

2025-26 SESSION

**SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET**

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2026



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-4171

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Thursday, June 11, 2026.

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
	SCR 112	Grove	Unfinished Business
	SCR 113	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 142	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 145	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 166	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 181	Grayson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SCR 182	Seyarto	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SCR 183	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 7	Cervantes	Unfinished Business
+	SJR 14	Cabaldon	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SJR 16	Caballero	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SJR 17	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SJR 18	McNerney	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 67	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 108	Hurtado	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 109	Menjivar	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 112	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 113	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 114	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 116	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 117	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 350	Bonta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 686	Berman	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 736	Wicks	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1377	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1549	Krell	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 1583	Rogers	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 1632	Johnson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1944	Lee	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1948	Ramos	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 1974	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2004	Alanis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2067	Patel	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2107	Pellerin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2286	Bryan	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 2294	Ta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2297	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2455	Haney	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 2539	Ramos	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 2556	Boerner	Consent Calendar First Legislative Day
+	AB 2561	Valencia	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2636	Pacheco	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2726	Fong	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
+	ACR 1	Quirk-Silva	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
+	ACR 94	Patel	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
+	ACR 107	Bauer-Kahan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
	ACR 119	Ta	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 123	Chen	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 124	Ta	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 143	Pacheco	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 149	Hart	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 158	Solache	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 159	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 163	Ramos	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 167	Hadwick	Special Consent Calendar No.27
+	ACR 173	Carrillo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 174	Muratsuchi	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 176	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 178	Flora	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 179	Flora	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 180	Connolly	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 181	Patel	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 182	Ransom	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 183	Sharp-Collins	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 184	Rivas	Special Consent Calendar No.27
+	ACR 185	Macedo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 186	Chen	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 188	Soria	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 189	Ahrens	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 190	Ortega	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 195	Gabriel	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 196	Solache	Special Consent Calendar No.27
+	ACR 197	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 198	Patel	Special Consent Calendar No.27
	ACR 200	Alanis	Special Consent Calendar No.27
+	ACR 202	Garcia	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 203	Hoover	Special Consent Calendar No.27
+	ACR 205	Lackey	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	ACR 209	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AJR 29	Berman	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SCR 112
Author: Grove (R), et al.
Amended: 4/14/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 2/26/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: National Human Trafficking Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes the month of January 2026 as National Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

Assembly Amendments of 4/14/26 make technical changes and include additional statistical findings.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Classified as a felony, human trafficking is a form of modern slavery. It is a crime that involves the use of force, fraud, or coercion to recruit, harbor, transport, provide, or obtain a person for the purpose of labor or sexual exploitation. As one of the most underreported crimes, it is extremely difficult to conduct accurate surveys on human trafficking.
- 2) In 2021, the International Labour Organization (ILO) estimated that there were 49.6 million victims of human trafficking globally, of which 27.6 million were in forced labor and 22 million in forced marriage.
- 3) Recent research supported by the National Institute of Justice reveals that labor and sex trafficking data appearing in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's national Uniform Crime Reporting Program may significantly understate the extent of human trafficking crimes in the United States.

- 4) According to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data, the number of T-1 visa applicants filed by trafficking victims increased from 1,701 in fiscal year 2021 to 15,332 in fiscal year 2024, which is an increase of approximately 800 percent. This statistic reinforces the claim that immigrants are at high risk for labor exploitation and trafficking by bad actors who weaponize their immigration status against them.
- 5) The Legislature recognizes the continuously growing crime of human trafficking within California due to its ever-increasing population and primary airports and harbors.
- 6) The State of California is committed to combating all forms of human trafficking, recovering victims, prosecuting offenders, advocating on behalf of victims, raising community awareness, and strengthening collaborative partnerships.

This resolution recognizes the month of January 2026 as National Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 97 – (Grove, Resolution Chapter 4, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 125 (Pellerin, Resolution Chapter 19, Statutes of 2024)

SR 52 – (Grove, 2024) From committee without further action.

HR 63 – (Villapudua, 2024) Died at desk.

SR 6 – (Grove, 2023) Adopted in Senate.

HR 7 – (Dahle, 2023) Adopted in Assembly.

SR 65 – (Grove, 2022) Adopted in Senate.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/6/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/6/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 2/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Fariás, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary,

Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Hart, Lee, McKinnor, Papan, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins, Valencia

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/6/26 16:12:56

**** **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 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 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 166
Author: Choi (R), et al.
Introduced: 4/23/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Soju Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution celebrates September 20, 2026, as Soju Day in this state.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Soju, a traditional Korean distilled beverage, holds significant cultural, historical, and social importance, not only within the Korean community but increasingly across the United States.
- 2) Soju has become an emblem of unity, celebration, and tradition for Korean Americans, serving as a bridge of cultural exchange and enhancing cross-cultural understanding in our diverse society.
- 3) Governor Gavin Newsom signed Assembly Bill 2069 (Chapter 306 of the Statutes of 2024) into law in 2024, which allows California on-sale beer and wine licensees to also offer domestically produced soju and shochu to their customers, when previously those licensees were only authorized to offer imported Korean soju and Japanese shochu.
- 4) The new law is likely to encourage domestic production of soju in California, and it is highly anticipated that new distilleries will contribute to the California economy by the consumption of California rice and other agricultural products in producing soju.
- 5) The establishment of Soju Day is intended to foster deeper appreciation for Korean heritage and culture, strengthen community bonds, and promote unity among people from diverse backgrounds.

This resolution encourages the citizens of this state to join in the celebration of Soju Day by learning about Korean culture, attending community events, and engaging in the rich traditions that soju represents.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 95 (Choi, Resolution Chapter 183, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/5/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/5/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/6/26 13:50:35

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 181
Author: Grayson (D)
Introduced: 5/20/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Family Justice Center Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims June 10, 2026, as Family Justice Center Day in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) An average of 10 million cases of domestic abuse are reported to occur in the United States each year, equating to 20 people per minute.
- 2) Family justice centers (FJCs) in California provide trauma-informed, coordinated, wraparound services that bring together advocates, mental health professionals, legal supports, police officers, prosecutors, doctors, nurses, chaplains, and other professionals under one roof.
- 3) FJCs in California are represented by the California Family Justice Network (CFJN), a membership organization that provides training, statewide coordination of victim services, advocacy for survivor services and support, and sharing of best practices.
- 4) California's FJCs serve more than 70,000 trauma survivors each year, with spikes in demand up more than 30 percent since the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 5) The purpose of the CFJN is to advocate for the victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, elder abuse, dependent adult abuse, and child abuse in the State of California, and to actively work toward the prevention of those crimes, while supporting the implementation of the provisions and intent of Section 13750 of the Penal Code, which defines family justice centers. This provision seeks to ensure "that victims of abuse are able to access all needed

services in one location in order to enhance victim safety, increase offender accountability, and improve access to services for victims”.

This resolution proclaims June 10, 2026, as Family Justice Center Day in California and recognizes the lifesaving and hope-giving work of the CFJN and its 26 member centers as they work with rape crisis centers, domestic violence shelters, human trafficking agencies, prosecutors’ offices, law enforcement agencies, and other professionals and community-based organizations to ensure that adult and child survivors of trauma can access all of their services in one setting.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 67 (Grayson, Resolution Chapter 123, Statutes of 2025)
ACR 194 (Grayson, Resolution Chapter 140, Statutes of 2024)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:20

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 182
Author: Seyarto (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/28/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Purple Heart Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares August 7, 2026, as Purple Heart Day in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The Purple Heart is awarded to members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are killed or wounded in action.
- 2) To date, approximately 2 million Purple Heart Medals have been awarded. The award can be awarded retroactively as far back as 1917, allowing veterans from World War I to be eligible.
- 3) From 1942 to 1997, inclusive, civilians serving in, or affiliated with, the Armed Forces of the United States were eligible to receive the Purple Heart. Some of the earliest civilians to receive this honor were firefighters wounded or killed while fighting fires caused by the attack on Pearl Harbor.
- 4) Since California is home to more than 1.8 million veterans and more than 200,000 active and reserve members of the Armed Forces of the United States, it is especially appropriate for all Californians to honor those who have been awarded the Purple Heart.

This resolution encourages all Californians to honor those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States, especially those who have been wounded and received the Purple Heart, and declares August 7, 2026, as Purple Heart Day in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 88 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 148, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 111 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 159, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 28 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 140, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

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

6/10/26 16:17:31

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 183
Author: Weber Pierson (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/28/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Juneteenth

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges the people of California to join in celebrating Juneteenth as a day to honor and reflect on the significant role that African Americans have played in the history of the United States and how they have enriched society through their steadfast commitment to promoting unity and equality.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Juneteenth, also known as “Juneteenth Independence Day,” “Emancipation Day,” and “Freedom Day,” is the oldest African American holiday observance in the United States. 2026 marks 161 years of freedom celebrations.
- 2) A growing number of American and African American cultural institutions have sponsored Juneteenth cultural events designed to make all Americans aware of this celebration, including the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of American History in Washington, D.C., the Chicago Historical Society, the Black Archives of Mid-America in Kansas City, Inc. in the City of Kansas City, Missouri, the California African American Museum in the City of Los Angeles, California, the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village in the City of Dearborn, Michigan, the African American Museum in the City of Dallas, Texas, and the National Juneteenth Observance Foundation. Juneteenth celebrations are a tribute to those African Americans who fought so long for freedom and worked so hard to make the dream of equality a reality.
- 3) Juneteenth commemorates African American freedom and emphasizes education and achievement. It is a day, a week, and in some areas, a month marked with celebrations, guest speakers, picnics, and family gatherings. It is a

time for reflection and rejoicing. It is a time for assessment, self-improvement, and for planning the future.

This resolution recognizes June 19, 2026, as Juneteenth and urges the people of California to join in celebrating Juneteenth as a day to honor and reflect on the significant role that African Americans have played in the history of the United States and how they have enriched society through their steadfast commitment to promoting unity and equality.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 86 (Weber Pierson, Resolution Chapter 138, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 90 (Gipson, Resolution Chapter 143, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 152 (Bradford, Resolution Chapter 145, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 192 (Jones-Sawyer, Resolution Chapter 152, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 76 (Bradford, Resolution Chapter 142, Statutes of 2023)

ACR 94 (Jones-Sawyer, Resolution Chapter 122, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

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

6/10/26 16:17:32

**** **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 14
Author: Cabaldon (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/22/26
Vote: 21

SENATE MILITARY & VETERANS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/8/26
AYES: Archuleta, Grove, McNerney, Menjivar, Umberg

SUBJECT: World War II Nurses Congressional Gold Medal Act

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges California's Congressional delegation to support federal legislation awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the United States Army Nurse Corps and Navy Nurse Corps who served during World War II.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes Congress to award the Congressional Gold Medal to individuals or groups whose achievements or service have had a significant impact on the history and culture of the United States.
- 2) Recognizes the Congressional Gold Medal as one of the highest civilian honors awarded by the United States Congress.

This bill:

- 1) Urges California's Congressional delegation to cosponsor and support Senate Bill 2195 and House Resolution 4901, federal legislation that would award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the United States Army Nurse Corps and Navy Nurse Corps.

- 2) Recognizes the service and sacrifices of military nurses who served during World War II in combat zones, aboard hospital ships, evacuation aircraft, military hospitals, and prisoner-of-war camps.

Background

During World War II, more than 73,000 women served in the United States Army Nurse Corps and Navy Nurse Corps. These nurses provided critical medical care to wounded service members in combat theaters throughout Europe, the Pacific, and other operational areas around the world.

Army and Navy nurses served as military personnel and commissioned officers within the Armed Forces. Although they were noncombat personnel, many served in frontline conditions and were exposed to bombings, sniper attacks, disease outbreaks, and prisoner-of-war captivity while continuing to care for injured troops.

Military nurses played a significant role in improving battlefield survival rates and maintaining military medical operations during the war. Their service also extended beyond active combat operations into postwar humanitarian and recovery efforts, including care for victims of the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and medical support in refugee camps throughout Europe.

At the time, opportunities for women in military service were limited. Nursing represented one of the few military career fields in which women could serve close to combat operations as commissioned officers. Despite their wartime service, many women who served in military nursing roles did not initially receive equal status, compensation, or veterans benefits comparable to those received by male service members.

The Congressional Gold Medal represents one of Congress's most significant forms of national recognition. The honor dates back to the American Revolution, when Congress first used the medal to recognize extraordinary service to the nation. Unlike military decorations awarded through the Department of Defense, the Congressional Gold Medal is authorized through an act of Congress and signed into law by the President. Each medal is individually designed by the United States Mint to commemorate the specific achievements, service, or contributions of the recipient.

Comments

According to the author: "The act of honoring those who served is not merely ceremonial; it is an affirmation of the values a society holds dear. More than

73,000 women answered their country's call during World War II, serving as Army and Navy nurses in combat zones, aboard hospital ships, and in prisoner-of-war camps, often without full military status, equal pay, or the veteran benefits their service had plainly earned. Their sacrifice is California's story too, and SJR 14 urges California's Congressional delegation to cosponsor and advance federal legislation awarding these women the Congressional Gold Medal.”

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

Prepared by: Diego Nelson / M.&V.A. / (916) 651-1503
6/10/26 16:52:24

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SJR 16
Author: Caballero (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/7/26
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 9-3, 6/9/26

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

NOES: Strickland, Dahle, Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SUBJECT: Vehicles: commercial driver's license revocation

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges the United States Congress and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to reevaluate certain regulations pertaining to commercial driver's licenses (CDL), as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Develops and administers via FMCSA at the federal level, CDL regulations that set nationwide standards relating to testing and licensing requirements, vehicle endorsements, and safety standards, as provided.
- 2) Declares, at the state level, that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is responsible for issuing, renewing, and enforcing compliance with CDL requirements, as specified.

This resolution urges the United States Congress and FMCSA to review federal CDL disqualification policies and consider reforms that allow states greater flexibility related to the enforcement of federal disqualification policies, as specified.

Comments

Purpose of the resolution. According to the author, "California's commercial truck drivers are the backbone of our supply chain and a critical workforce that keeps our state and our nation moving. In March of this year, a federal rulemaking targeting immigrant drivers disenfranchised 13,000 commercial drivers in California, stripping them of their ability to earn a living, provide for their families, and contribute the essential logistical services our economy depends on. This action threatens California's working families. Commercial truck drivers cross the country for weeks at a time, often working under dangerous weather conditions, away from their loved ones, to deliver the goods that sustain our communities. SJR 16 calls on Congress to take action to reinstate the displaced drivers who lost their ability to operate commercial vehicles following this federal rulemaking, and to recognize the substantial economic contributions these workers make to California and to the nation. This resolution is an important step to stabilize our supply chain, protect working families, and ensure that the drivers who keep our economy moving are valued and supported."

FMCSA's Interim Final Rule. On September 29, 2025, FMCSA issued an Interim Final Rule to limit state's ability to issue and renew non-domiciled CDLs to certain individuals domiciled in foreign jurisdictions. Specifically, the Rule amends Title 49 within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Parts 383 and 384, narrowing individuals eligible for non-domiciled CDLs by imposing stricter eligibility limits, changing documentation requirements, and requiring states to verify immigration status via the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) database. The Interim Final Rule went into immediate effect, in turn, requiring DMV to notify certain CDL holders that their license would be revoked per new federal regulations. Currently, a stay has been issued by the United States Court of Appeals (D.C. Circuit) due to a number of lawsuits pending in regard to the Interim Final Rule leaving both the Rule and implementation of the Rule on pending.

This resolution urges the United States Congress and FMCSA to review the Interim Final Rule's CDL disqualification policies and further consider reforms that provide greater flexibility for states to ensure the jobs and economic well-being of thousands of commercial drivers in California and throughout the country are preserved.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/26)

California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio
Teamsters California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/26)

None received

Prepared by: Manny Leon / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
6/10/26 16:52:23

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SJR 17
Author: Choi (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/12/26
Vote: 21

SENATE MILITARY & VETERANS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/8/26
AYES: Archuleta, Grove, McNerney, Menjivar, Umberg

SUBJECT: Korean American veterans

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges Congress and President of the United States to permit states to extend burial and memorial benefits in state veterans cemeteries to Republic of Korea veterans who served in the Vietnam War and subsequently became United States citizens.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to make grants to states for the purpose of establishing, expanding, improving, operating, and maintaining state veterans' cemeteries. (38 United States Code § 2408(a)(1))
- 2) Limits eligibility for burial in a federally funded state veterans cemetery to eligible veterans and certain family members, including spouses, surviving spouses, minor children, certain unmarried adult children with disabilities, and eligible parents of certain deceased service members. (38 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 39.10)
- 3) Provides that a United States citizen who served honorably in the armed forces of a government allied with the United States during a war may be eligible for burial in a national cemetery if the person was a United States citizen at the time of entry into service and at the time of death. (38 C.F.R. § 38.620(d))

This bill:

- 1) Urges Congress and the President of the United States to permit states to extend burial and memorial benefits in state veterans cemeteries to Republic of Korea veterans who served in the Vietnam War and subsequently became United States citizens.
- 2) Declare that the Legislature stands in solidarity with Republic of Korea veterans who served in Vietnam.
- 3) Require the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of the resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, congressional leadership, each Senator and Representative from California in the United States Congress, and the author for appropriate distribution.

Background

During the Vietnam War, the Republic of Korea was one of the United States' major military allies. At the request of the United States, South Korea deployed approximately 320,000 soldiers to Vietnam between 1965 and 1973, making it one of the largest allied contributors to the war effort outside of the United States. Republic of Korea forces served alongside United States forces and sustained significant losses, including 5,099 deaths and 10,962 injuries. Following the war, some Republic of Korea veterans immigrated to the United States, became naturalized citizens, and built their lives in this country. Approximately 3,000 Korean American Vietnam War veterans are naturalized United States citizens. California has a direct connection to this population, as the state is home to the largest Korean American population in the country.

Federal law governs eligibility for burial and memorial benefits in national veteran's cemeteries and also affects state veterans cemeteries that receive federal support. Under federal law, certain allied military service may qualify a person for burial in a VA national cemetery if the person served during a war involving the United States in the armed forces of a government allied with the United States and that service ended honorably. However, VA eligibility rules generally require the individual to have been a United States citizen when the allied military service began and at the time of death. As a result, Republic of Korea veterans who served alongside United States forces in Vietnam, but became United States citizens only after their military service, generally do not qualify for burial in a VA national cemetery based solely on that service.

The United States Department of Veterans Affairs administers the Veterans Cemetery Grants Program, which was established in 1978 to help states, territories, and tribal governments provide gravesites in areas where VA national cemeteries cannot fully meet burial needs. Since 1980, the program has awarded 525 grants totaling \$1.87 billion to establish, expand, improve, operate, or maintain veteran's cemeteries. VA grant-funded cemeteries must be operated in accordance with federal requirements, including restrictions on who may be interred. Because of these conditions, states that receive VA cemetery grant funding may be limited in their ability to expand burial eligibility beyond categories clearly authorized under federal law without raising compliance concerns.

Congress has previously addressed a related issue involving certain non-U.S. forces connected to the Vietnam War. The Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 provided special naturalization consideration to certain Hmong and Laotian veterans who supported United States military operations during the war. Federal law was later amended to extend national cemetery burial eligibility to certain Hmong veterans who served in American-backed units and later became naturalized United States citizens. However, federal law governing state veteran's cemeteries has not been fully conformed in the same way, leaving states with uncertainty when attempting to extend comparable cemetery benefits to similarly situated allied veterans.

Comments

According to the author: "Many Koreans served besides American soldiers in the Vietnam War, supporting them and fighting the same fight to protect democracy. Some of those veterans immigrated to the United States to pursue the American Dream, and then became citizens and have been living the remainder of their lives in this country. I believe SJR 17 is a great way to recognize these veteran's service and bravery. This resolution only urges Congress to provide the option for these Korean American Vietnam veterans to be buried alongside the soldiers they fought with, after they passed on, a right I believe they have done more than enough to deserve."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

Prepared by: Diego Nelson / M.&V.A. / (916) 651-1503
6/10/26 16:52:22

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SJR 18
Author: McNerney (D), et al.
Amended: 6/2/26
Vote:

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 10-2, 6/9/26

AYES: Umberg, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Wahab, Weber
Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Niello, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Stern

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 4-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Wiener, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi

SUBJECT: Campaign finance reform

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This joint resolution memorializes the California Legislature's strong disagreement with the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and encourages states to limit the powers of corporations to contribute to political campaigns.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law pursuant to Amendment I of the United States Constitution, and as applied to the states by Amendment XIV of the United States Constitution, provides neither Congress nor the states may enact any law abridging the freedom of speech.

Existing law, pursuant to rulings by the United States Supreme Court, provides:

- a) Pursuant to *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976) laws limiting election expenditures are unconstitutional, as such limits contravene the First Amendment's guarantee of

freedom of speech. The court opined that such a restriction on spending for political communication necessarily reduces the quantity of expression.

- b) Pursuant to *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (2010) the government may not, under the Amendment I, suppress political speech based on the speaker's corporate identity. This decision allows unlimited spending by corporations on election-related matters.

This joint resolution:

- 1) Memorializes the California Legislature's strong disagreement with the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Citizens United*.
- 2) Encourages states to adopt policies to limit the powers of corporations to contribute to political campaigns in a manner consistent with the United States Constitution.

Background

Citizens United. Citizens United is a nonprofit corporation that during the 2008 primary election campaign made a documentary critical of then U.S. Presidential Candidate Hillary Clinton. When planning to run commercials advertising the documentary, which was to be made available via on-demand television, Citizens United filed in federal court to make sure that the Federal Election Commission could not rule that ads and airing the documentary were illegal under federal campaign finance law. The law, known as the McCain-Feingold Act, forbade specified expenditures by corporations, including nonprofit corporations, to influence elections within certain timeframes.

As a result of this filing, the U.S. Supreme Court ultimately ruled in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that restricting spending on election-related matters violated the First Amendment's freedom of speech that all persons, including corporations, possess. This decision sparked an enduring controversy over corporate personhood and its attendant rights. Some viewed the ruling as a defense of the right of free speech with many others criticizing the decision as giving corporations outsized political power by allowing corporations to spend unlimited sums for or against political candidates so long as those expenditures were made independently of the campaigns.

Comments

- 1) *Author's Statement*. This year marks the 50-year anniversary of the landmark *Buckley v. Valeo* decision, where the Supreme Court decided that campaign

expenditure limits are unconstitutional. This decision, paired with the *Citizens United* decision in 2010, has led to the proliferation of corporate money in our political system. The amount of dark money spent on elections continues to grow every election cycle. This broken campaign finance system has prevented us from addressing some of the biggest issues facing our state and our country.

