability to walk, talk, eat, and eventually breathe.
- 2) Thousands of new ALS cases are reported every year, and estimates show that every 90 minutes someone is diagnosed with ALS and someone passes away from ALS.
- 3) The exact causes of ALS are unknown and there is no known cure for ALS. On average, patients diagnosed with ALS survive only two to five years from the time of diagnosis.
- 4) Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month provides an opportunity to increase public awareness of the dire circumstances of people living with ALS, acknowledge the terrible impact this disease has on those individuals and their families, and support research to eradicate this disease.

This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month, and calls upon all Americans to join in supporting ALS research, advocating for increased funding, and standing in solidarity with those affected by this relentless disease.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 42 (Choi, 2025) – Adopted in Senate.  
ACR 87 (Nguyen, Resolution Chapter 108, Statutes of 2025)  
ACR 190 (Dixon, Resolution Chapter 102, Statutes of 2024)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/22/26 14:56:48

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 96  
Author: Cortese (D), et al.  
Introduced: 4/6/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** National County Government Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims April 2026 National County Government Month and encourages all California residents to celebrate the essential work of county government.

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

- 1) California's 58 counties serve all of the state's 39,500,000 residents by providing essential services that foster healthy, safe, and thriving communities.
- 2) Counties take pride in their role as California's operational backbone, implementing state and federal programs while responding to local needs with efficiency, innovation, and fiscal responsibility.
- 3) Under the leadership of California State Association of Counties (CSAC) President and Santa Clara County Supervisor Susan Ellenberg, and the CSAC Board of Directors, counties continue to work with other local governments to advocate for policies and resources that support effective service delivery and local decisionmaking.
- 4) The year 2026 marks the 176th anniversary of the incorporation of California's original 27 counties and California's statehood, in tandem with our nation's 250th anniversary, underscoring the enduring role of counties in shaping and serving communities across the state.

This resolution proclaims April 2026 National County Government Month and encourages all California residents to celebrate the essential work of county government.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SR 93 (Durazo, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

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

4/15/26 13:55:47

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 97  
Author: Wahab (D)  
Introduced: 4/6/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Asian and Pacific Islander American Heritage Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution commends Asian and Pacific Islander Americans for their notable accomplishments and contributions to California, and recognizes May 2026 as Asian and Pacific Islander American Heritage Month.

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

- 1) Celebrating Asian and Pacific Islander Heritage Month provides Californians with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans.
- 2) California is home to over 7 million Asian and Pacific Islander Americans, more than any other state, and Asian and Pacific Islander Americans are one of the fastest growing ethnic populations in the state and nation.
- 3) Asian and Pacific Islander Americans have made indelible contributions throughout the history of California and the United States that include, but are not limited to, building the Transcontinental Railroad, serving honorably in the United States Armed Forces, fighting for the United States in foreign wars, coorganizing the Delano Grape Strike, and advocating for civil rights.
- 4) Asian and Pacific Islander Americans continue to cultivate, advance, and lead in the fields of art, fashion, business, technology, education, science, government, law, humanities, medicine, sports, and entertainment.

This resolution commends Asian and Pacific Islander Americans for their notable accomplishments and contributions to California, and recognizes May 2026 as Asian and Pacific Islander American Heritage Month.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

SCR 58 (Wahab, Resolution Chapter 117, Statutes of 2025)  
HR 35 (Fong, 2025) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/15/26 13:55:48

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: SR 101  
Author: Ashby (D)  
Introduced: 4/20/26  
Vote: Majority

---

**SUBJECT:** Election of Members of the Senate Committee on Rules

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution elects Senator Ochoa Bogh as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules.

**ANALYSIS:** This resolution elects Senator Ochoa Bogh as a member of the Senate Committee on Rules to replace Senator Jones, effective May 1, 2026.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/22/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/22/26 14:04:23

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 141  
Author: Ta (R), et al.  
Amended: 4/16/26 in Senate  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Vesak Day

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution recognizes the significance of Vesak Day to people of Buddhist faith and extends sincere best wishes to the state's Buddhist community in celebrating Vesak Day.

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

- 1) Vesak Day, one of the most important and sacred holidays to Buddhists worldwide, commemorates the life, enlightenment, and death of Buddha.
- 2) In countries using the Gregorian calendar, Vesak Day is recognized annually on April 8. This year Vesak Day will be observed on May 1, according to the lunar calendar.
- 3) Many observe the holiday by reaffirming their commitment to the moral precepts of Buddhism, performing good deeds, devoting time to chanting and meditation, and other customs, including lighting lanterns, decorating with flowers, and enjoying traditional Asian dishes.
- 4) The teachings of Buddha have inspired millions of people around the globe to strive for inner peace and to demonstrate greater compassion, tolerance, and understanding in their lives, and it is fitting to acknowledge the great importance of Vesak Day to the Buddhists who reside in California and beyond.