Dark money has also made government more responsive to corporate interests than the public, increased cynicism among voters, and corroded the very institutions we are meant to protect. This resolution sends a message that the California Legislature stands against the *Citizens United* decision and encourages states to limit the power of corporations to contribute to political campaigns.

- 2) *Montana*. Proponents of a statutory initiative in Montana, which is called “The Montana Plan,” are currently collecting signatures to qualify the initiative for a ballot this year. The initiative would create a new Montana law prohibiting corporations from spending money on political candidates or ballot issues. Rather than addressing the issues raised by the Supreme Court in its *Citizens United* decision, in which the court opined that the power to spend money in elections is tantamount to free speech, this initiative limits what a corporate charter can include in Montana.

In short, the Montana initiative amends the State Constitution of Montana to define corporations as “artificial persons” and then declares:

Any language in articles of incorporation, organization, association, or other organizational documents purporting to directly or indirectly confer Election-Activity authority or Ballot-Issue-Activity authority to Artificial Persons is void.

The initiative thus works through the state’s authority to regulate corporations through the charter process, rather than taking on a corporation’s free speech rights and likely running afoul of the *Citizen’s United* decision.

- 3) *Hawaii*. Last month, the State of Hawaii enacted a law that redefines corporations in such a manner as to preclude them from spending on elections. This new law will take effect on July 1, 2027. The initiative in Montana inspired the legislation in Hawaii, which states in its text:

...the purpose of this Act is to: ...[r]eaffirm that artificial persons created under state law possess only those powers that are necessary or convenient to carry out lawful business and organizational purposes, and that those

powers do not include the power to spend money or contribute anything of value to influence elections or ballot measures....

- 4) *Powers of States*. In general, it is unclear what power states would have in the current legal environment to reduce the power of corporations to influence elections, given that the courts have conferred full First Amendment rights onto corporations. The Montana approach, which should the initiative become law, will take effect on January 1, 2027, could provide a first test of the ability of states to limit the powers of corporations to contribute to political campaigns, as this resolution encourages states to do.

Related/Prior Legislation

SJR 1 (Wiener, Resolution Chapter 174, Statutes of 2025) rescinds all applications by the Legislature for the United States Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments to the United States Constitution, including the application resulting from AJR 1 (Gatto) of 2014.

AJR 1 (Gatto, Resolution Chapter 77, Statutes of 2014) submitted California's application to Congress to call for a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that: (1) limits corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech; and (2) declares that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited.

AJR 22 (Wieckowski, Resolution Chapter 69, Statutes of 2012) memorializes the Legislature's disagreement with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, and called upon the United States Congress to propose and send to the states for ratification a constitutional amendment to overturn *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and to restore constitutional rights and fair elections to the people.

AJR 32 (Allen) of 2012 would have petitioned Congress to call a federal convention for the purpose of amending the U.S. Constitution hopefully solely to limit corporate personhood and declare that money does not constitute speech. This measure failed passage in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/26)

CASS Democracy Reform Working Group
Consumer Watchdog
Indivisible CA: StateStrong

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/26)

None received

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
6/10/26 17:00:59

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

THIRD READING

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

SUBJECT: 250th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence

SOURCE: Author

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

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

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

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

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/13/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/13/25)

None received

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 108
Author: Hurtado (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/30/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: World Asthma Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes May 5, 2026, as World Asthma Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Asthma affects millions of Californians, with some communities across the state facing disproportionate rates due to poor air quality, environmental exposures, and limited health care access.
- 2) Communities throughout California face environmental burdens, including wildfire smoke, vehicle emissions, industrial pollution, and agricultural operations, that worsen asthma outcomes.
- 3) World Asthma Day, observed the first Tuesday in May, raises global awareness about asthma prevention, management, and research.

This resolution supports programs for asthma education, home-based interventions, and health care access in underserved communities statewide.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/11/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/11/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:28:15

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 109
Author: Menjivar (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/30/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Veterans

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution honors and recognizes the service and sacrifice of Korean American Vietnam War veterans residing in the State of California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California is home to approximately 700 Korean American Vietnam War veterans, representing the largest concentration of those veterans in the United States.
- 2) Korean American Vietnam War veterans served alongside the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam War in defense of freedom and democracy. Many of these veterans later became naturalized United States citizens and longtime residents of the State of California.
- 3) Many of these veterans are now in their late seventies and eighties and suffer from combat-related illnesses, including exposure to Agent Orange and post-traumatic stress disorder.
- 4) The overwhelming majority of veterans are Medicare or Medicaid beneficiaries and continue receiving medical care through community physicians, and therefore pose no significant fiscal burden to the State of California.
- 5) Their service represents a profound symbol of the enduring alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

This resolution encourages continued cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Korea in matters concerning the welfare and dignity of these veterans.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:28:16

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 112
Author: Niello (R)
Amended: 5/13/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Familial Adenomatous Polyposis Awareness Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of June 14, 2026, to June 20, 2026, inclusive, as Familial Adenomatous Polyposis Awareness Week in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Adenomatous polyposis coli (APC)-associated polyposis, which includes familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP), is a hereditary condition that results in a high number of polyps developing within the colon and rectum, significantly increasing an individual's risk of colorectal cancer.
- 2) Genetic changes in the APC gene related to FAP leads to the development of hundreds of polyps within the colon, frequently beginning during an individual's teenage years, that, if left untreated, leads to cancer developing, on average, by 39 years of age.
- 3) Attenuated familial adenomatous polyposis (AFAP) is a variant of the condition, that causes fewer polyps to develop at a later age, with an average cancer diagnosis of 55 years of age if left untreated.
- 4) During this week, the Stanford University Department of Health Policy joins with the Stanford Genetics and Genomics Program and the Stanford Cancer Center to raise awareness of FAP and AFAP. California residents are encouraged to gather their family health history and share that information with their health care provider for early screening and prevention of cancers associated with these conditions.

This resolution proclaims the week of June 14, 2026, to June 20, 2026, inclusive, as Familial Adenomatous Polyposis Awareness Week in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 73 (Niello, Resolution Chapter 146, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:06

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 113
Author: Choi (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/11/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: International Day of Peace

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution encourages all Californians to observe the International Day of Peace by reaffirming their commitment to peace, nonviolence, mutual understanding, and respect for human dignity.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The International Day of Peace was established by the United Nations General Assembly through Resolution 36/67, adopted on November 30, 1981.
- 2) Since its establishment, the International Day of Peace has been observed annually by United Nations Member States, international organizations, educational institutions, and civil society worldwide.
- 3) The International Day of Peace serves as a global reminder that peace is not merely the absence of conflict, but the presence of justice, mutual respect, and cooperation.

This resolution encourages all Californians to observe the International Day of Peace by reaffirming their commitment to peace, nonviolence, mutual understanding, and respect for human dignity.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 13 (Jackson, Resolution Chapter 189, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:07

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 114
Author: Niello (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/13/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Advancement Via Individual Determination Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of June 15, 2026, to June 21, 2026, as AVID Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The Advancement Via Individual Determination program (AVID) was founded in the City of San Diego in 1980 with the mission of closing the opportunity gap by preparing all pupils for college and career readiness and success in a global society.
- 2) AVID has grown from a single classroom in the City of San Diego to serve 418,000 students in over 2,000 schools across California and has expanded to serve over 1.4 million students in more than 7,400 K–12 schools across 46 states, in addition to schools in Washington, DC, the Virgin Islands, Canada, and Australia and schools operated by the United States Department of Defense Education Activity.
- 3) Over 37,000 California educators are trained in AVID strategies, and AVID-trained teachers have higher rates of retention, supporting statewide teacher workforce priorities.
- 4) AVID’s multilingual research and asset-based instructional approaches, including AVID Excel and AVID Emerge, support English language learners and multilingual students in alignment with California’s goal of 75% bilingual proficiency by 2040.

- 5) AVID should be recognized as a powerful tool for ensuring that California pupils develop the skills and beliefs they need to excel in a rapidly evolving world.

This resolution commends AVID's 46-year contribution to California education and its impact on pupil achievement, educator effectiveness, and college and career readiness across the state, and affirms the value of including AVID as a partner in statewide postsecondary readiness initiative.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:08

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 116
Author: Cervantes (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/26/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ+) Pride Month.

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims Senate proclaims June 2026 as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ+) Pride Month, urges all Californians to join in celebrating the culture, accomplishments, and contributions of LGBTQ+ people, and encourages the people of California to work to help advance the cause of equality for LGBTQ+ people and their families.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) LGBTQ+ people have made important and lasting contributions to our great state and nation in every field of endeavor, including, but not limited to, business, medicine, law, humanities, science, literature, politics, education, music, philanthropy, sports and athletics, arts, and culture, that enrich our national life.
- 2) The transgender, gender-diverse, and intersex (TGI) community in particular has gained newfound prominence in media, entertainment, sports, and business, raising awareness about gender identity and the obstacles this community continues to face.
- 3) In January 2023, California became the first state legislature in the nation to reach 10 % representation for LGBTQ+ individuals, matching the estimated 10 % of people identifying as LGBTQ+ in California.
- 4) While California's Legislature has achieved record representation, the Legislature still does not have any TGI or two-spirit representation, further

calling on the need to achieve representation from all members of the LGBTQ+ community.

- 5) California has become a safe haven for many LGBTQ+ people across the United States, its territories, and beyond, including for its access to health care and robust civil rights laws allowing LGBTQ+ people to live their authentic lives.
- 6) June 1 to June 30 spotlights LGBTQ+ people and their voices, increases awareness and knowledge of issues impacting the LGBTQ+ community, and commemorates lives lost to hate and violence, as well as health epidemics, amongst additional efforts to support the diverse LGBTQ+ community.

This resolution proclaims June 2026 as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ+) Pride Month, urges all Californians to join in celebrating the culture, accomplishments, and contributions of LGBTQ+ people, and encourages the people of California to work to help advance the cause of equality for LGBTQ+ people and their families.

Related/Prior Legislation

HR 115 (Ward, 2026), Held in Assembly Rules Committee

HR 43 (Ward, 2025), Adopted in the Assembly

SR 48 (Menjivar, 2025), Adopted in the Senate

SR 96 (Eggman, 2024), Adopted in the Senate

HR 101 (Ward, 2024), Adopted in the Assembly

SR 33 (Eggman, 2023), Adopted in the Senate

HR 33 (Ward, 2023), Adopted in the Assembly

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/1/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/1/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171

6/3/26 14:19:49

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 117
Author: Choi (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/27/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Taiwan

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution acknowledges that Taiwanese communities have made significant and indelible contributions to California's economic growth and development over the years and encourages California's government to further explore areas of cooperation with Taiwan.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The year 2026 marks the 42nd anniversary of California-Taiwan sister statehood. Since this bond was established in 1984, Taiwan has enjoyed extensive, close, and friendly relations with the State of California and the United States.
- 2) Taiwan has the ability and willingness to contribute to international society, and strives towards meaningful participation in important international organizations, such as the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Criminal Police Organization, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
- 3) Taiwanese American Heritage Week has been celebrated during the second week of May for over 26 years, has significantly promoted a shared community amongst various generations of Taiwanese Americans in California, and has tangibly strengthened the bilateral relationship between California and Taiwan in trade, science, technology, education, tourism, and culture.

This resolution declares that Taiwan's democracy is crucial to the peace and prosperity of the Asia-Pacific region.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 63 (McNerney, 2025) – Adopted by the Senate.

SR 116 (Cortese, 2024) – Adopted by the Senate.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/2/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/2/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/3/26 14:19:49

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 350
Author: Bonta (D), et al.
Amended: 5/12/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 11-0, 7/2/25

AYES: Menjivar, Valladares, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove, Limón, Padilla,
Richardson, Rubio, Weber Pierson, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/29/25

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-1, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Health care coverage: fluoride treatments

SOURCE: California Dental Association
Children Now

DIGEST: This bill (1) requires a health plan contract or health insurance policy issued, amended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2027, to provide coverage for the application of fluoride varnish in the primary care setting for children under 21 years of age, without a deductible, co-insurance, copayment or other cost-sharing requirement for that coverage; (2) requires the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to issue billing guidance and make any necessary updates to ensure Medi-Cal coverage policy for recipients under age 21 is consistent with the federal requirements and allows for the application of fluoride varnish without any place of service restrictions.

Senate Floor Amendments of 5/12/26 clarify that Medi-Cal plans are exempt from the portions of this bill regulating commercial managed care plans; delay the requirement for DHCS to issue a Medi-Cal fluoride varnish billing guidance by six months to July 1, 2027; change who can apply fluoride varnish in the Medi-Cal program and add supervision and training requirements; condition the

implementation of the Medi-Cal requirements upon the receipt of federal financial participation and any necessary federal approvals.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) to regulate health plans under the Knox-Keene Health Care Services Plan Act of 1975; the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to regulate health and other insurers; DHCS to administer the Medi-Cal program. [Health and Safety Code [HSC] §1340, et seq., Insurance Code [INS] §106, et seq. and Welfare and Institutions Code [WIC] §14000, et seq.]
- 2) Requires, under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and as codified in state law, health plans and issuers, subject to the minimum interval established by the United States Secretary Health and Human Services (Secretary), to provide coverage, and not impose cost sharing requirements, for the following preventive services with respect to plan years beginning on and after September 23, 2010:
 - a) Evidence-based items or services that have in effect a rating of 'A' or 'B' in the current recommendations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), with specified exceptions;
 - b) Immunizations that have in effect a recommendation from the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) with respect to the individual involved;
 - c) Evidence-informed preventive care and screenings for infants, children, and adolescents, provided for in the comprehensive guidelines supported by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA);
 - d) Additional preventive care and screenings for women not otherwise described above as provided for in comprehensive guidelines supported by HRSA, as specified; and,
 - e) Current recommendations of the USPSTF regarding breast cancer screening, mammography, and prevention. [Title 42 United States Code [U.S.C.] Sec. 300gg-13, HSC §1367.002 and INS §10112.2]
- 3) States that 2) above does not prohibit a health plan contract or insurance policy from providing coverage for services in addition to those recommended by USPSTF or denying coverage for services that are not recommended by USPSTF. [HSC §1367.002 and INS §10112.2]

- 4) Establishes a schedule of benefits under the Medi-Cal program, which includes benefits required under federal law and benefits provided at the state's option, both of which are funded with federal and state dollars. The scope of benefits includes the application of fluoride, or other appropriate fluoride treatment, as defined by DHCS, for children under age 17. [WIC §14132]
- 5) Requires, under federal law, coverage for individuals under age 21 of all necessary health care, diagnostic services, treatment, and other measures to correct or ameliorate defects and physical and mental illnesses and conditions discovered by the screening services, whether or not such services are covered under the State plan, known as the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) benefit, and codifies this benefit in state law. [42 USC §1396d and WIC §14059.5]
- 6) Specifies that EPSDT services also include all age-specific assessments and services listed under the most current periodicity schedule by the American Academy of Pediatrics and Bright Futures, and any other medically necessary assessments and services that exceed those listed. [WIC §14149.95]
- 7) Requires DHCS to establish a list of performance measures designed to evaluate utilization, access, availability, and effectiveness of preventive care and treatment to ensure the dental fee-for-service program meets quality and access criteria. Includes in the list of required performance measures the number of applications of fluoride varnishes. [WIC §14132.915]
- 8) Authorizes any person to apply topical fluoride, including fluoride varnish, to the teeth of individuals who are being served in a public health setting or public health program according to the prescription and protocol issues and established by a physician or dentist. [HSC §104762]
- 9) Requires pupils of public and private elementary and secondary schools to be given the opportunity to receive the topical application of fluoride, including fluoride varnish in a manner approved by the Department of Public Health. Requires the program of topical application to be under the general direction of a dentist licensed in the state, according to the prescription and protocol established by the dentist, and applied through self-application or by another person. [HSC §104830]

This bill:

- 1) Requires a health plan contract or health insurance policy issued, amended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2027, that provides coverage for the application of fluoride coverage as a pediatric oral care benefit to provide coverage for the application of fluoride varnish as medically necessary regardless of whether the services is billed as a dental benefit or as a medical benefit, and prohibits such plans and policies from imposing a deductible, co-insurance, copayment or other cost-sharing requirement for that coverage.
- 2) Exempts specialized health plan contracts and health insurance policies, Medicare supplement policies, and Medi-Cal managed care plan contracts with DHCS.
- 3) Specifies that this bill does not diminish a health plan or insurer's responsibility under the ACA to cover services that are assigned either a grade A or B by the USPSTF.
- 4) Conditions the implementation of this bill to an appropriation should the requirements create an obligation for the state to defray the costs.
- 5) Requires DHCS, by July 1, 2027, to issue billing guidance and make any necessary updates to ensure Medi-Cal coverage policy for recipients under age 21 is consistent with the federal EPSDT benefit.
- 6) Requires such policy to allow for the application of fluoride varnish without any place of service restrictions when rendered by a Medi-Cal enrolled, licensed medical or dental provider or another qualified health care or public health professional within their scope of practice who is trained on oral health, including the application of fluoride varnish, and is supervised by an enrolled, licensed medical or dental provider within their scope of practice who bills on their behalf. Specifies that "qualified health care or public health professional" includes community health workers and may include other non-licensed practitioners as designated by DHCS in its billing guidance, provided they are trained and supervised as specified in this subdivision.
- 7) Requires a qualified health care or public health professional to complete a training program on oral health and application of fluoride varnish, which may be issued by the American Academy of Pediatrics Oral Health Initiative, another nationally recognized organization or academic institution with subject-

matter expertise in oral health, or any other public or private organization specified by DHCS.

- 8) Requires Medi-Cal enrolled, licensed medical or dental providers to be responsible for ensuring each qualified health care or public health professional under their supervision completes the required training prior to providing services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries and maintaining documentation that is made available to the DHCS upon request or in the event of a state or federal audit.
- 9) Permits DHCS to implement this benefit via guidance without taking any further regulatory action, but conditions the implementation upon the receipt of federal financial participation and any necessary federal approvals.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

Fluoride varnish is a safe, inexpensive, and effective dental intervention that can help prevent tooth decay. However, current Medi-Cal policies are unnecessarily restrictive. First, although many types of non-clinical staff can be authorized to apply fluoride varnish, Medi-Cal policy requires a qualified health professional to “hold the brush” when applying fluoride varnish, making it more difficult and costly to incorporate into primary care and public health settings. Medi-Cal policy guidance is also unclear that medically necessary fluoride varnish in the primary care setting is currently covered by Medi-Cal for all children under 21, under federal EPSDT requirements. In addition, commercial insurance only covers fluoride varnish in the primary care setting for children under the age of five, which leaves out other children who could benefit from this preventive intervention. This bill will enhance coverage of fluoride varnish in the primary care setting and makes it easier for dental, medical, and school-based care providers to bill Medi-Cal for fluoride varnish. In an era where settled science on the effectiveness and safety of fluoride is being questioned, California should expand this cost-effective intervention to prevent cavities and promote good oral health for our children.

Background

Dental caries and children’s health. According to a June 2021 report by the California Department of Public Health, of the oral health status up children describing results from a 2018-2019 survey of third grade students, 61% of California children in third grade had experienced dental caries, compared to the national median of 53% among all states. The study also found that 21% had

untreated decay. For Latinos, the rate of caries experience was 72% and nearly 25% had untreated decay. These numbers were very similar to the number of socioeconomically disadvantaged students with caries experience or untreated tooth decay (73% and 26% respectively).

California Health Benefits Review Program (CHBRP) analysis. AB 1996 (Thomson, Chapter 795, Statutes of 2002) requests the University of California to assess legislation proposing a mandated benefit or service and prepare a written analysis with relevant data on the medical, economic, and public health impacts of proposed health plan and health insurance benefit mandate legislation. CHBRP was created in response to AB 1996, and reviewed this bill. Key findings include:

- *Coverage impacts and enrollees covered.* CHBRP assumed that 100% of health plan enrollees have coverage for fluoride varnish when applied in a primary care setting for enrollees aged 0 to 5 years in accordance with state and federal law. For enrollees aged 6-20, approximately 1.5% of commercial enrollees and 17% of Medi-Cal beneficiaries have coverage in medical settings (rather than a dentist office) at baseline. This bill would provide coverage for the varnish for all enrollees age 20 years and younger in medical settings.
- *Medical effectiveness.* Overall, CHBRP found evidence that fluoride varnish is effective in the prevention of tooth decay and dental caries, primarily in younger children, in both medical and other clinical settings. The evidence was stronger for primary teeth than permanent teeth in medical settings, but in other clinical settings there was strong evidence for all children under 18 that the application of fluoride varnish is effective in improving oral health outcomes. It should be noted that CHBRP did not identify studies for children over 18 and that there was very limited research on the application of the varnish in medical settings on permanent teeth, thus the absence of evidence is not evidence of no effect.
- *Utilization.* CHBRP assumes utilization of fluoride varnish among commercial and Medi-Cal enrollees aged 0 to 5 years would not increase because this service is fully covered at baseline. There are approximately 16,600 applications among commercial enrollees aged 0 to 5 years and 115,500 applications among Medi-Cal beneficiaries aged 0 to 5 years at baseline. CHBRP estimates an increase of 27,100 applications for commercial enrollees aged 6 to 20 years over the current 700 applications and an increase of 112,800 applications for Medi-Cal enrollees over the current 9,000 applications.

- *Medi-Cal.* According to CHBRP, fluoride treatments are covered under the Medi-Cal dental program for enrollees aged 20 and younger when provided by dental professionals, thus there is no change in benefit coverage when provided in that setting. They also flag that existing law requires coverage up through age 17. CHBRP also points to a national benchmark adopted by DHCS that establishes a minimum performance target level of 19.3% for Medi-Cal beneficiaries aged 1-20 years old to have at least two topical fluoride applications annually. In 2022, 16.17% had at least two applications of fluoride varnish annually.
- *Impact on expenditures.* Within DMHC-regulated commercial plans and CDI-regulated commercial policies, premiums would increase by \$653,000. This would be between 0.0007% and 0.0009% per member per month or between \$0.006 and \$0.007 per member per month. For Medi-Cal beneficiaries enrolled in DMHC-regulated plans and County Organized Health Systems (COHS), premiums would increase by \$2,249,000. This would be less than 0.01% or \$0.02 per member per month.
- *Public health.* CHBRP projects a very limited public health impact on the overall incidence of dental caries and loss of tooth enamel in the first year post mandate, largely because cavities generally take one to two years to develop. Assuming enrollees continue to receive fluoride varnish in a medical setting annually, this bill could potentially result in a reduction of 5,800 cavities among the 27,100 new users aged 6 to 20 years with commercial coverage and a reduction of 24,200 cavities among the 112,800 new users aged 6 to 20 years with Medi-Cal. This could be increased or decreased by other public health factors such as community water fluoridation.
- *Essential health benefits.* CHBRP states that this bill would not exceed the definition of Essential Health Benefits in California because it would expand an existing benefit requirement rather than create a new coverage requirement. This means that the state would not be responsible for covering the cost of the benefit in the commercial market under the ACA rules.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, this bill would have the following fiscal impact:

- DHCS estimates the following costs:

- Ongoing costs of \$156,000 (\$78,000 General Fund and \$78,000 federal funds) in 2025-26 and \$147,000 (\$74,000 General Fund and \$73,000 federal funds) in 2027-28 and annually thereafter for state operations to create new policies and billing guidelines to expand fluoride varnish coverage to include a broader range of providers who may apply fluoride varnish in primary care and public health settings.
- Indeterminate costs due to increased utilization of services. The fiscal impact to the Medi-Cal program is indeterminable as there are no active medical billing codes for the application of fluoride varnish and supplementation for members 6 to 20 years of age in the primary care setting. Additionally, it is difficult to determine the utilization rate for this new benefit being performed in a primary care setting, particularly since this is a covered Medi-Cal benefit in dental settings. For the application of topical fluoride varnish for children 0 to 5 years of age, the Medi-Cal program typically reimburses at \$18 per application in the primary care setting. As of December 2024, there were approximately 4.1 million Medi-Cal members ages 6 to 20 years. If five percent (206,250) of them received one fluoride varnish in the primary care setting per year and DHCS paid \$18 per application, DHCS estimates the annual, ongoing cost at approximately \$3.7 million (\$1.85 million General Fund and \$1.85 million federal funds).
- DMHC estimates minor and absorbable costs.
- CDI estimates costs of \$3,000 in 2025-26 and \$16,000 in 2026-27 for state administration (Insurance Fund).
- Unknown ongoing General Fund costs, potentially low tens of thousands, due to increases in CalPERS plan premiums.

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/11/26)

California Dental Association (co-source)
 Children Now (co-source)
 American Academy of Pediatrics, California
 Asian Resources, Inc.
 Association of Regional Center Agencies
 California Academy of General Dentistry
 California Academy of Family Physicians
 California Association of Orthodontists
 California Dental Hygienists' Association

California Neurology Society
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
California School- Based Health Alliance
California Society of Pediatric Dentistry
California State PTA
Care2u Oral Care Administrative Services
Center for Oral Health
Children's Choice Dental Care
County of Alameda
County of Los Angeles
County of Sacramento
Delta Dental of California
Dental Board of California
Dental Hygiene Board of California
Dientes Community Dental Care
EveryChild Foundation
First 5 Alameda County
First 5 Monterey County
First 5 Nevada County
First 5 San Bernardino County
LA Best Babies Network
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
North East Medical Services
State Council on Developmental Disabilities
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health
Western Center on Law & Poverty
Women Lawyers of Sacramento

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/11/26)

Association of California Life & Health Insurance Companies
California Association of Health Plans
1 individual

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Co-sponsors, Children Now and the California Dental Association write that cavities are the most common chronic, yet largely preventable condition experienced by children. Untreated cavities can cause pain and infections that may lead to problems with eating, speaking, playing and learning. Research shows that children with poor oral health status were nearly three times more likely than other students to miss school as a result of dental pain and were more likely to perform poorly in school. Unfortunately, in California, less

than half of children in the Medi-Cal program have annual dental visits where topical fluoride varnish could be applied. Primary care and public health settings such as schools offer additional access points for the application of fluoride varnish for children enrolled in Medi-Cal. They are also concerned about recent statements from the federal administration that threaten community water fluoridation, which the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has previously named as one of the 10 greatest public health interventions in the 20th century because of the dramatic decline in cavities since such fluoridation began in 1945.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Association of Health Plans (CAHP) and the Association of California Life and Health Insurance Companies (ACLHIC) write that this bill exceeds the current guidelines that mandate coverage of fluoride varnish for children ages 0-5. It would also increase total premiums paid by employers and enrollees for newly covered benefits by \$3,242,000. Given the current uncertainty regarding the Medi-Cal budget as well as the uncertainty pertaining to future funding from the federal government, they are fundamentally opposed to legislation that could further increase premium costs for families. They argue that focusing on updating the Essential Health Benefits allows for a more comprehensive and thoughtful approach when determining benefits while California continues to grapple with rising health care costs and budget shortfalls.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-1, 6/2/25

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

NOES: DeMaio

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bennett, Sanchez, Tangipa

Prepared by: Jen Flory / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
5/14/26 16:49:41

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 686
Author: Berman (D)
Introduced: 2/14/25
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/30/25
AYES: Ashby, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas,
Strickland, Umberg, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Grayson, Niello

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/27/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Cannabis: appointees: prohibited activities

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits other Governor-appointed officials within the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC), in addition to the members of the Cannabis Control Appeals Panel (CCAP) and the Director of the DCC, from having specified financial interests or relationships within the licensed cannabis industry.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Medicinal and Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MAUCRSA) to regulate the cultivation, distribution, transport, storage, manufacturing, processing, and sale of both medicinal cannabis and adult-use cannabis. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) § 26000)
- 2) Requires the Governor to appoint the director of the DCC, subject to confirmation by the Senate, who is to serve under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency and

at the pleasure of the Governor. (BPC § 20610.5)

- 3) Permits the Governor to additionally appoint a chief deputy director, a deputy director of equity and inclusion, and either a deputy director of legal affairs or a chief counsel to the DCC, as specified. (BPC § 20610.5(c)(2))
- 4) Establishes the CCAP consisting of one member appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one member appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, and three members appointed by the Governor and subject to confirmation by a majority vote of all of the members elected to the Senate. (BPC § 26040)
- 5) Authorizes the Governor to appoint a chief deputy director, a deputy director of equity and inclusion, and either a deputy director of legal affairs or a chief counsel to the DCC. Requires these positions to serve under the direction and supervision of the director and hold office at the pleasure of the Governor. (BPC § 26010.5(c)(2))
- 6) Prohibits either the director of the DCC or any member of CCAP from any of the following:
 - a) Receiving any commission or profit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, from any person applying for or receiving any license or permit under MAUCRSA.
 - b) Engaging or having any interest in the sale or any insurance covering a licensee's business or premises.
 - c) Engaging or having any interest in the sale of equipment for use upon the premises of a licensee engaged in commercial cannabis activity.
 - d) Knowingly soliciting any licensee for the purchase of tickets for benefits or contributions for benefits.
 - e) Knowingly requesting any licensee to donate or receive money, or any other thing of value, for the benefit of any person whatsoever. (BPC § 26011)

Background

Department of Cannabis Control (DCC). In 2021, the DCC was formally operational with licensing, regulatory and enforcement authority of cannabis regulation. Today, the DCC issues licenses to applicants, renews licenses and has enforcement authority for violations of cannabis laws and regulations.

Cannabis Control Appeals Panel (CCAP). Pursuant to Prop 64, the CCAP is designated in BPC § 260640, et seq. and is charged with reviewing licensing decisions issued by the DCC. The CCAP currently consists of five members: three appointed by the Governor, one by the Senate Committee on Rules, and one by the Speaker of the Assembly. Each member appointed by the Governor is required to be a resident of a different county from the other two at the time of their initial appointment. Members of the CCAP may not from engage in activities in the cannabis space to ensure that they are not financially motivated in the execution of their responsibilities as overseers of the state's licensed cannabis industry. Specifically, BPC § 26011 provides that neither the director of DCC nor a CCAP member may do any of the following:

- Receive any commission or profit whatsoever, directly or indirectly, from any person applying for or receiving any license or permit under MAUCRSA.
- Engage or have any interest in the sale or any insurance covering a licensee's business or premises.
- Engage or have any interest in the sale of equipment for use upon the premises of a licensee engaged in commercial cannabis activity.
- Knowingly solicit any licensee for the purchase of tickets for benefits or contributions for benefits.
- Knowingly request any licensee to donate or receive money, or any other thing of value, for the benefit of any person whatsoever.

Per BPC § 26010.5 the director of the DCC is authorized to employ and appoint employees and to delegate their powers and duties to a deputy director, assistant director, or chief. MAUCRSA then expressly authorizes the Governor to appoint a chief deputy director, a deputy director of equity and inclusion, and either a deputy director of legal affairs or a chief counsel to the DCC. These additional appointed officials arguably exercise significant influence over the DCC's activities and are similarly trusted to oversee the cannabis industry. This bill intends to recognize this influence by extending the same conflict of interest provisions that apply to the director of DCC and members of CCAP to these additional appointees.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/18/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/18/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/27/25

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bennett, Jeff Gonzalez, Nguyen

Prepared by: Elissa Silva / B., P. & E.D. / 916-651-4104
8/20/25 23:15:52

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 736
Author: Wicks (D), Haney (D) and Quirk-Silva (D), et al.
Amended: 4/10/25 in Assembly
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 8-1, 4/21/26

AYES: Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Padilla

NOES: Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Ochoa Bogh

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-11, 6/3/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: The Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2026

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This urgency bill authorizes the Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2026 to place a \$10 billion housing bond on the June 2, 2026 primary election ballot to fund production of affordable housing and supportive housing.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorized the Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, which provided \$4 billion in funding, including \$1 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) program and \$3 billion for various affordable housing programs.

- 2) Establishes the Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) at the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to assist the new construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing for lower income households through loans to local governments and non- and for-profit developers.
- 3) Establishes the Portfolio Reinvestment Program to provide loans or grants to rehabilitate, capitalize operating subsidy or replacement reserves for, and extend the long-term affordability of HCD-funded housing projects that have an affordability restriction that has expired, that have an affordability restriction with a remaining term of less than 10 years, or are otherwise at-risk for conversion to market-rate housing.
- 4) Establishes the Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program (Serna Program) at HCD to finance the new construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of owner-occupied and rental units for agricultural workers, with a priority for lower income households.
- 5) Establishes CalHome at HCD to provide grants to local public agencies and non-profit developers to assist individuals and households through deferred-payment loans. The funds provide direct, forgivable loans to assist development projects involving multiple ownership units, including single-family subdivisions.
- 6) Authorizes CalHFA to provide first time homebuyer assistance, including but not limited to a deferred-payment, low-interest, subordinate mortgage loan, including down payment assistance, closing cost assistance, or both, to make financing affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds to fund the following programs:
 - a) \$5 billion to MHP. At least 10% of units in a MHP development must be available for extremely low-income households;
 - b) \$1.7 billion to supportive housing administered through the MHP program. Requires HCD to offer capitalized operating subsidy reserves for supportive housing developments receiving funding;

- c) \$800 million for the Portfolio Reinvestment Program, which provides funding to rehabilitate, fund short-term capitalized operating subsidy reserve, and extend the long-term affordability of HCD-funded rental multifamily housing projects that are at-risk of conversion to market-rate housing;
 - d) \$250 million for the Tribal Housing Grant Program;
 - e) \$500 million for a program to be created by the Legislature that funds acquisition and rehabilitation of unrestricted housing units (*i.e.*, unsubsidized housing that may naturally be affordable) and the attachment of long-term affordability restrictions to the units;
 - f) \$1 billion to the CalHOME Program and the My Home down payment assistance program administered by the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA);
 - g) \$350 million to the Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing (Serna) Program; and
 - h) \$400 million to the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program of 2019, which promotes infill housing development by providing financial assistance for the infrastructure and adaptive reuse that is an integral part of, or necessary to facilitate the development of affordable and mixed-income housing.
- 2) Authorizes the Legislature to amend any law related to programs, which have been allocated funds by the bond, to further improve the efficacy and effectiveness of those programs.
 - 3) Authorizes the Legislature to reallocate funds authorized by the bond to effectively promote affordable housing in the state.
 - 4) Authorizes HCD to disperse funds made available through the bond to housing developments during the construction period.

Background

Affordable housing finance generally. California has the largest concentration of severely unaffordable housing markets in the nation, with the average home value in California at \$877,285. To keep up with demand, the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimates that California must plan for the development of more than 2.5 million homes by 2031, 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).

Developing housing that is affordable to very low- and low-income families almost always requires some amount of public investment. Unlike market-rate housing, tenants in affordable housing are only required to pay 30% of their income toward rent, so the state provides enough long-term subsidy to reduce the overall debt service on a development. The high cost of land and construction, as well as regulatory barriers, in California generally makes it economically impossible to build new housing that can be sold or rented at prices affordable to such households. The private sector sometimes provides financial subsidies or land donations mandatorily through inclusionary zoning policies or voluntarily through density bonus ordinances, described below. In most cases, however, some amount of public financial subsidy is needed from federal, state, and/or local governments.

Comments

- 1) *Publicly available funds for affordable housing.* Prior to 1974, the federal government invested heavily in affordable housing construction. When those units began to deteriorate, the Housing Community and Development Act ended most new construction of public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8) was created in its place. This new program allowed eligible tenants to pay only a portion of their rent (based on their income) and shifted funds from public housing authorities to the private sector. The goal was to eliminate concentrations of low-income people in housing developments. In 1981, the Reagan administration dismantled federal affordable housing funding. From 1978 to 1983, the funding for low- to moderate-income housing decreased by 77%. In 1970, there were 300,000 more low-cost rental units (6.5 million) than low-income renter households (6.2 million). By 1985, however, the number of low-cost units had fallen to 5.6 million, and the number of low-income renter households had grown to 8.9 million, a disparity of 3.3 million units. Federal investments have not gone back up to pre-1978 levels, and measures like the Faircloth amendment hamstringing federal investments in new publicly-funded affordable units.

At the state level, California has invested significantly in affordable housing construction and rehabilitation in recent years through the passage of one-time discretionary actions in the budget and the passage of voter approved bonds.

Only in the last few years have the Legislature and Governor allocated General Fund dollars to affordable housing programs. Beginning in 2019, an unprecedented \$8 billion from the General Fund has gone to a variety of

affordable housing programs. The Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018 (Proposition 1), authorized \$3 billion to fund state affordable housing programs and \$1 billion for the CalVet program, which provides advantageous mortgages to veterans. All of the funding from the bond will be fully allocated by the end of 2023. Proposition 2 of 2018 authorized the state to issue \$2 billion in General Obligations bonds against revenues from the Mental Health Services Act for purposes of funding the No Place Like Home Program (NPLH). Those funds supported the construction of over 7,000 supportive housing units and the funds are now exhausted.

It should be noted that of these investments, only funds from the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program (AHSC), federal and state low income housing tax credits, and funds from SB 2 (Atkins, Chapter 364, Statutes of 2017), are ongoing sources of funding.

These investments, while critical, have not made up for decades of disinvestment from the federal level, resulting in a supply-side shortage of affordable housing to meet the growing demand. Significant ongoing investments are necessary to meet the current undersupply of housing affordable to lower-income families. According to the bill sponsors, California has nearly 45,000 shovel-ready affordable homes that cannot move forward due to lack of gap financing.

- 2) *Who benefits from affordable housing?* Most subsidized affordable housing developments are built for families and individuals with incomes of 60% or less than AMI; as noted above, AMI is set regionally and means different things in different areas of the state. While these income limits may seem low, many “middle-class” and working families fall into low-income categories due to the high cost of housing. For example, a renter earning minimum wage (such as a pre-school teacher, janitor, or retail employee) needs to earn 2.8 times the state minimum wage to afford the average asking rent in California. The average beginning elementary school teacher in California makes between \$55,000 - \$62,000 per year and a beginning high school teacher makes between \$55,000 and \$67,000 per year¹, which in some areas of the state falls into the low- or even very low-income categories.
- 3) *A renewed GO Bond for Housing.* According to the sponsors, this new bond could produce more than 40,000 new affordable homes for lower-income

¹ Statewide Average Salaries and Expenditure Percentages: 2023-24. California Department of Education. Accessible here: [Average Salaries & Expenditure Percentage - CalEdFacts \(CA Dept of Education\)](#)

households, preserve more than 5,500 existing units, create more than 53,000 construction jobs, and generate \$1.3 billion in state and local tax revenue. This bill would provide \$1.75 billion to supportive housing for people at-risk or experiencing homelessness. In addition, the bond would require that 10% of any units created through MHP go to people who are extremely low-income (at or below 30% of area median income), who may be at greater risk of homelessness. It would also reinvest in the Serna Program and CalHOME. These three programs benefited from funding through Proposition 1.

The bond would also fund a new program contemplated by SB 1091 (Caballero, 2026). That program would support the acquisition and rehabilitation of unrestricted housing units and attach long-term affordability restrictions to the units.

This bill is substantially similar to SB 417 (Cabaldon, 2026), which is pending in the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee. Below is a chart comparing the funding proposed in both bills.

Program Funded	AB 736 (Wicks) Housing Bond (\$10 BN)	SB 417 (Cabaldon) Housing Bond (\$10 BN)
Multifamily Housing Program (MHP)	\$5 BN (at least 10% to ELI)	\$5.25 BN ² (at least 10% for ELI)
MHP Supportive Housing	\$1.7 BN	\$1.75 BN
CalHome	\$1 BN combined for both	\$1 BN combined for both
Downpayment Assistance Program (CalHFA)		
Portfolio Reinvestment Program (PRP)	\$800 MN	\$800 MN
Infill Infrastructure Grant Program of 2019	\$400 MN	Funds for this program included in \$5.25 BN for MHP above

² This also includes funds for the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program of 2019.

Tribal Housing Grant Program (SB 1187, McGuire, 2024)	\$250 MN	\$250 MN
Joe Serna Jr., Farmworker Housing Program	\$350 MN	\$250 MN
NEW Community Anti-Displacement and Preservation Program (contemplates SB 225, Caballero, 2024)	\$500 MN	\$500 MN
NEW Wildfire Prevention, rental assistance, and affordable housing construction program	\$0	\$200 MN

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Bond costs: Total principal and interest costs to pay off the bonds would be approximately \$17.88 billion (\$10 billion in principal and \$7.88 billion in interest), with average annual debt service payments of \$596 million (General Fund), when all bonds are sold, and assuming a 30-year maturity and an interest rate of 4.25% (the all-in true interest rate secured by the State Treasurer at recent \$2.4 billion general obligation bond sale). If interest rates increase to 5% in the near future, annual debt service would be approximately \$651 million (General Fund) and total principal and interest costs over the repayment period would be approximately \$19.5 billion. Staff notes that this bill explicitly authorizes a maturity date of up to 35 years from the date of issuance of each bond. The estimated annual debt service costs would be lower, but total interest costs would be higher over the repayment period, if the bonds are sold with a 35-year maturity date.
- Administrative costs: The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) would incur significant increased staffing and operations costs to administer the various housing programs funded by this Bond Act (Affordable Housing Bond Act Trust Fund of 2026). HCD expects to utilize up to 5% of bond proceeds dedicated to the programs it administers, or up to \$465 million in total, for administrative costs. See staff comments.

The California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), which administers the Downpayment Assistance Program, does not anticipate significant additional administrative costs as a result of this measure.

- Ballot costs: One-time Secretary of State (SOS) costs, likely in the range of \$4 million in the current fiscal year (General Fund), to generate and mail a supplemental pamphlet to voters for the June 2, 2026 primary election, due to the compressed timeline and deadlines in the Elections Code for measures to be included in the main Voter Information Guide pamphlet that is mailed to voters. Staff notes that this timeline is infeasible. See Recommended Amendments below.

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/17/26)

A Community of Friends

Abode Housing Development

Acce Action (alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment)

All Home

Alliance for Housing and Healing

Allied Framers LLC

Alta Housing

Amazon.com

Architects Fora

Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California

Associated Builders and Contractors of California

Berkeley City Councilmember Igor Tregub

Better Opportunities Builder, INC.