This resolution recognizes the significance of Vesak Day to people of Buddhist faith and extends sincere best wishes to the state's Buddhist community in celebrating Vesak Day.

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/20/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/22/26 14:04:18

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 152  
Author: Davies (R), et al.  
Introduced: 3/2/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** American Red Cross Month

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims March 2026 as American Red Cross Month, dedicates it to all those who continue to advance the noble legacy of the organization's founder, and encourages all Californians to reach out, support the organization's humanitarian mission, and join in their commitment to care for people in need.

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

- 1) March is American Red Cross Month, a special time to honor the kindness of our neighbors who aid families in need every day in California, across the United States, and around the world. Their dedication touches millions of lives each year as they carry out the organization's 145-year-old mission of preventing and alleviating suffering.
- 2) Here in California, local families have relied on American Red Cross volunteers for comfort and hope while coping with over 3,000 local disasters. Last year, over 25,000 California volunteers assisted with small and large disasters, such as the devastating wildfires. Volunteers also helped over 5,000 people affected by home fires in the state by addressing their urgent needs, including food, lodging, and recovery support.
- 3) California volunteers have supported local families in other ways too. Last year, almost 400,000 people enrolled in training classes that taught lifesaving skills, such as first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, water safety, and caregiving. The American Red Cross provided services to military members, veterans, retirees, and their families. Over 45,000 cases were open to assist in various ways.

- 4) Every two seconds, someone in the United States needs blood. Nationwide, the American Red Cross provides 40% of the country's blood supply. In California, the American Red Cross collects over 330,000 units of red blood cells each year. In addition, over 130,000 units of platelets are collected each year to help treat trauma and cancer patients. Blood products are also essential for surgeries and chronic illnesses.
- 5) Nearly 200 years since the birth of American Red Cross founder Clara Barton, this lifesaving work is vital to strengthening our community's resilience.

This resolution proclaims the month of March 2026 as American Red Cross Month and dedicates it to all those who continue to advance Clara Barton's noble legacy.

### **Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 139 (Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 30, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 20 (Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 33, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/15/26 13:55:39

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 160  
Author: Sharp-Collins (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/18/26  
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.
- 2) The symptoms of Parkinson's disease vary from person to person and can include tremors, slowness of movement and rigidity, gait and balance difficulties, speech and swallowing disturbances, cognitive impairment and dementia, mood disorders, and a variety of other nonmotor symptoms.
- 3) Parkinson's disease is the fastest growing neurological disease in the United States. It is estimated that 90,000 individuals are diagnosed annually with Parkinson's disease in North America, 50% higher than research previously suggested.
- 4) 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.
- 5) Increased research, education, and community support services are needed to find more effective treatments and to provide access to quality care to those living with the disease today.

- 6) 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**

ACR 56 (Michelle Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 67, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 43 (Archuleta, Resolution Chapter 79, Statutes of 2025)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/21/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171  
4/22/26 14:04:19

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

---

THIRD READING

---

Bill No: ACR 161  
Author: Addis (D), et al.  
Introduced: 3/18/26  
Vote: 21

---

**SUBJECT:** Special Districts Week

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This resolution proclaims the week of April 5, 2026, to April 11, 2026, to be Special Districts Week.

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

- 1) Special districts are local governmental entities created by a community's residents, funded by those residents, and overseen by those residents, to provide specialized services and infrastructure.
- 2) Today, just over 2,000 independent special districts provide millions of Californians with essential services, including services related to water, sanitation, and water recycling, fire protection, electricity, parks and recreation, health care, open space, ports and harbors, flood protection, mosquito abatement, cemeteries, resource conservation, airports, transit, road maintenance, veterans' facilities, and more.
- 3) Special districts vary in size and scope and serve diverse communities throughout California, from small rural neighborhoods, such as the Pine Cove Water District in the San Jacinto Mountains in the County of Riverside, to large urban regions, such as the East Bay Municipal Utility District spanning much of the Counties of Alameda and Contra Costa.
- 4) Local residents own special districts and govern them through locally elected or appointed boards. A series of sunshine laws ensure special districts remain transparent and accountable to the communities they serve, as these laws require open and public meetings, public access to records, regular audits, online posting of finances and compensation, and more.

This resolution proclaims the week of April 5, 2026, to April 11, 2026, to be Special Districts Week.

**Related/Prior Legislation**

ACR 36 (Carillo, Resolution Chapter 89, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 163 (Hart, Resolution Chapter 97, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 52 (Alvarado-Gil, Resolution Chapter 88, Statutes of 2023)

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

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 4/13/26)

California Municipal Utilities Association

California Special Districts Association

Vista Irrigation District

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 4/13/26)

None received

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

4/15/26 13:55:40

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