Bolinas Community Land Trust

Brilliant Corners

Brooks + Scarpa

Buen Vecino

CAA Consultants

Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation

California Apartment Association

California Association of Councils of Governments

California Building Industry Association

California Center for Cooperative Development

California Coalition for Community Investment

California Coalition for Rural Housing

California Community Land Trust Network

California Council for Affordable Housing
California Department of Education
California Housing Consortium
California Housing Partnership
California National Organization for Women
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California-hawaii State Conference of the NAACP
Care Clt (a Division of Care Assn, Inc)
Champions for Progress INC.
Chelro Care Institute
Chinatown Community Development Center
Christian Church Homes
City of Anaheim
City of Culver City
City of Norwalk
City of Riverside
City of Santa Ana Councilwoman Jessie Lopez
City of Soledad
City of Woodland
Coachella Valley Housing Coalition
Collective Operation
Community Corp. of Santa Monica
Corporation for Supportive Housing
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Courage California
Destination: Home
Disability Rights California
Drug Policy Alliance
Eah Housing
East Bay Housing Organization - Ebho
East Bay Yimby
Eden Housing
Eden I&r, INC.
Endangered Habitats League
Enterprise Community Loan Fund
Enterprise Community Partners, INC.
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco
Equal Rights Advocates
Eviction Defense Network
Fantastic Calculator

Firm Foundation Community Housing
Fresno Housing Authority
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Fsy Architects, INC
Generation Housing
Grow the Richmond
Heavin Helps
Homes & Hope
Hope Solutions
Housing Accelerator Fund
Housing Action Coalition
Housing Authority of City of Santa Paula
Housing Authority of the City of San Buenaventura
Housing Authority of the City of San Luis Obispo
Housing California
Housing El Dorado
Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County
Housing Now!
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Human Good
Human Impact Partners
Indivisible Ca: Statestrong
Initiate Justice
Inland Abundant Housing & Housing and Homeless Collaborative of Claremont
Inland Empire Health Plan Foundation
Inland So Cal Housing Collective
Inner City Law Center
League of Women Voters of California
Legal Aid of Sonoma County
Let Spirit Lead, INC.
Lifehouse, INC
Lifesteps
Lift to Rise
Lighthouse Silicon Valley
Lisc San Diego
Making Housing and Community Happen
Mayor Daniel Lurie, City and County of San Francisco
Midpen Housing Corporation
Mission Economic Development Agency
Mithun

Monterey Bay Economic Partnership
Monterey Peninsula Yimby
Mountain View Yimby
Move California
Napa-solano for Everyone
National Alliance to End Homelessness
National Housing Law Project
Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services INC
Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California
Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority
Northern Dreamcatcher
Northern Neighbors
Oxnard Union High School District
Path Ventures
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing Orange County
People's Self-help Housing
Pep Housing
Pico California
Public Interest Law Project
Public Counsel
Redwood Community Services
Related California
Resources for Community Development
Sacramento Area Congregation Together
Sacramento Community Land Trust
Sacramento Housing Alliance
Sacramento Transit Advocates and Riders STAR
Saida + Sullivan Design Partners
San Francisco Community Land Trust
San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
San Francisco Yimby
San Jose Yimby
San Mateo Forward
Santa Clara County Housing Authority
Santa Cruz Yimby
Santa Rosa Yimby
Self Help Enterprises
Self-help Enterprises
Self-help for the Elderly

Serving Seniors
Sf Yimby
Sierra Business Council
Sloco Yimby
South Bay Yimby
Southern California Association of Non-profit Housing
Supportive Housing Alliance
Supportive Housing Community Land Alliance
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
The Unity Council
Two Valleys Community Land Trust
United Way Bay Area
University of California
Ventura County Yimby
Ventura Homeless Prevention
Victor Valley Family Resource Center
Visalia; City of
Women's Empowerment
Yes! in Redwood City
Yimby Action
Yimby Los Angeles
Yimby Monterey Peninsula
Yimby Oceanside
Yimby Slo
Yolo Yimby
Young Community Developers
Zillow Group

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/17/26)

Habitat for Humanity California

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “Housing affordability is the number one issue for lower income Californians. The Affordable Housing Bond of 2026 will help produce and preserve tens of thousands of affordable housing units over several years, serving hundreds of thousands of lower income households over the following decades. And because every \$1 spent by the state is matched by \$4 from federal tax credits, local grants, and rent payments from the residents, the Affordable Housing Bond of 2026 is a smart investment.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Habitat for Humanity California is opposed to this bill unless it is amended “to designate a \$1 billion appropriation specifically to the CalHome Program to increase the production of affordable homes for ownership in our state.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-11, 6/3/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Fariás, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Castillo, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Macedo, Sanchez, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Chen, Hoover, Ta

Prepared by: Alison Hughes / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124
5/17/26 9:09:05

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1377
Author: McKinnor (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: 27

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 4-0, 7/9/25
AYES: McNerney, Ashby, Grayson, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/29/25
AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-5, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Income taxes: credits: motion picture credit

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill removes the option for applicants to make a good faith effort to meet the diversity goals in their diversity work plans to receive an additional 4% Motion Picture and Television Production Tax Credit amount, effective in the 2025 taxable year.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Allows various income tax credits and deductions, as well as sales and use tax exemptions.
- 2) Enacts a tax credit against the Personal Income and Corporation Taxes for producing qualified motion pictures with a minimum production budget of at least \$1 million at a certified studio construction project, in which the qualified taxpayer claiming a credit must have at least 50% ownership or a ten-year lease

with the soundstage, using most of the same definitions and requirements from the motion picture production credit detailed below (SB 144, Portantino, Chapter 114, Statutes of 2021). The California Film Commission (CFC) can allocate \$150 million in credits for qualified motion pictures, but cannot allocate more than \$12 million in total or \$750,000 per episode.

- 3) Enacts a tax credit against the Personal Income and Corporation Taxes for qualified motion picture production in California, directing CFC to allocate \$750 million in credits each fiscal year starting in 2025-26 and continuing through 2029-30 (SB 132 Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review, Chapter 56, Statutes of 2023; SB 132, Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review, Chapter 17, Statutes of 2025; AB 1138, Zbur, Chapter 27, Statutes of 2025); CFC can allocate credits to “qualified motion pictures” that:
 - a) Have 75% of the motion picture shooting days take place in California, or have 75% of the production budget incurred within the state for services or the purchase or rental of property;
 - b) Commence principal photography after the date CFC approves its application, but before 180 days after the date of approval, and finish within 30 months from the date when the application was approved by the CFC, with some exceptions;
 - c) Obtain a copyright from the United States Copyright Office; and
 - d) Provide a workplace diversity plan checklist.
- 4) Provides that a qualified motion picture includes:
 - a) A feature with a minimum production budget of at least \$1 million; however, no more than \$120 million in qualified expenditures count for purposes of generating the credit.
 - b) An independent film, defined as a motion picture that is produced by a company that is neither publicly traded, nor more than 30% owned by publicly traded companies.
 - c) A television series that relocated to California, defined as one that had 75% of the principal photography of the most recent season conducted outside the state.

- d) A live action or animated series produced in California with a run time of 20 minutes or more on average, with a minimum budget of \$1 million per episode.
 - e) Animated films produced in California with a \$1 million budget or more.
 - f) A large-scale competition show produced in California with a minimum budget of \$1 million per episode.
 - g) A pilot for a new live action or animated series with a run time of 20 minutes or more on average, produced in California with a minimum budget of \$1 million per episode.
- 5) Provides that the amount of the tax credit is equal to either:
- a) 35% of the qualified production expenditures for films, television series, pilots, or independent films, or
 - b) 40% of the qualified expenditures for relocating television.
- 6) States that qualified expenditures are amounts paid or incurred to purchase or lease tangible personal property, pay wages and fringe benefits, or contract for services performed in the state during production in California.
- 7) Excludes from qualified expenditures any amounts paid to writers, directors, music directors, music composers, music supervisors, producers, or performers, other than background actors.
- 8) Requires applicants to file an application with the CFC that includes specified information, including data regarding the diversity of the workforce employed by the applicant, and, if applicable, a summary of the applicant's voluntary programs to increase the representation of minorities and women in the job classifications.
- 9) Allows credit "uplifts" for productions when they incurred qualified expenditures for:
- a) Filming outside the Los Angeles zone (5%), as defined;
 - b) Visual effects expenditures, where at least 75% or a minimum of \$10 million is paid or incurred in California (5%); and

- c) Local-hire labor for feature films, new TV series, recurring TV series, pilots, and miniseries (10%), as well as independent films or relocating TV series (5%).
- 10) Directs CFC to increase the total credit amount allocated to an applicant by up to 2% of the initial credit amount for qualified productions that employ trainees from a Career Pathways Program.
 - 11) Requires CFC to include on a tax credit application the diversity of the workforce employed by the applicant, including the ethnic and racial makeup of the individuals employed by the applicant during the production of the qualified motion picture, to the extent possible.
 - 12) Precludes CFC from allocating credits unless applicants supplied aggregate data for individuals whose wages cannot generate credits (such as actors, writers, and directors), including their gender, ethnic, and racial makeup.
 - 13) Under the soundstage and general production credit, limits the overall credit amount to 96%, unless the qualified taxpayer chooses to submit a diversity work plan, and CFC determines that the applicant has met or made a good-faith effort to meet the diversity goals in its diversity work plan.
 - 14) Requires CFC to certify an additional 4% when the qualified taxpayers submit the following to CFC:
 - a) A diversity work plan within 30 days after receiving a credit allocation letter, which must be consistent with the diversity work plan checklist to address diversity and be broadly reflective of California's population in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, veteran status, disability status, and ZIP code for members of the workforce whose wages are excluded from qualified expenditures.
 - b) A statement of the diversity goals the motion picture will seek to achieve in terms of qualified wages, and for individuals whose wages are excluded from qualified wages.
 - c) A plan of what strategies the motion picture will employ to achieve its diversity goals.
 - d) An interim assessment, and a final assessment, of whether it is meeting its diversity work plan.

- 15) Directs CFC to approve or reject diversity work plans to the extent allowed by state and federal law.
- 16) Requires CFC to also annually report diversity data supplied by applicants, commencing June 30, 2027, including an assessment of whether the diversity work plan goals are met for productions that submitted a final assessment.
- 17) Requires assessments to include accounts of diversity work plans submitted, interim assessments submitted, and final assessments submitted, as well as diversity checklist information.
- 18) Requires CFC to submit each assessment to the Legislature.
- 19) Directs CFC to adopt rules and regulations implementing voluntary programs designed to increase the representation of minorities and women in certain job classifications and to establish the Career Pathways Training program.
- 20) Requires CFC to identify a fiscal agent with direct relationships to industry skills training programs to manage the funds; and engage labor-management jointly administered training programs with skills training focused on the entertainment industry to implement the Program with CFC approval and oversight.
- 21) Requires applicants receiving a credit allocation letter under the current credit program to make a financial contribution to fund the Program for individuals from underserved communities to receive training for careers in the industry of 0.5% of the credit amount, which CFC can increase in 0.25% increments up to 1% after January 1, 2028.
- 22) Directs the Program to work with nonprofit organizations that have an established record of training and job placement in the entertainment industry, focus on training individuals from traditionally underserved communities, and offer training courses focused on skilled, technical positions that would be eligible for qualified wages if performed on a qualified motion picture as well as administrative- and industry-related technical occupations or soft skills training for the motion picture industry.
 - a) Require CFC to expand the number of nonprofit organizations that partner with the Career Pathways Program to provide access to the widest cross-section of Californians, including historically disadvantaged and underrepresented individuals seeking training and employment opportunities in motion picture and television production.

- b) Direct CFC to establish an application process for these nonprofit organizations, with applications submitted to the fiscal agent as part of a request for proposal process.
- c) Set forth a series of requirements for CFC to initiate and sequence the request for proposal process.
- d) Direct CFCs to approve Career Pathways Programs, and requires them to meet all of the following requirements:
 - i) Be conducted by a nonprofit organization that has an established record of training and job placement in the entertainment industry.
 - ii) Be focused on training individuals 18 years or older from traditionally underserved communities.
 - iii) Offer training courses focused on one or more of the following:
 - (1) Skilled, technical positions that would be eligible for qualified wages if performed on a qualified motion picture.
 - (2) Administrative- and industry-related technical occupations.
 - (3) Soft skills training.

This bill:

- 1) Amends the soundstage and 4.0 credits in the Personal Income and Corporation Tax laws to delete the option for applicants to show a good faith effort for CFC to certify an additional 4% credit amount. Instead, the 4% augmentation would be contingent on a finding by the CFC that the qualified taxpayer has met the diversity goals in its diversity work plan.
- 2) Applies commencing in the 2025 taxable year.
- 3) Makes conforming changes.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) notes that the revenue impact of this bill is unknown. To calculate the magnitude of its potential impact to the General Fund, FTB would need to know (1) the frequency of taxpayers meeting the

diversity workplan goal, and (2) the amount of additional credits allocated. FTB assumes that the motion picture credit will be fully allocated each year, and assumes that if taxpayers meet the requisite diversity plan requirements, they would generate more credits than they would have otherwise. The annual impact would likely be less than \$100,000.

- The California Film Commission (CFC) indicates that it would incur annual General Fund costs of \$919,000 to support five positions to implement the provisions of the bill. Additionally, CFC estimates a one-time General Fund cost of \$150,000 to update forms and contract for external consulting and software services to support to tutorial and educational materials (See Staff Comments).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/25)

California Arts Advocates
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
Entertainment Union Coalition
Five Individuals

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “AB 1377 builds on the important work of expanding the state’s film and television tax credit program by requiring studios who opt-in to participate in optional diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility tax credits to actually complete the plans that the studios themselves develop and submit to the California Film Commission. It’s simple math. If a studio chooses to apply for additional DEIA tax credits, they actually need to do the work they are committing to do. Currently, studios only have to demonstrate a good faith effort to accomplish diversity goals in order to receive these additional tax credits. And frankly, just a good faith effort is not good enough. It is a false choice for anyone to say that California has to choose between retaining and growing jobs in the film and television industries and increasing the diversity of its workforce. The film industry can and must do both.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-5, 6/2/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson,

Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: DeMaio, Ellis, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Ta

Prepared by: Colin Grinnell / REV. & TAX. / (916) 651-4117
8/31/25 16:55:41

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 1549
Author: Krell (D)
Introduced: 1/7/26
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 3/16/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Alternative domestic violence program

SOURCE: California State Association of Counties

DIGEST: This bill extends the sunset date of the pilot program authorizing specified counties to offer an alternative batterer's intervention program (BIP) from July 1, 2026 to July 1, 2030, and adds Sacramento County as one of the authorized counties that can participate in the pilot program.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) States that a person who willfully inflicts corporal injury resulting in a traumatic condition upon the offender's spouse or former spouse, cohabitant or former cohabitant, fiancé, someone with whom the offender has, or previously had, a dating relationship, or the mother or father of the offender's child, is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for two, three, or four years, or in a county jail for no longer than one year, or a fine of up to \$6,000 or by both fine and imprisonment. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 273.5, subds. (a), (b).)
- 2) Requires a defendant who receives probation for a domestic violence offense to successfully complete a BIP lasting for a period not less than one year with periodic progress reports by the program to the court every three months or less

and weekly sessions of a minimum of two hours class time. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (a)(6).)

- 3) Requires a defendant to attend consecutive weekly sessions, unless granted an excused absence for good cause by the program for no more than three individual sessions during the entire program, and to complete the program within 18 months. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (a)(6).)
- 4) Requires that approved programs be designed to stop domestic violence and include, among other things, structured group sessions focused on offender accountability, education regarding the dynamics and impacts of abuse, victim notification procedures, and regular reporting to the court and probation department, among other required components. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (c).)
- 5) Requires a defendant convicted of an offense against any of the following persons to complete a BIP: a spouse or former spouse, a cohabitant or former cohabitant, a person the offender was in a dating or engagement relationship with, the mother or father of the offender's child, the child, or any person related to the offender by blood or marriage in the first or second degree. (Family (Fam.) Code, § 6211.)
- 6) Authorizes the Counties of Napa, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Yolo to offer a program for individuals convicted of domestic violence that does not comply with the components of the BIP otherwise outlined in state law, if the program meets certain requirements. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a).)
- 7) Requires the counties above to develop the program in consultation with the domestic violence service providers and other relevant community partners. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(1).)
- 8) Requires the counties above to perform a risk and needs assessment utilizing an assessment demonstrated to be appropriate for domestic violence offenders for each offender entering the program. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(2).)
- 9) Requires that the offender's treatment within the program be based on the findings of the risk and needs assessment. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(3).)

- 10) Requires the program to include components that are evidence-based or promising practices. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(4).)
- 11) Requires the program to have a comprehensive written curriculum that informs the operations of the program and outlines the treatment and intervention modalities. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(5).)
- 12) Requires the offender's treatment within the program to be not less than one year in length, unless an alternative length is established by a validated risk and needs assessment completed by the probation department or an organization approved by the probation department. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(6).)
- 13) Requires the counties to collect data on participants in the program, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(7).)
- 14) Requires the counties to report all of the following information annually to the Legislature:
 - a) The risk and needs assessment tool used for the program;
 - b) The curriculum used by each program;
 - c) The number of participants with a program length other than one year, and the alternative program lengths used;
 - d) Individual data on the number of offenders participating in the program; and,
 - e) Other individual data that the county is required by law to collect, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a)(8)(A)-(E).)
- 15) Defines "evidence-based program or practice" as a program or practice that has a high level of research indicating its effectiveness, determined as a result of multiple rigorous evaluations including randomized controlled trials and evaluations that incorporate strong comparison group designs, or a single large multisite randomized study, and, typically, has specified procedures that allow for successful replication. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (c)(1).)
- 16) Defines "promising program or practice" as a program or practice that has some research demonstrating its effectiveness but does not meet the full criteria for an evidence-based designation. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (c)(2).)

- 17) Provides that the law authorizing the named counties to operate alternative BIPs sunsets on July 1, 2026. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (f).

This bill:

- 1) Extends the sunset date of the pilot program authorizing specified counties to offer an alternative BIP to July 1, 2030.
- 2) Adds Sacramento County as one of the authorized counties that can participate in the pilot program.

Background

In California, it is a felony to willfully inflict a physical injury that results in a traumatic condition on an intimate partner, including a spouse, former spouse, a current or previous cohabitant, a person the offender was in a dating or engagement relationship with, or the mother or father of the offender's child. (Pen. Code, § 273.5, subds. (a), (b).)

When a person is convicted of a domestic violence offense and granted probation, state law requires the court to impose specific mandatory conditions. One of those conditions is participation in a BIP. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (a).) A BIP is a court-ordered counseling and educational program for individuals convicted of domestic violence offenses. State law sets minimum requirements for BIPs. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (c).) Offenders who receive probation must complete at least one year in a BIP and participate in weekly group sessions. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (a)(6).) BIPs must include content designed to promote accountability for abusive behavior, educate participants about the impact of domestic violence on victims and children, and encourage the development of nonviolent relationship skills. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (c)(1)(F).) BIPs are required to provide regular progress reports to the court and probation department on the participant's progress in the program. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (c)(1)(O).) County probation departments are responsible for approving and monitoring these programs to ensure compliance with statutory standards. (Pen. Code, § 1203.097, subd. (c)(5).)

Existing law allows selected counties to provide alternative BIPs in place of the existing BIPs counties are required to offer. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (a).) Alternative BIPs allow the county more flexibility to update program design elements, including curriculum and program length, while not constrained by the

standards in existing law. (*Ibid.*) If an individual who is convicted of domestic violence receives probation and is located within a participating county, that individual can be enrolled in an alternative BIP, likely with an updated program design, and upon completion will be deemed to have met the existing BIP requirements. (Pen. Code, § 1203.099, subd. (b).)

In October 2022, the California State Auditor issued an audit of the state’s existing BIPs. The Auditor examined the administration and oversight by the probation departments and courts in five counties—Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Los Angeles, and San Joaquin. The Auditor found that persons convicted of domestic violence who completed a BIP recidivated in 20 percent of cases. (Cal. State Auditor, *Batterer Intervention Programs: State Guidance and Oversight Are Needed to Effectively Reduce Domestic Violence*, Rep. No. 2021-113 (Oct. 2022) <<https://information.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2021-113.pdf> [as of May 28, 2026].) However, nearly 50% of program participants reviewed by the Auditor did not complete the program, and 65% of those participants later reoffended. (*Ibid.*) The State Auditor found “probation departments did not consistently assess all offenders for underlying issues, such as mental health or substance abuse concerns, that might interfere with an offender’s ability to complete a program.” (*Id.* at p. 2.) The auditor also reported that “probation departments, program providers, and courts generally did not hold many of the offenders we reviewed accountable for probation and program violations.” (*Ibid.*) “Program providers did not supervise offenders appropriately or report required information.” (*Ibid.*)

AB 372 (Stone, Chapter 290, Statutes of 2018), authorized the Counties of Napa, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Yolo to offer an alternative BIP for individuals convicted of domestic violence that does not need to comply with existing requirements for batterer’s programs. These alternative BIPs have been used by counties to update program design elements including curriculum, program length, risk assessment factors, oversight, and other program design considerations.

Each year, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) is required to submit an annual report to the Legislature assessing the effectiveness of the pilot program and reporting on specified data. The most recent report states:

Five years into the AB 372 Pilot and across six counties, more than 6,900 people have entered the program. For those who entered the program in the fourth year, half (50%) had shown a positive completion of the program. One in six had a negative completion

(16%) and over one third (34%) had a neutral, pending, or unknown completion status. (CSAC, *AB 372 Year 5 Legislative Report* (Sept. 2025) <<https://www.counties.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/AB372-Year-5-Legislative-Report.pdf> [as of May 28, 2026].)

A recent Sacramento County Grand Jury report identified concerns with the existing BIPs in the county, regarding completion rates, data collection, provider oversight, and the absence of validated risk assessment tools. The grand jury report states that “the program in Sacramento County has had virtually no change in treatment intervention (method, curriculum, and philosophy/approach) since its inception, and there is no standardized assessment tool to determine the offender’s risk for reoffending at the completion of the program.” (Sacramento County Grand Jury, *Adding Insult to Injury: The Systematic Failure of the Sacramento County Batterer's Treatment Program* (2024-2025 Rep.)

<<https://sacgrandjury.org/docs/reports/24-25/gj-batterers-treatment-program.pdf> [as of May 28, 2026].) “Probation estimates that the [program] failure rate could be as high as 95%.” (*Ibid.*) The report notes that the program is ineffective in part because offenders must pay for the program and because the program is retributive, rather than rehabilitative. (*Ibid.*)

However, it is still unclear whether program completion rates are generally stronger for the alternative BIPs when compared to the existing BIPs in other counties. Due to data limitations surrounding recidivism measurement time, recidivism rates for individual counties are not presented in the report. (*Id.* at pp. 15-16.)

This bill extends the sunset date of the pilot program authorizing specified counties to offer an alternative BIP from July 1, 2026 to July 1, 2030. This bill also adds Sacramento County as one of the authorized counties that can participate in the pilot program, due to concerns that the existing program in Sacramento is not achieving its goals.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

California State Association of Counties (source)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association

Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
Chief Probation Officers of California
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
County of Santa Barbara
County of Santa Clara
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Smart Justice California Impact

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

The Chief Probation Officers of California write:

To date, the work under AB 372 has led to local batterer intervention program modifications, curriculum advancements, briefs on California's domestic violence system, recidivism research, and annual reporting. After the first five years of implementation, over 6,900 individuals have entered programs across the six counties. While progress has been made in this area, there remains work to be done to expand evidence-based practices that will change thinking patterns, reduce anti-social behavior, and better understand the complex relationship between the risk of reoffending and treatment needs.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 3/16/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Lee, Patterson, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:14

**** END ****

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 1583
Author: Rogers (D)
Introduced: 1/13/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 3/12/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Criminal procedure: jurisdiction

SOURCE: Sonoma County District Attorney's Office

DIGEST: This bill expands jurisdiction for a criminal action for wage theft or labor trafficking to include the county in which the victim was present at the time the employment contract was entered into, the county in which any portion of the work was performed, or the county in which the business or any of its locations was situated at the time of the wage theft or labor trafficking; allows multiple related cases of wage theft and human trafficking to be tried in the same jurisdiction; and extends jurisdiction to all associated offenses connected together in their commission to an underlying wage theft or labor trafficking offense.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that every person who defrauds any other person of money, labor, or property, whether real or personal, or who fraudulently obtains the labor or service of another, is punishable in the same manner and extent as theft of the money or property so obtained. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 532, subd. (a).)
- 2) Makes it a misdemeanor to violate various sections of the Labor Code pertaining to employee compensation. (Labor (Lab.) Code, § 215.)

- 3) States that any person, or an agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, who does the following, is guilty of a misdemeanor:
 - a) Willfully refuses to pay wages due and payable after demand has been made, having the ability to pay; or,
 - b) Falsely denies the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to secure for himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due. (Lab. Code, § 216.)
- 4) States that in addition to, and independent from, any other penalty provided, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee shall be subject to the following penalties:
 - a) For each initial violation, \$100 for each failure to pay each employee; and,
 - b) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, \$200 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount willfully withheld. (Lab. Code, § 210.)
- 5) Defines “wages” for the above provisions to include all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, commission basis, or other method of calculation. (Lab. Code, § 200.)
- 6) States that the intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than \$950 from any one employee, or \$2,350 in the aggregate from two or more employees, by an employer in any consecutive 12-month period may be punished as grand theft, which is a felony. (Pen. Code, § 487m, subd. (a).)
- 7) Defines “theft of wages” for purposes of grand theft as the intentional deprivation of wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation by fraudulent or other unlawful means with the knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to the employee under the law. (Pen. Code, § 487m, subd. (b).)
- 8) Authorizes the Labor Commissioner to investigate employee complaints and provide for a hearing in any action to recover wages, penalties, and other demands for compensation, as provided. (Lab. Code, § 98, subd. (a).)

- 9) States that a person who deprives or violates the personal liberty of another with the intent to obtain forced labor or services is guilty of human trafficking and shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for 5, 8, or 12 years and a fine of not more than \$500,000. (Pen. Code, § 236.1, subd. (a).)
- 10) States that, except as otherwise provided by law, the jurisdiction of every public offense is in any competent court within the jurisdictional territory in which it is committed. (Pen. Code, § 777.)
- 11) States that when a public offense is committed in part in one jurisdictional territory and in part in another, the jurisdiction of such offense is in any competent court within either jurisdiction. (Pen. Code, § 781.)
- 12) Provides that when a criminal offense is committed on the boundary of two or more counties, or within 500 yards of the boundary, territorial jurisdiction is proper within either county. (Pen. Code, § 782.)
- 13) Permits consolidation of different offenses which do not relate to the same transaction or event where there is a common element of substantial importance in their commission, such as belonging to the same class of crimes. (Pen. Code, § 954.)
- 14) States that if property taken in one jurisdictional territory by burglary, carjacking, robbery, theft, or embezzlement has been brought into another, or when property is received in one jurisdictional territory with the knowledge that it has been stolen or embezzled and the property was stolen or embezzled in another jurisdictional territory, the jurisdiction of the offense is in any competent court within either jurisdictional territory. States that jurisdiction is also proper in any contiguous jurisdictional territory if the arrest is made within the contiguous territory, the prosecution secures on the record the defendant's knowing, voluntary, and intelligent waiver of the right of vicinage, and the defendant is charged with one or more property crimes in the arresting territory. (Pen. Code, § 786, subd. (a).)
- 15) Specifies that the jurisdiction of a criminal action for theft, as defined, also includes the county where an offense involving the theft or receipt of the stolen merchandise occurred, the county in which the merchandise was recovered, or the county where any act was done by the defendant in instigating, procuring,

promoting, or aiding in the commission of a theft offense. (Pen. Code, § 786.5, subd. (b).)

- 16) States that if multiple offenses of theft or receiving stolen property involving the same merchandise, the same scheme, or substantially similar activity occur in multiple jurisdictions, then any of those jurisdictions is a proper jurisdiction for all offenses. States that jurisdiction also extends to all associated offenses connected together in their commission to the underlying offenses. (Pen. Code, § 786.5, subd. (b).)
- 17) Provides that if one or more specified human trafficking, pimping, and pandering offenses occur in more than one jurisdictional territory, the jurisdiction of any of those offenses, and for any offenses properly joinable with that offense, is in any jurisdiction where at least one of the offenses occurred, subject to the following conditions:
- 18) Indicates the consolidation of the cases is subject to a joinder hearing, within the jurisdiction of the proposed trial court.
- 19) Requires that the prosecution presents written evidence that all district attorneys in counties with jurisdiction of the offenses agree to the venue.
- 20) Establishes that charged offenses from jurisdictions in which there is no written agreement from the district attorney must be returned to that county.
- 21) States that the court must consider the location and complexity of the likely evidence, where the majority of the offenses occurred, the rights of the defendant and the people, and the convenience of, or hardship to, the victims and witnesses. (Pen. Code, § 784.7, subd. (c).)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that the jurisdiction of a criminal action for wage theft, as specified, or labor trafficking, as specified, includes the county in which the victim resided at the time of the wage theft or labor trafficking, the county in which the victim was present at the time the employment contract was entered into, the county in which any portion of the work was performed, or the county in which the business or any of its locations was situated at the time of the wage theft or labor trafficking.

- 2) States that if multiple offenses of wage theft or labor trafficking involving the same defendant or defendants occur in multiple jurisdictions, then any of those jurisdictions is a proper jurisdiction for all of the offenses, subject to a hearing to determine if there is good cause to consolidate the cases. Requires that at the hearing, the prosecution must present written evidence that all district attorneys in counties with jurisdiction over the offenses agree to the venue. Requires that charged offenses from jurisdictions where there is not a written agreement from the district attorney be returned to that jurisdiction.
- 3) Extends jurisdiction to all associated offenses connected together in their commission to an underlying wage theft or labor trafficking offenses.

Background

Territorial jurisdiction for a criminal offense is generally proper in any competent court within the jurisdictional territory where it was committed. (Pen. Code, § 777.) In other words, criminal charges must normally be brought in the county where the crime is alleged to have happened. When an offense is committed in part in one jurisdictional territory and in part in another, the jurisdiction of such offense is in any competent court within either jurisdiction. (Pen. Code, § 781.)

Additionally, the rules governing joinder of criminal cases allow prosecutors to charge multiple offenses in a single accusatory pleading (in a single court) when there are two or more different offenses that are connected in their commission, different statements of the same offense, or two or more different offenses of the same class of crime. (Pen. Code, § 954.) A court may, in the interests of justice and for good cause shown, order the different offenses or counts in the accusatory pleading be tried separately or divided into two or more groups and each of said groups tried separately. (See *Belton v. Superior Court (People)* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 1279, 1281.)

Cases of human trafficking, sexual assault, kidnapping, burglary, assault with intent to commit a specified sex offense, homicide, theft, including retail theft and shoplifting, robbery, identity theft, incest, and revenge porn, that occur in multiple counties can be consolidated into a single trial, and then tried in a single county. (See Pen. Code, §§ 784.5, 784.7, 785, 786, 786.5, 789, 790, and 791.) The court still has discretion to separate these cases in the interest of justice and for good cause. (*Ibid.*) The court must consider the location and complexity of the likely evidence, where the majority of the offenses occurred, the rights of the defendant and the people, and the convenience of, or hardship to, victims and witnesses. Additionally, consolidation based on specified offenses against a single defendant

across multiple jurisdictions requires district attorneys in each county to agree to try all counts in one identified county.

Wage theft is punishable as a misdemeanor or felony in California, depending on the value of the wages stolen. Any person, or an agent, manager, superintendent, or officer of that person, who does the following is guilty of a misdemeanor:

- a) Having the ability to pay, willfully refuses to pay wages due and payable after demand has been made; or,
- b) Falsely denies the amount or validity thereof, or that the same is due, with intent to secure for himself, his employer or other person, any discount upon such indebtedness, or with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay or defraud, the person to whom such indebtedness is due. (Lab. Code, § 216.)

Existing law defines “wages” for the above provisions to include all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, commission basis, or other method of calculation. (Lab. Code, § 200.)

Additionally, the intentional theft of wages in an amount greater than \$950 from any one employee, or \$2,350 in the aggregate from two or more employees, by an employer in any consecutive 12-month period may be punished as grand theft, which is a felony. (Pen. Code, § 487m, subd. (a).) For purposes of grand theft, “theft of wages” is defined as the intentional deprivation of wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation by fraudulent or other unlawful means with the knowledge that the wages, gratuities, benefits, or other compensation is due to the employee under the law. (Pen. Code, § 487m, subd. (b).)

There is no jurisdiction statute specifically for wage theft. The jurisdiction of a criminal action for general theft, as specified, includes the county where an offense involving the theft or receipt of the stolen merchandise occurred, the county in which the merchandise was recovered, or the county where any act was done by the defendant in instigating, procuring, promoting, or aiding in the commission of a theft offense. If multiple offenses of theft occur in multiple jurisdictions, involving the same defendant or defendants and the same property or scheme, then any of those jurisdictions is a proper jurisdiction for all of the offenses, subject to a hearing. At the hearing, the prosecution must present written evidence that all district attorneys in counties with jurisdiction over the offenses agree to the venue. Charged offenses from jurisdictions where there is not a written agreement from

the district attorney must be returned to that jurisdiction. Jurisdiction also extends to all associated offenses connected together in their commission to the underlying theft offenses. (Pen. Code, § 786.5 (b).)

A person who deprives or violates the personal liberty of another with the intent to obtain forced labor or services is guilty of human trafficking which is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for 5, 8, or 12 years and a fine of not more than \$500,000. (Pen. Code, § 236.1, subd. (a).)

If more than one violation of the state's human trafficking statute occurs in more than one jurisdictional territory, the jurisdiction of any of those offenses, and for any offenses properly joinable with that offense, is in any jurisdiction where at least one of the offenses occurred, subject to a hearing. (Pen. Code, § 784.7, subd. (c).) In determining whether all counts in the complaint should be joined in one county for prosecution, the court must consider the location and complexity of the likely evidence, where the majority of the offenses occurred, the rights of the defendant and the people, and the convenience of, or hardship to, the victim or victims and witnesses. At the hearing, the prosecution must present written evidence that all district attorneys in counties with jurisdiction over the offenses agree to the venue. Charged offenses from jurisdictions where there is not a written agreement from the district attorney must be returned to that jurisdiction.

The existing code sections governing jurisdiction of a criminal action for theft do not specifically cover acts for wage theft, and only some cases of wage theft fit into existing code sections. This leads to uncertainty in wage theft investigations when workers face situations where their employer lives or works in a location separate from the one where they reside.

This bill allows for wage theft and labor trafficking to be tried in any county where: (a) a victim resided at the time of the wage theft or labor trafficking; (b) a victim was present at the time the employment contract was entered into; (c) any portion of the work was performed; or (d) the business or any of its locations were situated at the time of the wage theft or labor trafficking.

This section may be overly broad because, in some cases, these locations may not have a reasonable nexus to the commission of the crime. Where any portion of the work was performed could include a county where someone picked up a few tools for a roof installation and immediately left the county to perform the work. In that case, there may not be a nexus to the county.

This bill also provides that if multiple offenses of wage theft or labor trafficking involving the same defendant or defendants occur in multiple jurisdictions, then any of those jurisdictions is a proper jurisdiction for all of the offenses, subject to a hearing. At the hearing, the prosecution must present written evidence that all district attorneys in counties with jurisdiction over the offenses agree to the venue. Charged offenses from jurisdictions where there is not a written agreement from the district attorney must be returned to that jurisdiction.

Finally, this bill extends jurisdiction to all associated offenses connected together in their commission to the underlying wage theft or labor trafficking offenses.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Sonoma County District Attorney's Office (source)
California District Attorneys Association
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California District Attorneys Association writes:

Labor trafficking and wage theft remain some of the most egregious and profitable criminal enterprises in the world, often victimizing some of California's most vulnerable residents. Labor trafficking and wage theft victims are often subjected to coercive and continuous exploitation at the hands of their traffickers, who profit financially while causing profound and lasting harm to their victims.

AB 1583 strengthens California's response to labor trafficking by allowing labor trafficking and wage theft prosecutions to occur in the county where the theft or trafficking occurred, where the victim resided at the time of the theft or trafficking, where any portion of the work was performed, or where the business or any of its locations were situated. This measure also closes a critical loophole by expressly authorizing coordinated prosecutions for multi-jurisdiction offenders. In this regard, AB 1583 solves for labor trafficking and

wage theft prosecutions what several other key jurisdictional statutes have solved for human trafficking, identity theft, revenge pornography, and domestic violence prosecutions.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 3/12/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bonta, Castillo, Hoover, Johnson, Krell, Lowenthal, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Valencia

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:15

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1632
Author: Johnson (R)
Amended: 3/19/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-0, 5/7/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Trespass

SOURCE: City of Riverside

DIGEST: This bill removes the requirement that trespass letters of authorization be submitted in notarized writing on a law enforcement agency (LEA)-provided form.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that a person is guilty of misdemeanor trespass if they enter and occupy real property or structures of any kind without the consent of the owner, the owner's agent, or the person in lawful possession (hereafter "owner"). (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 602, subd. (m).)
- 2) Punishes trespass as a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in county jail for up to six months, a fine of up to \$1,000, or both. (Pen. Code, §§ 19, 602.)
- 3) Provides that a person is guilty of misdemeanor trespass if they refuse or fail to leave land, real property, or structures belonging to, or lawfully occupied by, another and not open to the general public, upon being requested to leave by the owner, or by a peace officer at the request of the owner upon being informed by the officer that they are acting at the request of the owner. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)

- 4) Requires the owner to make a separate request to an officer on each occasion when an officer's assistance in dealing with a trespass is requested. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 5) Authorizes an owner to make a single request for an officer's assistance, made in a notarized writing on an LEA-provided form, to cover up to 12 months or a period determined by local ordinance, whichever is shorter, and identified by specific dates, during a period where there is a fire hazard or the owner is absent from the premises or property. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 6) Authorizes an owner to make a single request for an officer's assistance, made in a notarized writing on an LEA-provided form, to cover up to 12 months when the premises or property is closed to the public and posted as being closed. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 7) Requires the requester to inform the LEA to which the request was made, in writing, if assistance is no longer desired before the 12-month authorization period expires. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 8) Specifies that this offense does not apply to persons engaged in lawful labor union activities that are permitted to be carried out on the property, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 9) Provides that land, real property, or structures owned or operated by a housing authority for tenants, as defined, constitutes property not open to the general public, although this offense does not apply to persons on the premises who are engaging in constitutionally protected activities, or who are there at the request of a resident or management and who are not loitering or otherwise suspected of violating a law or ordinance. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 10) Provides that a request for a peace officer's assistance shall expire upon transfer of ownership of the property or upon a change in the person in lawful possession. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 11) Provides that a request for an officer's assistance in dealing with a trespass may be submitted electronically, and a local government may accept electronic submissions of requests. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).)
- 12) Establishes numerous other trespass crimes, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 602, subds. (a)-(y).)

This bill:

- 1) Eliminates the requirement that the written request for officer assistance in dealing with a trespass be notarized.

Background

As a general rule, a person who enters and occupies real property or structures of any kind without the consent of the owner is guilty of misdemeanor trespass. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (m).) Trespass is typically a misdemeanor, though California law does include a felony for aggravated trespass. (Pen. Code, § 601.) For misdemeanor trespass, the penalty is up to six months of jail time or up to a \$1,000 fine, or both. (Pen. Code, §§ 19, 602.) California's primary trespass statute—Penal Code section 602—has nearly an entire alphabet of subdivisions. Most of the subdivisions in Section 602 define separate crimes, typically each with slightly different elements than the other subdivisions.

Most relevant to this bill, a person is guilty of misdemeanor trespass if they refuse or fail to leave land, real property, or structures belonging to, or lawfully occupied by, another and not open to the general public, upon being requested to leave by the owner or by a peace officer at the request of the owner. (Pen. Code, § 602, subd. (o).) Owners of such property may request law enforcement assistance in ejecting trespassers from their property. Owners are generally required to submit a separate request to law enforcement for each occasion where law enforcement assistance in ejecting the trespasser is required. However, during a period where there is a fire hazard or the owner is absent, or when the premises or property is closed to the public and posted as such, a single request for assistance may be valid for the shorter of either 12 months or a period determined by local ordinance. Such requests must be made in a notarized writing on an LEA-provided form and may be submitted electronically. A request for assistance expires upon transfer of ownership of the property or upon a change in the person in lawful possession. Lastly, the owner must inform the LEA to which the request was made, in writing, when assistance is no longer desired, before the period not exceeding 12 months expires. (*Ibid.*)

Requests for law enforcement assistance in enforcing trespass laws are generally made via a "Trespass Letter of Authority." These letters, also known as "602 Letters," authorize local authorities to enter the premises to enforce trespass laws in the owner's absence.

Criminal trespass laws, enforced in part through trespass authorization letters, are often used to address homelessness. For example, in 2019, Bakersfield officials

proposed a program to fight homelessness by more aggressively prosecuting and incarcerating trespassers. In 2025, San Jose voted to adopt a new ordinance subjecting an unhoused person to arrest for trespass if that person has rejected three offers for shelter.

Critics argue that trespass authorization letters exacerbate homelessness by disproportionately targeting homeless individuals. According to a report by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), “trespass letters of authorization enable police, local businesses, public services, and even homelessness service providers to work together to control the movements of unhoused people and exclude them from both public and private spaces.” In a case study conducted in Laguna Beach, the ACLU found that “[s]eventy percent of trespass letters of authorization reference unhoused people as an impetus for the letter” and that from 2020 to April 2021, “three-quarters of all trespassing citations were issued to people that police officers identified as being unhoused.”

Trespass letters can constitute a significant portion of the total citations issued to unhoused persons. According to the ACLU Report, of the 97 citations issued to unhoused people in Laguna Beach from January 2020 to April 2021, 67 (69%) resulted from trespass authorization letters. Such strict enforcement of trespass laws can contribute to a cycle of arrests, hearings, and fines that make emerging from homelessness more difficult.

This bill removes a procedural requirement that applies to trespass authorization letters for the trespass offense of refusing or failing to leave private property upon being requested to leave by the owner or a peace officer. Specifically, it removes the requirement that the request for assistance in dealing with a trespasser be made in a notarized writing on an LEA-provided form, during a period where there is a fire hazard or the owner is absent, or when the premises or property is closed to the public and posted as such. The author contends that this notarization requirement is onerous and overly burdensome. This notarization requirement was recently added by SB 602 (Archuleta, Chapter 404, Statutes of 2023), and has only been in effect for approximately two years. This requirement largely functions to protect the credibility of 602 Letter submissions by verifying the identity of the owner submitting the letter.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

City of Riverside (source)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association

Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of Realtors
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
City of Corona
City of Eastvale
City of Norwalk
City of Palm Desert
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
League of California Cities
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
The California Baptist Capitol Ministry

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

ACLU California Action
California Public Defenders Association
Housing California
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The City of Riverside writes:

Under current law, property owners must obtain a notarized form to allow peace officers to act on their behalf when trespass occurs. This creates unnecessary delays and costs for residents and imposes a significant administrative burden on local law enforcement agencies. For Riverside, the notarization mandate has had real operational impacts. Since the requirement took effect, the Riverside Police

Department has processed roughly 1,400 notarizations, each taking about 30 minutes of Community Service Officer time at a billable rate of \$54.02 per hour, totaling over \$37,800 in staff costs. The City also spent \$8,177.68 to certify additional employees as notaries to meet demand. These resources are better directed toward public safety work rather than duplicative paperwork.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: ACLU California Action writes:

As a case study for the harms unhoused people experience with California Penal Code 602 citations for trespass, the ACLU report show that trespassing citations issued in Laguna Beach demonstrates that unhoused people are overwhelmingly targeted for enforcement. From the beginning of 2020 through April 22, 2021, a full three-quarters of all trespassing citations were issued to people that police officers identified as being unhoused (see Figure 11). In some of the remaining cases, the housing status of the person issued the citation is unknown. Most of the citations issued to unhoused people resulted from trespass letters: of the 97 citations issued to unhoused people, 67 (69 percent) resulted from trespass letters of authorization. Moreover, a full 87 percent of all citations resulting from trespass letters of authorization were issued to people police officers identified as being unhoused (See Figure 12.)

Finally, this policy would fall disproportionately on people experiencing homelessness, and extensive evidence shows it would likely exacerbate and prolong their homelessness. Trespassing is often one of the most common offenses used to cite people experiencing homelessness. Yet the arrests, citations, and fines that arise from these offenses often make it harder for people to move back into housing—one recent study showed citations and arrests prolonged a person’s homelessness for nearly two years, even when controlling for other factors.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-0, 5/7/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom,

Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Chen, Elhawary, Flora, Hart, Hoover, Kalra, Lee, McKinnor, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Wallis, Ward, Wicks

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:16

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1944

Author: Lee (D)

Introduced: 2/13/26

Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 10-3, 6/9/26

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

NOES: Strickland, Dahle, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-3, 4/6/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Zero-emission transit buses: axle weight

SOURCE: California Transit Association

DIGEST: This bill establishes higher axle weight limits for zero-emission transit buses, up to 25,000 pounds through 2027, with limits decreasing to 22,000 pounds by 2032.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes a maximum curb weight, as defined, of 22,000 pounds on any one axle of a bus procured through a solicitation process where the solicitation was issued on or after January 1, 2019. (Vehicle Code Section 35554(c)(2))
- 2) Establishes a decreasing maximum curb weight, as defined, on any one axle of a zero-emission transit bus of 25,000 pounds starting January 1, 2016, to 22,000 pounds by January 1, 2022. (Vehicle Code Section 35554(d)(1))

This bill:

- 1) Extends the dates by which zero-emission transit buses must reach target, maximum curb weights, as follows:

- a) Establishes a maximum curb weight of 25,000 pounds on any one axle for zero-emission buses procured through a solicitation process where the solicitation was issued between January 1, 2027, and December 31, 2027, inclusive.
- b) Establishes a maximum curb weight of 24,000 pounds on any one axle for zero-emission buses procured through a solicitation process where the solicitation was issued between January 1, 2028, and December 31, 2029, inclusive.
- c) Establishes a maximum curb weight of 23,000 pounds on any one axle for zero-emission buses procured through a solicitation process where the solicitation was issued between January 1, 2030, and December 31, 2031, inclusive.
- d) Establishes a maximum curb weight of 22,000 pounds on any one axle for zero-emission buses procured through a solicitation process where the solicitation was issued on or after January 1, 2023.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, “California has set ambitious zero-emission goals, requiring that by 2029 all buses purchased by transit agencies must be zero-emission vehicles. However, because of axle-weight limits set by the Legislature, transit agencies are struggling to procure Zero Emission Buses that keep up with their operational needs while staying within existing weight limits. AB 1944 provides a practical and responsible solution by adjusting the timeline for these limits while maintaining the previously negotiated upper weight cap, allowing California Transit Agencies to continue making progress towards our clean transportation goals.”
- 2) *Innovative Clean Transit regulation.* In December 2018, as part of its efforts to regulate vehicle emissions, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) regulation. ICT is a statewide rule that requires public transit agencies to transition their bus fleets to zero-emission vehicles. Specifically, the ICT sets up two different timelines for large and small transit agencies. A large transit agency is defined as (1) any transit agency in the South Coast or San Joaquin Valley Air Basin that operates more than 65 buses in annual maximum service, or (2) any transit agency outside of these areas, but in an urbanized area with a population of at least 200,000 that operates at least 100 buses in annual maximum service. A small transit agency is any agency that does not meet either of these definitions.

Under the ICT, large transit agencies are required to have 25% of their bus purchases in each calendar year be zero-emission starting on January 1, 2023, 50% be zero-emission starting on January 1, 2026, and 100% be zero-emission starting on January 1, 2029. Small transit agencies are required to have 25% of their bus purchases in each calendar year be zero-emission starting on January 1, 2026, and 100% be zero-emission starting on January 1, 2029. All transit agencies are required to fully transition all of their buses to zero-emission by 2040.

- 3) *Heavy buses damage roads.* As vehicles drive over roads, they exert pressure, causing wear, and thus damaging road surfaces over time. The amount of damage is proportional to the weight of the vehicle; however, this relationship is not linear. Instead, broadly speaking, road wear is generally thought of as being proportional to a vehicle's axle weight to the fourth power. This means that doubling the weight of a vehicle can increase damage to the road by 16 times. Large vehicles, like trucks or transit buses, can weigh up to 20 times more than an average passenger vehicle, causing substantially more road wear than a typical passenger vehicle.

Thus, in order to mitigate these effects, large vehicles have maximum weight loads. Current California law limits buses to a single axle weight of 20,500 pounds. However, numerous exceptions have been made over time, including for transit buses and zero-emission buses. As of today, the maximum allowed single axle weight for a zero-emission transit bus is 22,000 pounds.

- 4) *Zero-emission bus availability.* Currently, many zero-emission bus options are available to transit agencies across California, including both battery electric and hydrogen fuel cell options. However, these buses are not one-to-one replacements for the traditional buses currently used by transit agencies in terms of cost or performance. As a result, transit agencies are struggling to comply with the latest phase of ICT rules.

These issues were highlighted in CARB's comprehensive review of the ICT regulation ahead of the Phase II transition in 2026. This review was carried out before the 2026 rules came into effect in order to assess the readiness of transit agencies to conform with the regulations. Overall, while the report found that the market was generally able to support the required transitions to zero-emission buses, there were key exceptions. Namely, the report identified issues surrounding a lack of necessary infrastructure and associated high costs with infrastructure deployment, and a lack of longer-range bus models.

As a result, transit agencies do not have access to zero-emission buses with the range necessary to comparably replace their current fleets. Generally speaking, transit buses need a range of up to 300 miles, with additional margin to account for weather conditions, terrain, running HVAC systems, and battery degradation overtime. Presently, however, zero-emission buses available to California transit operators have ranges maxing out at roughly 250 miles.

In order to increase bus ranges, bus manufacturers need to add additional battery capacity which in turn increases the weight. Current models, with lower ranges, are already at the statutory axle weight maximum in California. Therefore, according to the author, some kind of exemption is needed to allow bus manufacturers to find ways to increase range without substantially increasing weight.

Beyond the weight issues, cost is also a concern. A recent audit of East Bay Transit Agencies performed by the California State Auditor, found that the average zero-emission bus costs roughly twice as much as the average diesel bus. Multiplying this cost across the various agencies' fleet sizes, the audit found that the costs generally far exceed agency revenues and reserves. Exacerbating factors further, the Federal Transit Administration has stopped awarding grants for purchasing zero-emission buses. As a result, the audit found that transit agencies will face difficulty meeting the ICT requirement and recommended that the Legislature extend the ICT deadline.

- 5) *Creating axle weight exemptions, again.* AB 1944 seeks to ease some of these burdens on transit operators by allowing them to operate heavier buses while industry works to catch up and supply buses compliant with ICT. Specifically, this bill extends the dates by which transit agencies must reduce the weights of their zero-emission buses, pushing out the ultimate deadline for meeting the 22,000 pound curb weight requirement to 2032.

However, this is not the first-time limits on transit bus weights have had to be pushed off. AB 1706 (Eng, Chapter 771, Statutes of 2012) allowed transit operators to operate buses over the previously established 20,500 pound axle weight limit, and to procure further overweight buses through 2015. As the new 2015 deadline approached, AB 1720 (Bloom, Chapter 263, Statutes of 2014) provided an additional two-year exemption. Finally, AB 1250 (Bloom, Chapter 484, Statutes of 2015) aimed to address the issue in the longer term by creating a decreasing weight schedule that allowed articulated buses and zero-emission buses to slowly come into compliance with an increased 22,000 pound limit

over a seven year period. This final deadline for 22,000 pounds was reached in 2022.

As discussed above, however, this 22,000 pound limit is too restrictive to meet current needs. Currently, zero-emission bus manufacturers are attempting to offset weight increases associated with increased battery range by finding weight reductions in other areas throughout the bus. Manufacturers are counting on innovations in bus design and battery technology to reduce weights in time to meet the new deadlines for axle weight requirements put forward by this bill. However, absent a specific technological or design innovation, it is unclear if they will be able to do so, and thus this problem may reoccur in the future.

- 6) *Local jurisdictions are concerned about road damage.* While transit operators tout the need of a weight limit exemption, local jurisdictions, particularly cities, have raised concerns about increased road damage. Importantly, as roads deteriorate more, they become exponentially more expensive to repair, meaning relatively frequent resurfacing is cheaper than waiting to replace a pavement entirely once it has degraded too much. However, even these more modest repairs are out of reach for many jurisdictions, as in 2025 alone there was a \$54.2 billion shortfall in needed funding for maintaining pavement. As a result, many local roads across the state are at risk of further degradation, requiring more expensive repairs, and widening the shortfall even further.

For these reasons, local jurisdictions are concerned about allowing the operation of heavier transit buses. One potential solution floated by some local jurisdictions is to allow transit operators to utilize lower weight, low NOx buses while waiting for advancements in zero-emission bus technology. While this would address the bus weight issue, it would violate and effectively nullify the ICT requirements by allowing the operation of GHG emitting buses. Ultimately, the Legislature should consider whether it wants to maintain the status quo, minimize road damage at the cost of increased transit emissions, or accept heavier buses and thus increased road wear in exchange for zero-emission transit buses.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/2026)

California Transit Association (Source)

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District
California Electric Transportation Coalition
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Orange County Transportation Authority
Sacramento Regional Transit District
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
San Mateo County Transit District
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Sunline Transit Agency
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/2026)

League of California Cities

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Writing as the sponsor of this bill, the California Transit Association states, “In December 2018, CARB adopted the ICT regulation, which requires public transit agencies to convert their bus fleets to zero-emission technology by no later than 2040. The regulation functions by way of a tiered zero-emission bus (ZEB) purchase mandate, which requires that, beginning in 2023, transit agencies purchase a fixed percentage of ZEBs with each bus procurement...As ZEB deployment continues to increase (and short-range ZEBs are deployed on available shorter routes), transit agencies will be required to procure ZEBs with extended ranges to complete longer routes and more aggressive duty cycles. With today’s technology, extended range ZEBs require additional batteries, which result in additional weight that meet or, in some cases, exceed the axle weight limits in current law.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Writing in opposition, the League of California Cities states, “AB 1944 authorizes higher axle weight limits for transit vehicles, which, by well-established engineering principles, will accelerate pavement damage on city streets. At the same time, the state’s transportation funding system, heavily reliant on SB 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), is projected by the Legislative Analyst’s Office to decline by billions of dollars over the coming decade as zero-emission vehicle adoption increases. Without a corresponding funding solution, this creates an unsustainable mismatch between infrastructure wear and available resources.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-3, 4/6/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Bains, Hadwick, Macedo

NO VOTE RECORDED: Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Caloza, Gabriel, Gallagher, Harabedian, Johnson, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Tangipa, Valencia

Prepared by: Samuel Myers / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
6/10/26 16:58:15

**** END ****

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 1948
Author: Ramos (D) and Valencia (D)
Amended: 3/19/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 3/26/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SUBJECT: Firearms: concealed carry licenses

SOURCE: San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

DIGEST: This bill extends the duration of a license to carry concealed firearms (CCW) from two years to three years, except as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits, generally, the possession of firearms in most public areas, with specified exceptions. (Pen. Code § 25300 et seq.)
- 2) Exempts persons with CCW licenses from the laws prohibiting possessing a firearm in a public area. (Pen. Code § 25655.)
- 3) Provides that when a California resident applies for a new CCW license or license renewal, the sheriff of a county or the chief or other head of a municipal police department of any city or city and county shall issue or renew a license to that person upon proof of all of the following:
 - a) The applicant is not a disqualified person to receive such a license, as defined.

- b) The applicant is at least 21 years of age, and presents clear evidence of the person's identity and age, as defined.
 - c) The applicant is a resident of the county or a city within the county, or the applicant's principal place of employment or business is in the county or a city within the county and the applicant spends a substantial period of time in that place of employment or business.
 - d) The applicant has completed a course of training, as defined.
 - e) The applicant is the recorded owner, with the Department of Justice (DOJ), of the pistol, revolver, or other firearm for which the license will be issued. (Pen. Code, §§ 26150, subd. (a)(1)-(5); 26155, subd. (a)(1)-(5).)
- 4) Sets forth separate requirements for non-California residents apply for a new CCW license or CCW license renewal, including that the non-California resident must attest, under oath, that the jurisdiction in which they have applied is the primary location in California in which they intend to travel or spend time. (Pen. Code, §§ 26150, subd. (b); 26155, subd. (b).)
 - 5) Requires applicants for a new CCW license to complete a course of training that meets specified criteria, including that the course be no less than 16 hours in length and include live-fire shooting exercises. (Pen. Code, § 26165.)
 - 6) Establishes that, unless a court makes a contrary determination, an applicant shall be deemed to be a disqualified person and cannot receive or renew a license if, among other things, the applicant is reasonably likely to be dangerous, has been convicted of specified crimes, has engaged in the reckless use of a firearm, or is currently abusing any controlled substance, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 26202, subd. (a)(1)-(10).)
 - 7) States that in determining whether an applicant is a disqualified person and cannot receive or renew a license, the licensing authority shall conduct an investigation that includes, among other things, an in-person interview unless otherwise stated, interviews with three character witnesses, and a review of information provided by DOJ. (Pen. Code, § 26202, subd. (b)(1)-(6).)
 - 8) Authorizes a person issued a CCW license to apply to the licensing authority for an amendment to the license for one of several specified purposes, but specifies that an amendment to the license does not extend the original expiration date of the license and that the license shall be subject to renewal at the same time as if the license had not been amended. (Pen. Code, § 26215, subds. (a), (c).)

- 9) States that except as otherwise provided, a CCW license is valid for any period of time not to exceed 2 years from the date that the license is issued. (Pen. Code, § 26220, subd. (a).)
- 10) Provides that if the licensee's place of employment or business was the basis for issuance of a CCW license, the license is valid for any period of time not to exceed 90 days from the date of the license, unless the license was issued to a custodial officer who is an employee of the sheriff of a county, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 26220, subd. (b).)
- 11) Provides that a CCW license is valid for any period of time not to exceed three years from the date of the license if the license is issued to any of the following individuals:
 - a) A judge of a California court of record.
 - b) A full-time court commissioner of a California court of record.
 - c) A judge of a federal court.
 - d) A magistrate of a federal court. (Pen. Code, § 26220, subd. (c).)
- 12) Provides that a CCW license is valid for any period of time not to exceed 4 years from the date of the license if the license is issued to a custodial officer who is an employee of the sheriff of a county, as specified, except that the license shall be invalid upon the conclusion of the person's employment if the four year period has not otherwise expired or any other condition does not limit the validity of the license. (Pen. Code, § 26220, subd. (d).)
- 13) Provides that a CCW license issued to a reserve or auxiliary peace officer or sheriff's deputy, as provided, is valid for any period of time not to exceed four years from the date of the license, except that the license shall be invalid upon the conclusion of the person's appointment if the four-year period has not otherwise expired or any other condition does not limit the validity of the license to a shorter time period. (Pen. Code, § 26220, subd. (e).)

This bill:

- 1) Extends the duration that a standard CCW license may be valid from 2 years to 3 years.
- 2) Strikes the existing provision specifying that a CCW issued to certain judicial officers may be valid for any period of time not to exceed three years.

- 3) Clarifies that the provisions specifying the duration that a CCW is valid when issued to a sheriff's department custodial officer or a reserve officer of a police or sheriff's department applies to both new and renewal licenses.

Comments

Since the enactment of SB 2 (Portantino, Chapter 249, Statutes of 2023 which shifted California from a "may-issue" CCW regime to a "shall-issue regime" where licensing authorities have less discretion to deny applications, many counties have been plagued by CCW processing delays and application backlogs. San Francisco Sheriff Paul Miyamoto recently issued a formal apology after processing delays caused several timely requested permit renewals to expire without action, citing staffing shortages. Other reports suggest that wait times and administrative hurdles have been greater particularly for Black and Latino Californians, with some applicants in Los Angeles County waiting 16-20 months for a screening interview. In response to such claims, the United States Department of Justice sued the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department in September 2025, alleging that such delays infringed on the applicants' Second Amendment rights. For context, SB 2 provided that the licensing authority must give written notice to the applicant indicating approval or denial of the application within 120 of receiving the completed application or 30 days after receiving background check information from the California Department of Justice, whichever is later.

Existing law enacted by SB 2 provides that a CCW license is valid for a maximum of 2 years from the date of issuance, except in the case of judicial officers, for whom CCW licenses are valid for up to 3 years before requiring renewal. Additionally, CCWs issued to custodial officers employed by a sheriff's department or to reserve police officers are valid for a maximum of 4 years. Last year, Assemblymember Castillo authored AB 1092, which would have extended the validity of a CCW issued after January 1, 2026 and before January 1, 2027 from 2 years to 3 years, and of a CCW issued on or after January 1, 2027 to a maximum of 4 years. That measure failed in the Assembly Public Safety Committee. This bill is similar to AB 1092, except that it simply specifies that all standard CCWs are valid for a maximum of 3 years, and strikes the consequently unnecessary language granting a 3-year CCW to judicial officers. This bill also clarifies that the 4-year CCW available to custodial officers and reserve officers applies to both new and renewal CCWs.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department (source)
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Rifle & Pistol Association
California State Sheriffs Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 3/26/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Berman, Carrillo, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Mark González, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:17

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1974
Author: Stefani (D)
Amended: 5/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-2, 4/20/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Firearms: voluntary firearm storage program

SOURCE: Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence

DIGEST: This bill authorizes a law enforcement agency to create a voluntary firearm storage program that allows a person to voluntarily transfer custody of their firearm to the local law enforcement agency for temporary safekeeping purposes to prevent firearm violence, suicide, and other injury, as provided.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Generally prohibits the sale, lease or transfer of firearms unless the person has been issued a license by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and establishes various exceptions to this prohibition. (Penal (Pen.) Code, §§ 26500-26625.)
- 2) Provides that a license to sell firearms is subject to forfeiture for any violation of a number of specified prohibitions and requirements, with limited exceptions. (Pen. Code, § 26800, subd. (a).)
- 3) Includes several exemptions from the requirement that transfers go through a licensed dealer, including for the transfer of a firearm by bequest or intestate succession, or to a surviving spouse, or transfers by a person acting pursuant to operation of law, a court order, or pursuant to other specified laws. (Pen. Code, §§ 26505, 26515.)

- 4) Provides that persons convicted of felonies and certain violent misdemeanors are prohibited from owning or possessing a firearm. (Pen. Code, §§ 29800, 29805.)
- 5) Provides that where neither party to a firearms transaction holds a dealer's license (i.e. a "private party transaction"), the parties shall complete the transaction through a licensed firearms dealer. (Pen. Code, § 27545.)
- 6) Provides that the above provision does not apply to a firearm transfer if all of the following conditions are satisfied:
 - a) The firearm is voluntarily and temporarily transferred to another person who is 18 years of age or older for safekeeping to prevent it from being accessed or used to attempt suicide by the transferor or another person that may gain access to it in the transferor's household.
 - b) The transferee does not use the firearm for any purpose and, except when transporting the firearm to the transferee's residence or when returning it to the transferor, keeps the firearm unloaded and securely stored in the transferee's residence.
 - c) The duration of the loan is limited to that amount of time reasonably necessary to prevent harm.
 - d) The individual receiving the firearm is not prohibited by state or federal law from possessing, receiving, owning, or purchasing a firearm. (Pen. Code, § 27882, subd. (a).)
- 7) Provides that if a firearm transferred pursuant to the above cannot be returned to the owner because the owner is prohibited from possessing a firearm, the person in possession of the firearm shall deliver the firearm to a law enforcement agency without delay. (Pen. Code, § 27882, subd. (b).)
- 8) Establishes procedures for the transfer of a firearm to a dealer or a third party in order to prevent it from being accessed or used by the transferor or other persons that may gain access to it in the transferor's household to cause significant danger of personal injury to themselves or others. (Pen. Code, §§ 27882, 26892.)
- 9) Prohibits firearm dealers from delivering newly purchased firearms within 10 days of the application to purchase a firearm, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 26815.)

- 10) Provides that any person who claims title to any firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition that is in the custody or control of a court or law enforcement agency and who wishes to have the firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition returned shall make application, including specified information, for a determination by the Department of Justice as to whether the applicant is eligible to possess a firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition, as provided. (Pen. Code, § 33850, subd. (a).)
- 11) Provides that a person who owns a firearm that is in the custody of a court or law enforcement agency and who does not wish to obtain possession of the firearm, and the firearm is an otherwise legal firearm, and the person otherwise has right to title of the firearm, shall be entitled to sell or transfer title of the firearm to a licensed dealer or a third party that is not prohibited from possessing that firearm. (Pen. Code, § 33850, subd. (b).)
- 12) Specifies several requirements that must be satisfied before a law enforcement agency or court that has taken custody of any firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition may be returned to an individual claiming said items. (Pen. Code, § 33855.)
- 13) Specifies that when DOJ receives a completed application for return of a firearm, it shall conduct an eligibility check of the applicant to determine whether the applicant is eligible to possess a firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition. (Pen. Code, § 33865, subd. (a).)
- 14) Provides that if a law enforcement agency determines that an applicant requesting the return of a firearm, ammunition feeding device, or ammunition is the legal owner of said items, the applicant shall be entitled to sell or transfer those items to a licensed firearm or ammunition vendor, as applicable. (Pen. Code, § 33870.)
- 15) Requires a law enforcement agency to enter into the DOJ's Automated Firearm System each firearm that has been reported stolen, lost, found, recovered, held or safekeeping, surrendered, relinquished, or under observation, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 11108.2.)
- 16) Requires any weapon surrendered to law enforcement under specified provisions to be destroyed, except as specified. (Pen. Code, § 18005, subd. (a).)
- 17) Requires every California law enforcement agency to develop and maintain a written policy on the destruction of firearms and other weapons, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 18005, subd. (e).)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that a law enforcement agency may create a voluntary firearm storage program that allows a person to voluntarily transfer custody of their firearm to the local law enforcement agency for temporary safekeeping purposes to prevent firearm violence, suicide, and other injury.
- 2) Provides that an agency adopting a voluntary storage program shall not be held liable for damage to the firearms while the firearms are in the temporary custody of the agency.
- 3) Requires the following of any law enforcement agency that elects to adopt a voluntary storage program:
 - a) The agency shall have the capability to store the firearm for a duration of one year.
 - b) The agency shall provide clear instructions on the procedure for a person to voluntarily transfer custody of their firearm to the law enforcement agency, and make the procedure available to the public on the agency's internet website, as specified.
 - c) The agency shall provide clear instructions on the process for requesting return of the firearms in accordance with existing law, including, but not limited to, by electronically submitting a Law Enforcement Release application for the return of a firearm via the California Firearms Application Reporting System (CFARS). Instructions on the process for requesting the return of surrendered firearms shall be made available to the public on the agency's website.
 - d) The agency shall provide clear information on the maximum amount of time that the law enforcement agency may store a firearm and on the disposition of a firearm after the firearm has exceeded the maximum storage time allowed by the local law enforcement agency. This information must notify the person that their firearm or firearms shall be destroyed, returned to the person, or donated to a public or private nonprofit historical society, museum, or institutional collection.
 - e) The agency shall provide clear information on how people using the safe storage program, if they decide they no longer want their firearm at any point during the firearm storage period, can elect to have the firearm destroyed, donated to a public or private nonprofit historical society, museum, or institutional collection, or, pursuant to policies and

- procedures set forth in existing law, may sell or transfer title of the firearm to a licensed dealer or a third party that is not prohibited from possessing that firearm.
- 4) Provides that upon receipt of a firearm, a law enforcement agency with a voluntary storage program must do all of the following:
 - a) Check the Automated Firearm System (AFS) to ensure that the firearm has not previously been reported as lost or stolen or otherwise involved in a crime, as specified.
 - b) Update AFS to record the current disposition of the firearm.
 - c) Prior to the return of a firearm to a person requesting its return, the law enforcement agency shall ensure that the requesting person is eligible to possess firearms when the firearm is returned to the person, as provided.
 - d) Upon return, donation, transfer or destruction of the firearm, a law enforcement agency shall update the AFS to reflect the change in disposition pursuant to the agency's firearm destruction policy.
 - 5) Specifies that failure to retrieve the firearm at the end of a time period specified by the law enforcement agency shall result in the destruction of the firearm pursuant to the agency's firearm destruction policy. However, destruction of the firearm shall not be executed if the person who surrendered the firearm has submitted a Law Enforcement Release application for the return of their firearm via CFARS and the person is awaiting an eligibility determination.
 - 6) Encourages law enforcement agencies that establish a voluntary firearm storage program to make family law advocates and veterans' outreach programs aware of the program.
 - 7) Specifies that it does not limit a law enforcement agency's ability to accept firearms for voluntary temporary firearm storage pursuant to any other authority, program, or services the law enforcement agency offers.
 - 8) Defines law enforcement agency as any police or sheriff's department.
 - 9) Provides that specified laws restricting openly carrying an unloaded firearm, carrying an unloaded firearm, and delivering or transferring a firearm, do not apply to or affect the transportation of a firearm by a person to a law enforcement for the purposes of participating in a voluntary storage program, if

the person gives prior notice to the agency that they are transporting the firearm to the agency.

Comments

In 2019, the Legislature added a preventative feature to California firearm law via SB 172 (Portantino), Chapter 840, Statutes of 2019, which permitted the temporary transfer of a firearm without a dealer's participation to a person who is 18 years of age or older for safekeeping to prevent it from being used to attempt suicide by the transferor or another person that may gain access to it in the transferor's household. In 2023, another protective firearm transfer provision was added to California law via SB 368 (Portantino), Chapter 251, Statutes of 2023, which required firearm dealers to accept a firearm for storage if 1) the firearm is voluntarily and temporarily transferred to the licensee to prevent significant danger of personal injury to the transferor or others, 2) the licensee does not use the firearm for any purpose except storage, and 3) the duration of the transfer is limited to the amount of time reasonably necessary to prevent the harm.

After a custody battle resulted in the murder of her 9-year-old son, Pierce, by his father, Lesley Hu founded Pierce's Pledge, a nonprofit dedicated to reducing gun violence against children during volatile custody disputes by promoting the voluntary, temporary storage of firearms outside the home during situations of crisis or high conflict. In September 2025, the San Francisco Police Department, in partnership with Pierce's Pledge, launched a first-in-the-nation gun storage program in which San Francisco residents can store their firearms at any of the city's 10 police district stations for up to a year without paying any fees. According to the author, such programs are critical, especially in light of the fact that few dealers participate in voluntary storage pursuant to the programs described above. The author further states that:

Although there is nothing preventing law enforcement from establishing a program to temporarily store firearms for the public—indeed, SFPD did and serves as the basis for this law—there is also nothing in the current law to provide guidance or best practices for local law enforcement seeking to implement the policy. This lack of guidance can lead to police departments being more hesitant to establish such a program within their own jurisdiction or lead to inconsistencies in the application of each program.

Accordingly, the author proposes this bill, which provides that a law enforcement agency may create a voluntary firearm storage program that allows a person to voluntarily transfer custody of their firearm to the agency for temporary

safekeeping to prevent firearm violence, suicide and other injury. The bill does not require agencies to establish such a program, but imposes several mandates on agencies that do, including that the agency have the capability to store a firearm for one year and that it provide clear instructions on the relevant transfer processes, including those already set forth in existing law, such as the process for requesting the return of a firearm.

Additionally, the bill requires a participating agency to provide clear information on the maximum duration that the agency may store a firearm and on the disposition of a firearm after the expiration of the storage period, including that the firearm must be destroyed, returned, or donated to a public or private nonprofit historical society, museum, or institutional collection. Participating agencies must also provide information on how individuals who no longer want their firearm can elect to have the firearm destroyed, donated or transferred to a firearm dealer or nonprohibited third party pursuant to specific procedures set forth in existing law.

This bill further requires that participating agencies make relevant updates to the Automated Firearms System and provides that failure to retrieve a firearm at the end of the storage period shall result in the destruction or donation of the firearm according to prescribed processes. Finally, the bill indemnifies participating agencies against liability for damage to firearms while they are being stored and clarifies that existing criminal penalties related to the transportation of firearms do not apply when the firearms are being transported for the purpose of being stored pursuant to this bill and the transporting party has given the agency prior notice.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence (source)
Association of Riverside County Chiefs of Police and Riverside Sheriff
Brady California
Brady United Against Gun Violence
California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians
California District Attorneys Association
Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund
Moms Demand Action
Palm Springs Police Department
Peace Officers Research Association of California
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Marin Medical Society

Students Demand Action

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

California Rifle and Pistol Association

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-2, 4/20/26

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

NOES: Hadwick, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bonta, Castillo, Macedo, Patterson, Celeste Rodriguez, Wallis, Ward

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:17

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2004
Author: Alanis (R), et al.
Amended: 3/18/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-0, 4/6/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Peace officers: deputy sheriffs

SOURCE: San Joaquin County Correctional Officers Association

DIGEST: This bill adds the counties of Fresno and San Joaquin to the list of specified counties within which deputy sheriffs assigned to perform duties exclusively or initially related to custodial assignments are peace officers whose authority extends to any place in the state while engaged in the performance of duties related to their employment.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that any deputy sheriff of the Counties of Los Angeles, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Riverside, San Benito, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Tulare, Tuolumne, and Yuba who is employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments with responsibilities for maintaining the operations of county custodial facilities, including the custody, care, supervision, security, movement, and transportation of inmates, is a peace officer whose authority extends to any place in California only while engaged in the performance of the duties of his or her respective employment and for the purpose of carrying out

the primary function of employment relating to custodial assignments or when performing other law enforcement duties directed by his or her employing agency during a local state of emergency. (Pen. Code, § 830.1, subd. (c).)

- 2) Provides that all cities and counties are authorized to employ custodial officers who are public officers but not peace officers for the purpose of maintaining order in local detention facilities. Custodial officers under this section do not have the right to carry or possess firearms in the performance of his or her duties. However, custodial officers may use reasonable force to establish and maintain custody and may make arrests for misdemeanors and felonies pursuant to a warrant. (Pen. Code, § 831.)
- 3) Provides that notwithstanding existing law, law enforcement agencies in counties with a population of 425,000 or less and the Counties of San Diego, Fresno, Kern, Napa, Riverside, Santa Clara, and Stanislaus may employ custodial officers with enhanced powers. The enhanced powers custodial officers are empowered to serve warrants, writs, or subpoenas within the custodial facility and, as with regular custodial officers, use reasonable force to establish and maintain custody. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (a).)
- 4) Provides that custodial officers with enhanced powers may carry firearms under the direction of the sheriff while fulfilling specified job-related duties such as while assigned as a court bailiff, transporting prisoners, guarding hospitalized prisoners, or suppressing jail riots, escapes, or rescues. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (b).)
- 5) Requires a peace officer to be present in a supervisory capacity whenever 20 or more custodial officers are on duty. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (d).)
- 6) Provides that enhanced powers custodial officers may also make warrantless arrests within the facility. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (f).)
- 7) Provides that custodial officers employed by the Santa Clara County, Napa County, and Madera DOC's are authorized to perform the following additional duties in the facility:
 - a) Arrest a person without a warrant whenever the custodial officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a misdemeanor or felony in the presence of the officer that is a violation of a statute or ordinance that the officer has the duty to enforce;
 - b) Search property, cells, prisoners, or visitors;

- c) Conduct strip or body cavity searches of prisoners as specified;
 - d) Conduct searches and seizures pursuant to a duly issued warrant;
 - e) Segregate prisoners; and,
 - f) Classify prisoners for the purpose of housing or participation in supervised activities. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subds. (g)-(i).)
- 8) Provides that Penal Code § 831.5 does not authorize a custodial officer to carry or possess a firearm when the officer is not on duty. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (j).)
- 9) States that it is the intent of the Legislature, as it relates to Santa Clara, Madera, and Napa Counties, to enumerate specific duties of custodial officers and to clarify the relationship of correctional officers and deputy sheriffs in Santa Clara County. And, that it is the intent of the Legislature that all issues regarding compensation for custodial officers remain subject to the collective bargaining process. The language is, additionally, clear that it should not be construed to assert that the duties of custodial officers are equivalent to the duties of deputy sheriffs or to affect the ability of the county to negotiate pay that reflects the different duties of custodial officers and deputy sheriffs. (Pen. Code, § 831.5, subd. (k).)
- 10) Provides that every peace officer shall satisfactorily complete an introductory course of training prescribed by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and that, after July 1, 1989, satisfactory completion of the course shall be demonstrated by passage of an appropriate examination developed or approved by POST. (Pen. Code, § 832, subd. (a).)
- 11) Provides that prior to the exercise of peace officer powers, every peace officer shall have satisfactorily completed the POST course. (Pen. Code, § 832, subd. (b).)
- 12) Provides that a person shall not have the powers of a peace officer until he or she has satisfactorily completed the POST course. (Pen. Code, § 832, subd. (c).)

This bill:

- 1) Adds to the list of specified counties within which deputy sheriffs assigned to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to specified custodial assignments are peace officers whose authority extends to any place in California while engaged in the performance of the duties of their employment.

2) Includes related findings and declarations.

Comments

Pursuant to Penal Code section 830.1 subdivision (c), the custodial deputy sheriff classification is part of a continuum of classifications of custodial officers in county jails and other local detention facilities. Custodial officers under Penal Code sections 831 and 831.5 are not peace officers, whereas a custodial deputy sheriff is a peace officer, “who is employed to perform duties exclusively or initially relating to custodial assignments.” (Pen. Code § 830.1 subd. (c).) One of the most significant differences between custodial deputy sheriffs and custodial officers is that as “peace officers,” custodial deputy sheriffs are granted all the rights and protections contained in the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBOR, see Government Code, § 3301 et seq.), which provides peace officers with procedural protections relating to investigation and interrogations of peace officers, self-incrimination, privacy, polygraph exams, searches, personnel files, and administrative appeals. Accordingly, this bill gives POBOR protections to custodial officers in San Joaquin and Fresno Counties.

All counties may utilize Penal Code section 831 non-peace officer custodial officers; however, these officers may not carry firearms. (Pen. Code, § 831 subd. (b).) Existing law also establishes limitations on the authority and use of Penal Code section 831.5 custodial officers. For example, Penal Code section 831.5 custodial officers may not perform strip searches (unless they are employed in Santa Clara County, Napa County, or Madera County), have limited arrest powers, and are limited in their “armed duty” roles. Another limitation on the use of both Penal Code section 831 and 831.5 non-peace officer custodial officers is that whenever 20 or more of such officers are on duty there must be at least one Penal Code section 830.1 peace officer, who has received the full 664-plus hour basic training for Penal Code section 830.1(a) deputy sheriffs, on duty at the same time to supervise the custodial officers. (Pen. Code §§ 831 subd. (d) and 831.5 subd. (d).)

Existing law does contain one limitation on the scope of authority granted to custodial deputy sheriffs, which would be extended to Fresno and San Joaquin County custodial deputy sheriffs under this bill. Namely, deputies granted authority by this bill are limited in their authority as a peace officer “only while engaged in the performance of the duties of his or her respective employment and for the purpose of carrying out the primary function of employment relating to his or her custodial assignments, or when performing other law enforcement duties

directed by his or her employing agency during a local state of emergency.” (Pen. Code, § 830.1, subd. (c).)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

San Joaquin County Correctional Officers Association (source)
Fresno County Public Safety Association
Fresno County Sheriff’s Office
Riverside Sheriffs’ Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-0, 4/6/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ransom, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Caloza, Gabriel, Harabedian, Lackey, Lee, Muratsuchi, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Schultz, Valencia, Ward, Zbur

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:18

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2067

Author: Patel (D)

Introduced: 2/18/26

Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-1, 6/3/26

AYES: Pérez, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

NOES: Ochoa Bogh

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: School facilities: leasing real property

SOURCE: Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Coalition for Adequate School Housing

DIGEST: This bill (1) extends, by five years, the existing authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value solicitation process for school construction projects; (2) extends the operative date of these provisions from July 1, 2027, to July 1, 2032.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes a school district governing board, notwithstanding specified competitive bidding provisions, to lease district property for a minimum of \$1 per year to a person, firm, or corporation if the lease requires the lessee to construct school facilities for district use and requires title to vest in the district at the conclusion of the lease term. Requires the instrument to be awarded through a competitive solicitation process using a best value methodology.
- 2) Provides that the current authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value process becomes inoperative on July 1, 2027.

- 3) Authorizes school districts to enter into agreements under which a private entity constructs school facilities and leases the facilities back to the district, with title ultimately vesting in the district, and requires agreements entered into pursuant to specified provisions to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.
- 4) Prohibits a school district from entering into a lease-leaseback agreement unless the entity and its subcontractors agree to use a skilled and trained workforce for all apprenticeable occupations on the project.
- 5) Defines “best value” for purposes of lease-leaseback procurement as a competitive procurement process that evaluates proposers based on objective criteria representing the best combination of price and qualifications.

This bill:

- 1) Extends, by five years, the existing authorization for school districts to use the lease-leaseback project delivery method through a competitive best value solicitation process for school construction projects.
- 2) Extends the operative date of these provisions from July 1, 2027, to July 1, 2032.

Comments

Need for the bill. According to the author, “AB 2067 affords the continued use of an existing tool to improve transparency and bring certainty to school districts, contractors, and architects engaged in delivering school construction projects. Most importantly, this authority helps to control project costs and deliver facility projects on time, which directly benefits students and taxpayers.”

Extends a project delivery method that was substantially reformed following litigation and longstanding concerns regarding transparency and competitive bidding. Lease-leaseback has long been used by school districts as an alternative project delivery method for school construction projects. Historically, however, the process generated controversy because prior law authorized districts to enter into lease-leaseback agreements “without advertising for bids,” leading to concerns that some projects were effectively awarded without meaningful competition. These concerns culminated in the *Davis v. Fresno Unified School District* litigation, which challenged whether certain lease-leaseback arrangements improperly circumvented California’s public contracting laws.

In response, the Legislature enacted AB 2316 (O'Donnell, Chapter 521, Statutes of 2016), which substantially revised the lease-leaseback process by eliminating the authority to proceed without competitive bidding and replacing it with a competitive best value procurement process that included additional transparency, disclosure, workforce, and subcontractor protections.

This bill does not expand the scope of lease-leaseback authority or materially alter the procurement process established in 2016. Instead, it extends the sunset date for the current competitive best value framework for an additional five years.

Reflects a legislative preference for preserving procurement flexibility while maintaining guardrails adopted in 2016. Supporters of this bill argue that lease-leaseback provides districts with additional flexibility compared to traditional design-bid-build procurement methods, including the ability to incorporate preconstruction services, utilize guaranteed maximum pricing structures, and consider qualifications and project approach in addition to cost. They further contend that continuation of the current framework is particularly important for smaller districts that may benefit from early contractor involvement and integrated project delivery approaches.

At the same time, the current statutory framework preserves significant guardrails adopted following the Fresno litigation, including competitive solicitation requirements, public disclosure requirements, skilled and trained workforce provisions, and protections for subcontractors. As a result, this bill can largely be viewed as an extension of the Legislature's existing policy balance between procurement flexibility and public accountability rather than a reopening of the broader policy debate regarding lease-leaseback authority itself.

Allowing the sunset to occur could create uncertainty regarding continued use of lease-leaseback procurement. If the competitive best value provisions sunset, the statute would revert to a prior version of the Education Code that no longer expressly references the competitive selection process established in 2016.

Supporters argue that allowing the sunset to occur could create uncertainty for districts, architects, and contractors regarding the continued viability and structure of lease-leaseback procurement. While some procurement-related protections adopted in subsequent legislation would remain in effect, the expiration of the current framework could create ambiguity regarding procedural expectations and procurement standards moving forward.

This bill continues a broader legislative trend toward authorizing alternative project delivery methods for school construction. Over the past two decades, the

Legislature has increasingly authorized alternative project delivery methods for public infrastructure projects, including lease-leaseback, design-build, progressive design-build, and construction manager/general contractor models. These approaches are generally intended to provide public entities with greater flexibility in addressing project complexity, cost control, scheduling, and risk allocation.

This bill continues that broader trend by preserving an existing alternative delivery authority rather than reverting school districts exclusively to more traditional low-bid procurement structures. However, unlike some newer alternative delivery models, lease-leaseback already represents a mature and heavily litigated procurement framework with significant existing statutory guidance and operational experience among school districts.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/4/26)

Associated General Contractors, California Chapters (co-source)

Coalition for Adequate School Housing (co-source)

Alameda County Office of Education

Blach Construction Company

California Association of School Business Officials

California School Boards Association

County School Facilities Consortium

Del Mar Union School District

Harris Construction Co., Inc.

Hemet Unified School District

Jurupa Unified School District

Los Angeles Unified School District

Manteca Unified School District

Oakland Unified School District

Poway Unified School District

San Benito High School District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/4/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Bains, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick,

Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lee,
Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Pacheco, Papan, Patel,
Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle
Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache,
Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett,
Bonta, Bryan, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Haney, Kalra, Ortega, Celeste
Rodriguez, Schultz, Zbur

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/8/26 16:04:25

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2107
Author: Pellerin (D)
Amended: 5/26/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/3/26

AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Expanded Learning Opportunities Program: offering access:
unduplicated pupils

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires school districts and charter schools participating in the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP) that have an unduplicated pupil percentage (UPP) of 55% or higher to prioritize offering access to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs, which may include, but is not limited to, specialized outreach to the parents and guardians of unduplicated pupils and providing assistance with enrollment of unduplicated pupils.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “expanded learning” as before school, after school, summer, or intersession learning programs that focus on developing the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs and interests of students through hands-on, engaging learning experiences. (Education Code (EC) § 8482.1)
- 2) Expresses the intent of the Legislature that expanded learning programs are pupil-centered, results-driven, include community partners, and complement, but do not replicate, learning activities in the regular schoolday and school year. (EC § 8482.1)

- 3) Defines “unduplicated pupil” as a pupil enrolled in a school district or a charter school who is either classified as an English learner, eligible for a free or reduced-price meal, or is a foster youth. Specifies that a school district’s or charter school’s UPP is calculated by dividing the enrollment of unduplicated pupils in the school district or charter school by the total enrollment in that school district or charter school. (EC § 42238.02)
- 4) Establishes the ELOP with the intent of the Legislature that all local educational agencies (LEAs) offer all unduplicated pupils in classroom-based instructional programs access to comprehensive after school and intersessional expanded learning opportunities. (EC § 46120)
- 5) Defines, for the purposes of ELOP, the term “local educational agency” as a school district or charter school, excluding a charter school that submitted a petition directly to a board of education that would serve pupils for whom the county office of education would otherwise be responsible for providing direct education and related services. (EC § 46120)
- 6) Requires, commencing with the 2023-24 school year, as a condition of receipt of ELOP funding, the following:
 - a) That LEAs with a prior year UPP of 55% or more offer the program to all pupils in kindergarten through 6th grade and provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program. These LEAs are known colloquially as “Tier 1” and receive an allocation equal to \$2,750 multiplied by the number of unduplicated pupils at an LEA.
 - b) That LEAs with a prior year UPP less than 55% offer the program to at least all unduplicated pupils and provide access to any unduplicated pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program. These LEAs are known colloquially as “Tier 2” and receive an allocation based on the amount of funding remaining after accounting for Tier 1 allotments.
 - c) That on schooldays, LEAs offer no less than 9 hours of combined instructional time, recess, meals, and expanded learning opportunities per instructional day, and that for at least 30 nonschooldays, LEAs offer

no less than 9 hours of in-person expanded learning opportunities per instructional day. (EC § 46120)

- 7) Requires LEAs to prioritize ELOP services at schoolsites in the lowest income communities, while maximizing the number of schools and neighborhoods with ELOP programs across their attendance area. (EC § 46120)
- 8) Defines the following terms:
 - a) “Offer access” means to recruit, advertise, publicize, or solicit through culturally and linguistically effective and appropriate communication channels.
 - b) “Provide access,” with respect to an “expanded learning opportunity program,” means to enroll in the expanded learning opportunity program. If a parent or guardian has a signed expanded learning opportunity program registration form and that form is on file, the pupil shall be considered enrolled in the expanded learning opportunity program. (EC § 46120)

This bill requires school districts and charter schools participating in the ELOP that have a UPP of 55% or higher to prioritize offering access to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs, which may include, but is not limited to, specialized outreach to the parents and guardians of unduplicated pupils and providing assistance with enrollment of unduplicated pupils.

Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, “though local educational agencies’ entitlement amounts are based on the number of unduplicated pupils enrolled and the CDE advises that LEAs prioritize ELOP enrollment for these students, there is currently no explicit requirement that LEAs prioritize offering access to these pupils. While the majority of LEAs respect the intent of the law, stakeholders in the education space have identified instances where access has been offered to non-unduplicated students prior to being offered to unduplicated students.

To ensure that the legislative intent of the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program is fulfilled, AB 2107 clarifies that local education agencies are required to prioritize offering access to low-income students, English learners, and foster youth.”

- 2) *Differences between Tier 1 LEAs and Tier 2 LEAs for ELOP relating to funding rates and program requirements.* Though this bill makes changes to ELOP for Tier 1 LEAs specifically, statute establishes two funding rates for ELOP that vary based on an LEA's percentage of unduplicated pupils, also known as UPP:
- a) Tier 1 LEAs are defined as having a UPP that is 55% or higher, and they receive a rate of \$2,750 per unduplicated pupil. Tier 1 LEAs are required to offer ELOP to all TK-6 pupils and provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests placement in the program.
 - b) Tier 2 LEAs are defined as having a UPP lower than 55%, and they receive an allocation based on the amount of funding remaining after accounting for Tier 1 allotments. Tier 2 LEAs are required to offer the program to at least all unduplicated pupils and provide access to any unduplicated pupils whose parent or guardian requests placement in the program. The 2026-27 Governor's Budget proposes to provide a guaranteed rate of at least \$1,800 per pupil for Tier 2 LEAs.
- 3) *Offering access vs. providing access.* Statute defines and creates distinctions between "offering access" and "providing access" for ELOP. *Offering access* generally refers to outreach, and means to "recruit, advertise, publicize, or solicit through culturally and linguistically effective and appropriate communication channels". This bill specifically aims to require Tier 1 LEAs to prioritize *offering access* to unduplicated pupils in ELOP programs, which may include, but is not limited to, specialized outreach to the parents and guardians of unduplicated pupils and providing assistance with enrollment of unduplicated pupils. This bill intends to ensure that unduplicated pupils in Tier 1 LEAs are aware of ELOP programs in their schools, including resources these pupils may use to access these programs.

Providing access generally refers to enrolling a student in ELOP, and if a parent or guardian has a signed ELOP registration form and that form is on file, the pupil shall be considered enrolled. However, the definition for providing access is specific to a signed registration form and does not reference children receiving ELOP services or care.

For Tier 1 LEAs, they are required to offer ELOP to all TK-6 pupils and to provide access to any pupil whose parent or guardian requests placement in

the program. Because providing access to any pupil means enrolling a student, but not necessarily providing services, California Department of Education (CDE) guidance explicitly specifies that LEAs should be prioritizing enrollment for unduplicated pupils. However, given the discrepancy between enrolling and serving pupils, CDE has shared that they have received some complaints from parents reporting that, despite having a signed enrollment form on file with their LEA, their unduplicated children have been placed on a program waitlist while non-unduplicated pupils have been offered spots. CDE has also stated that other complaints indicate that unduplicated pupils are being placed at the bottom of a waitlist once capacity is reached. However, CDE was unable to provide the number of complaints it received on this topic, or any other characteristics about the situation from which these complaints originated. According to some stakeholders, this issue exists but may not be widespread.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 121 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2025), commencing with the 2025-26 school year, lowers the UPP requirements for Tier 1 LEAs from 75% to 55% and doubles the minimum ELOP funding for LEAs to \$100,000 in a fiscal year.

AB 181 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 52, Statutes of 2022), commencing with the 2023-24 school year, and as a condition of receipt of ELOP funds, LEAs with a calculated UPP less than 75% (Tier 2 LEAs) shall offer to at least all unduplicated pupils in K-6 classroom-based instructional programs access to ELOP, and shall provide access to any unduplicated pupil whose parent or guardian requests their placement in a program.

AB 130 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021) establishes the ELOP and appropriates \$753 million for allocation to specified school districts and charter schools serving a high proportion of unduplicated pupils. Requires, upon receipt of funding for this purpose, specified schools serving pupils in kindergarten through grade 6 to provide at least 50% of unduplicated pupils with ELOP for a minimum of 9 hours of combined in-person instruction and expanded learning opportunities on school days and no less than 9 hours of expanded learning opportunities per day for at least 30 non-school days during summer and intersessional periods.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/4/26)

Alameda County Office of Education
California Association for Bilingual Education
Delta Kappa Gamma California
Partnership for Children and Youth

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/4/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Bains, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Bonta, Bryan, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Haney, Kalra, Ortega, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Zbur

Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/8/26 16:04:26

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 2286
Author: Bryan (D)
Introduced: 2/19/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Criminal procedure: attorney visits: medical settings

SOURCE: Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148

DIGEST: This bill clarifies that existing penalties for peace officers who refuse to allow an attorney to visit a prisoner apply if a prisoner is in a jail, prison, hospital or medical setting.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. (U.S. Const., Amend. 6)
- 2) Provides that the defendant in a criminal cause has the right to a speedy public trial, to compel attendance of witnesses in the defendant's behalf, to have the assistance of counsel for the defendant's defense, to be personally present with counsel, and to be confronted with the witnesses against the defendant. (California (Cal.) Constitution (Const.), art. I, §§ 15, 24.)
- 3) Provides that in a criminal action the defendant is entitled to be allowed counsel as in civil actions, or to appear and defendant in person and with counsel. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 686.)

- 4) Provides that when a complaint is filed with a magistrate charging a felony originally triable in the superior court of the county in which he or she sits, if, and only if, the magistrate is satisfied from the complaint that the offense complained of has been committed and that there is reasonable ground to believe that the defendant has committed it, the magistrate shall issue a warrant for the arrest of the defendant, except that, upon the request of the prosecutor, a summons instead of an arrest warrant shall be issued. (Pen. Code, § 813, subd. (a).)
- 5) Provides that an arrest warrant shall be directed generally to any peace officer, or to any public officer or employee authorized to serve process where the warrant is for a violation of a statute or ordinance which such person has the duty to enforce, in the state, and may be executed by any of those officers to whom it may be delivered. (Pen. Code, § 816.)
- 6) Provides that if the offense charged is a felony, and the arrest occurs in the county in which the warrant was issued, the officer making the arrest must take the defendant before the magistrate who issued the warrant or some other magistrate of the same county. (Pen. Code, § 821.)
- 7) Provides that an arrest is taking a person into custody in a case and in the manner authorized by law, and that an arrest may be made by a peace officer or by a private person. (Pen. Code, § 834.)
- 8) Provides that an arrest is made by an actual restraint of the person, or by submission to the custody of an officer, and that the person arrested may be subjected to such restraint as is reasonable for his arrest and detention. (Pen. Code, § 835.)
- 9) States that a defendant shall be taken before a magistrate without unnecessary delay, and, in any event, within 48 hours after his or her arrest, excluding Sundays and holidays. (Pen. Code, § 825, subd. (a)(1).)
- 10) Provides that after the arrest, any attorney may, at the request of the prisoner or any relative of the prisoner, visit the prisoner. Any officer having charge of the prisoner who willfully refuses or neglects to allow that attorney to visit a prisoner is guilty of a misdemeanor. Any officer having a prisoner in charge, who refuses to allow the attorney to visit the prisoner when proper application is made, shall forfeit and pay to the party aggrieved the sum of \$500, to be recovered by action in any court of competent jurisdiction. (Pen. Code, § 825, subd. (b).)

This bill:

- 1) Strikes the provision stating that after the arrest, any attorney may visit the prisoner at the request of the prisoner or any relative of the prisoner.
- 2) Specifies that the misdemeanor for willfully refusing or neglecting to allow an attorney to visit a prisoner applies when the prisoner is in a jail, prison, medical setting, or hospital.

Comments

This bill relates specifically to access to counsel by arrestees, defendants and prisoners in medical settings. It is well established that while hospitals and their staff may restrict access to counsel in particular cases, like where such a meeting would interfere with hospital operations or compromise the person's medical care, no attorney should be required to give the officer in charge of the prisoner the reason why he desired a private consultation with his client, as to do so could give the officer the power to determine whether such reasons were sufficient to grant such an interview, which would improperly substitute the judgment of the officer for the judgment of the prisoner and his counsel. Indeed, the right an accused person, confined to any place of detention, to have an opportunity to consult freely with his counsel is "one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the American criminal law – a right that no legislature or court can ignore or violate."

Beyond its constitutional guarantees regarding the right to counsel, California law – Penal Code section 825 subdivision (b) – specifies that after an arrest, any attorney licensed in the state may, at the request of the prisoner or a relative of the prisoner visit the prisoner. Moreover, existing law makes it a crime, punishable as a misdemeanor, for any peace officer having charge of the prisoner to refuse or neglect to allow that attorney to visit the prisoner, and allows the "party aggrieved" to recover from that officer damages in the amount of \$500. California case law establishes that the statute does not require that booking be completed in order for the right to attach, and that, because the statute was enacted to "protect the historic rights of the accused to have counsel, the "party aggrieved" clearly refers to the prisoner, not the attorney.

The author asserts that "defense attorneys and public defenders have [experienced] refusal from sheriffs to see their clients while they were hospitalized" and stresses the importance of clarifying in statute that peace officers looking after incarcerated people be specifically disallowed from blocking a person's access to counsel in a hospital or medical setting. Accordingly, this bill further clarifies the application of section 825(b), namely by specifying that an officer having charge of a prisoner in

a “jail, prison, medical setting or hospital,” is subject to criminal liability under that section.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Los Angeles County Public Defender’s Union, Local 148 (source)

ACLU California Action

Bridges of Hope CA

California Association of Licensed Investigators

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

California Civil Liberties Advocacy

California Coalition for Women Prisoners

California Community Foundation

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

Initiate Justice

Justice2Jobs Coalition

La Defensa

Restoring Hope California

Rubicon Programs

San Francisco Public Defender

San Quentin Skunkworks

Sister Warrior Freedom Coalition

Smart Justice

Uncommon Law

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Boerner, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen,

Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Berman, Bonta, Dixon, Flora, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:18

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2294
Author: Ta (R), et al.
Amended: 6/2/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/9/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Hurtado

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: State holidays: Sylvia Mendez Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill designates April 14 as Sylvia Mendez Day, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Designates specific days as holidays in the state, including, among others, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day.
- 2) Designates certain days as judicial holidays and exempts others including, Lunar New Year, Diwali, and Genocide Remembrance Day.

This bill:

- 1) Designates April 14, a state holiday, as Sylvia Mendez Day.
- 2) Exempts Sylvia Mendez Day from being a judicial holiday, as specified.

3) Includes related Legislative findings and declarations, as specified.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "as the former Mayor of Westminster, I know the power of the Mendez v. Westminster case. It's important for California to celebrate the civil rights challenges faced by Mexican-Americans in this state. Furthermore, I am confident California will benefit from learning of the historical link between Mendez v. Westminster and Brown v. Board of Education, and of how California led the way as the first state to outlaw all public school segregation. This legislative session should waste no time in celebrating Sylvia Mendez's contribution to civil rights in the state's government code to ensure this trailblazing case receives its proper place in history."

State Holidays. Existing law establishes the various state holidays of California, including those deemed to be judicial holidays. While many state holidays coincide with "judicial" or "bank" holidays, a number of these dates have been exempted in law from being a judicial holiday.

Existing state holidays include:

- a. Every Sunday.
- b. January 1.
- c. The third Monday in January, known as "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day."
- d. The date corresponding with the second new moon following the winter solstice, or the third new moon following the winter solstice should an intercalary month intervene, known as "Lunar New Year."
- e. February 12, known as "Lincoln Day."
- f. The third Monday in February.
- g. March 31, known as "Farmworkers Day."
- h. April 24, known as "Genocide Remembrance Day."
- i. The 15th day of the month of Kartik in the Hindu lunar calendar of each year, known as "Diwali."
- j. The last Monday in May.
- k. June 19, known as "Juneteenth."
- l. July 4.
- m. The first Monday in September.
- n. September 9, known as "Admission Day."
- o. The fourth Friday in September, known as "Native American Day."
- p. The second Monday in October, known as "Columbus Day."

- q. November 11, known as “Veterans Day.”
- r. December 25.
- s. Good Friday from 12 noon until 3 p.m..

This bill establishes April 14 as “Sylvia Mendez Day,” and specifically exempts that date from being included as a judicial holiday. This bill also includes related Legislative findings and declarations regarding Sylvia Mendez.

Sylvia Mendez. The landmark case of *Mendez v. Westminster School District of Orange County* (S.D. Cal. 1946) 64 F.Supp. 544, aff’d *Westminster School District of Orange County v. Mendez* (9th Cir. 1947) 161 F.2d 774 (hereafter *Mendez v. Westminster*) was a pivotal decision in the struggle for civil rights and educational equality for Mexican American students in California.

The case arose when Sylvia Mendez and other children in Orange County were denied admission to neighborhood schools and instead directed to separate “Mexican schools,” based solely on their ancestry and ethnicity. In response, Sylvia Mendez’s family, with others, challenged the practice in federal court. The families argued that the segregation of Mexican American students violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The federal district court agreed, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the decision in 1947, marking a major victory for educational equity and civil rights.

Mendez v. Westminster is widely regarded as one of the earliest and most important school desegregation cases in the nation. Years before the United States Supreme Court decided *Brown v. Board of Education*, the federal Courts in California recognized that separating children based on ancestry deprived them of equal educational opportunities and underlined the principles of equality upon which public education is founded. The case also attracted support from a broad coalition of civil rights organizations including the NAACP which filed an amicus brief through attorneys – including Thurgood Marshall – who would later successfully argue *Brown v. Board of Education* before the United States Supreme Court.

The decision’s impact extended beyond the courtroom. Just months after the Ninth Circuit affirmed the ruling, Governor Earl Warren signed legislation ending statutory school segregation in California. This act made California a national leader in the movement toward integrated public education. Governor Warren would later go on to serve as the Chief Justice of the United States and the author of the unanimous opinion in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

This bill designates Sylvia Mendez Day as a state holiday and exempts that date from being considered a judicial holiday. Existing law does not require private employers to provide paid holidays or close their businesses on any holiday. Similarly, local governments and state employers retain authority under applicable laws regarding paid time off.

Not All Holidays are Paid Holidays. California law does not require private employers to provide paid holidays, to close their business on any holiday, or to give employees the day off for any particular holiday. When an employer chooses to close its business on a holiday and provide paid time off, that practice exists because of an employer adopted policy or practice, the terms of a collective bargaining agreement, or the terms of an individual employment agreement. There is no legal requirement that an employer offer paid holidays or close its operations on those days.

At the local level, cities have the liberty to specify by charter, ordinance or resolution what paid holidays the city will provide to its city employees. Similarly, most state workers are bound by the memorandum of understanding that they have negotiated with the Governor. For all other state employees, they are entitled to the holidays prescribed in existing law.

This bill adds Sylvia Mendez Day to the list of state holidays. An additional state holiday does not equate to an additional paid day off. Public employees earn personal holidays that they may use to take any day off with pay.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1841 (Ramos, 2026) entitles state employees to a holiday on the 4th Friday in September, known as “Native American Day,” among other provisions. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

AB 2017 (Haney, 2026) adds “Eid al-Fitr” and “Eid al-Adha” to the list of state holidays, as specified. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

AB 2156 (Rivas, Chapter 7, Statutes of 2026) designated May 31 as Farmworkers Day and requires the Governor to annually proclaim March 31 as Farmworkers Day.

AB 2455 (Haney, 2026) requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as Bruce Lee Day, and designates that date as having special significance, as specified. (Pending on the Senate Floor)

AB 268 (Kalra, Chapter 358, Statutes of 2025) added Diwali to the list of state holidays, authorized public schools and community colleges to close on Diwali, and authorized state employees to elect to take specified leave in recognition of Diwali.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Anaheim Union High School District
California Association for Bilingual Education
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Campbell Union High School District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: In support of the bill, the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce writes that, “[t]he Mendez v. Westminster decision stands as an early and pivotal affirmation of equal protection in public education. Through determination and sacrifice, Latino families successfully confronted institutional discrimination, leading California to become one of the first states to prohibit school segregation. Their efforts not only advanced justice within the state but also helped lay the groundwork for the United States Supreme Court’s later rulings on educational equality.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo,

Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward,
Wicks, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Chen, Flora, Wallis, Wilson

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530

6/10/26 16:58:19

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2297
Author: Stefani (D)
Amended: 3/26/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 4/20/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Restitution: diversion

SOURCE: San Diego County District Attorney's Office

DIGEST: This bill applies the general restitution statute to defendants who enter a diversion program.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that, in order to preserve and protect a victim's rights to justice and due process, a victim is entitled to specified rights, including restitution. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 28, subd. (b)(13).)
- 2) Requires that restitution is ordered from the convicted wrongdoer in every case, regardless of the sentence or disposition imposed, in which a crime victim suffers a loss. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 28, subd. (b)(13)(B).)
- 3) States that it is the intent of the Legislature that a victim of a crime who incurs an economic loss as a result of the commission of a crime shall receive restitution directly from a defendant convicted of that crime. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (a)(1).)

- 4) Requires the court, upon a person being convicted of a crime, to order the defendant to pay a fine in the form of a penalty assessment. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (a)(2).)
- 5) Requires the court, in addition to any other penalty provided or imposed under the law, to order the defendant to pay both of the following: a restitution fine and restitution to the victim or victims, if any, which is enforceable as if the order were a civil judgment and must be paid, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (a)(3).)
- 6) Requires the court to impose a separate and additional restitution fine in every case where a person is convicted of a crime unless it finds compelling and extraordinary reasons for not doing so and states those reasons on the record. Provides that the restitution fine is set at the discretion of the court and commensurate with the seriousness of the offense. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (b).)
- 7) Requires the court to impose the restitution fine unless it finds compelling and extraordinary reasons for not doing so and states those reasons on the record. Provides that a defendant's inability to pay is not a compelling and extraordinary reason not to impose a restitution fine. Provides that inability to pay may be considered only in increasing the amount of the restitution fine in excess of the minimum fine. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (c).)
- 8) Requires the court, in setting the amount of the fine in excess of the minimum fine, to consider any relevant factors, including, but not limited to, the defendant's inability to pay, the seriousness and gravity of the offense and the circumstances of its commission, any economic gain derived by the defendant as a result of the crime, the extent to which any other person suffered losses as a result of the crime, and the number of victims involved in the crime. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (d).)
- 9) Requires the court, in every case in which a victim has suffered economic loss as a result of the defendant's conduct, to require that the defendant make restitution to the victim or victims in an amount established by court order, based on the amount of loss claimed by the victim or victims or any other showing to the court. Provides that the defendant has the right to a hearing before a judge to dispute the determination of the amount of restitution, and authorizes the court to modify the amount, on its own motion or on the motion

of the district attorney, the victim or victims, or the defendant. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f)(1).)

- 10) Requires, to the extent possible, that the restitution order be prepared by the sentencing court, identify each victim and each loss to which it pertains, and be of a dollar amount that is sufficient to fully reimburse the victim or victims for every determined economic loss incurred as the result of the defendant's criminal conduct, including, but not limited to full or partial payment for the value of stolen or damaged property, medical expenses, mental health counseling expenses, and wages or profits lost due to injury incurred by the victim, among other expenses. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f)(3)(A)-(L).)
- 11) Specifies that a restitution order is enforceable by the victim as a civil judgment, and enforceable in the same manner as is provided for the enforcement of any other money judgment. (Pen. Code, §§ 1202.4, subd. (i) & 1214, subd. (b).)
- 12) States that any portion of a restitution fine or restitution fee that remains unsatisfied after a defendant is no longer on probation, parole, postrelease community supervision or mandatory supervision, after a term in custody, or after completing diversion is enforceable by the California Victim Compensation Board (Cal VCB). (Pen. Code, §§ 1202.4, subd. (l) & 1214, subd. (a).)

This bill:

- 1) Requires the court to order restitution to the victim or victims, if any, which is enforceable as if the order were a civil judgment, and paid in the order required under existing law, when a defendant participates in a diversion program.
- 2) Requires a defendant to be informed of their right to have a judicial determination of the amount and is provided with a hearing, or they may waive the hearing or stipulate to the amount ordered.
- 3) Provides that if the court finds that restitution is owed to any victim as a result of the diverted offense, the court must order its payment during the period of diversion.

- 4) Prohibits a defendant's inability to pay restitution due to indigence or mental disorder from being used as grounds for denial of diversion or a finding that the defendant has failed to comply with the terms of diversion.
- 5) Requires, if the defendant withdraws from diversion or fails to complete the terms of diversion, that a restitution order is suspended until criminal proceedings are resolved.
- 6) States that if the defendant completes diversion, a restitution order may be enforced in the same manner as a civil judgment pursuant to existing provisions of law.

Background

Diversion. Diversion is the suspension of criminal proceedings for a prescribed period of time with certain conditions. A defendant may not be required to admit guilt as a prerequisite for placement in a pretrial diversion program. If diversion is successfully completed, the criminal charges are dismissed and the defendant may, with certain exceptions, legally answer that they have never been arrested or charged for the diverted offense. If diversion is not successfully completed, the criminal proceedings resume.

Diversion programs may be pre-plea or post-plea (often called deferred entry of judgment). Pre-plea programs allow a defendant to participate in the program without admitting guilt. In post-plea programs, the defendant must first admit guilt before participating in the program. The primary difference between the two types of diversion is that in a pre-plea program, criminal proceedings resume if the defendant does not successfully complete the program, and the defendant has the option to plead guilty or pursue a defense against their case. In a post-plea diversion program, the defendant (having already pled guilty) would be sentenced if they do not successfully complete the program.

In recent years, the Legislature has enacted several pre-plea diversion programs such as military diversion (SB 1227 (Hancock), Chapter 658, Statutes of 2013), mental health diversion (SB 215 (Beall), Chapter 1005, Statutes of 2018), diversion for primary caretakers (SB 394 (Skinner), Chapter 593, Statutes of 2019), and court-initiated misdemeanor diversion (AB 3234 (Ting), Chapter 334, Statutes of 2020). Drug diversion was enacted as a pre-plea program and changed to a post-plea program in 1997 (SB 1369 (Kopp), Chapter 1132, Statutes of 1996), then changed back to a pre-plea program (AB 208 (Eggman), Chapter 778, Statutes

of 2017). Existing law also authorizes a city or county prosecuting attorney or county probation department, until January 1, 2031, to create a diversion or deferred entry of judgment program for individuals who commit a theft offense or repeat theft offenses. (Pen. Code, § 1001.81.)

Restitution. The California Constitution guarantees victims the right to restitution. Specifically, the California Constitution provides that, in order to preserve and protect a victim's rights to justice and due process, a victim shall be entitled to specified rights, including among others, restitution. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 28, subd. (b)(13); added by Proposition 8, approved by California voters in the general election on November 8, 1982.) It also states that "[i]t is the unequivocal intention of the People of the State of California that all persons who suffer losses as a result of criminal activity shall have the right to restitution from the persons convicted of the crimes for losses they suffer. Restitution shall be ordered from the convicted persons in every case, regardless of the sentence or disposition imposed, in which a crime victim suffers a loss, unless compelling and extraordinary reasons exist to the contrary." (Cal. Const., art. I, § 28, subd. (b).) "A victim's right to restitution is, therefore, a constitutional one; it cannot be bargained away or limited, nor can the prosecution waive the victim's right to receive restitution." (*People v. Gross* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1313, 1317-1318.)

As directed by the voters, the Legislature enacted Penal Code section 1202.4 to implement the Victims' Bill of Rights. (*Gross, supra*, 238 Cal.App.4th at p. 1318; *People v. Seymour* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 1418, 1435.) This statute provides that "in every case in which a victim has suffered economic loss as a result of the defendant's conduct, the court shall require that the defendant make restitution to the victim or victims in an amount established by court order." (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f).) The statute further provides that a "defendant's inability to pay shall not be a consideration in determining the amount of a restitution order." (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (g).) Rather, victim restitution orders must be of a dollar amount that is sufficient to fully reimburse the victim, which can include an assortment of expenses such as medical expenses, mental health counseling expenses, wages or lost profits, noneconomic losses like psychological harm, actual and reasonable attorney's fees, and relocation fees. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f).) The victim restitution order must also include interest at the rate of 10% per annum. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f)(3)(G).)

If the amount of restitution cannot be ascertained at the time of sentencing, the court must include a provision in the restitution order that the restitution amount must be determined at a future time. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f).) The trial

court must incorporate the restitution order in the defendant's conditions of probation. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (l).) If part of a restitution order has not been paid after a defendant is no longer on probation, it remains enforceable by the victim as though it were a civil judgment. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (i); Pen. Code, § 1214.) Notably, if a defendant is unable to pay full restitution within the initial term of probation, the court can modify and extend the period of probation to allow the defendant to pay off all restitution within the probation term. (Pen. Code, § 1203.3, subd. (b)(4); *People v. Cookson* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1091, 1097.) Generally, the probation term may be extended up to, but not beyond, the maximum probation period allowed for the offense. (*People v. Medeiros* (1994) 25 Cal.App.4th 1260, 1267-1268.)

Payment of victim restitution goes directly to the victim and compensates them for economic losses they have suffered because of the defendant's crime (i.e., to make the victim reasonably whole). (*People v. Guillen* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 975, 984.) A victim restitution order is an enforceable civil money judgment, and typical post-judgment enforcement tools are available to the victim. (Pen. Code, § 1214, subd. (b).) Victims have access to all available resources to enforce the order, including wage garnishment and lien procedures, even if the defendant is no longer in custody or on supervision. (*Ibid.*)

Restitution is specifically authorized in several of the existing diversion statutes. For example, the mental health diversion law provides that “[u]pon request, the court shall conduct a hearing to determine whether restitution, as defined in subdivision (f) of Section 1202.4, is owed to any victim as a result of the diverted offense and, if owed, order its payment during the period of diversion.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.36, subd. (f)(1)(D).) The court-initiated misdemeanor diversion program requires a defendant to “[m]ake full restitution.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.96, subd. (b).) Both statutes provide that a defendant's inability to pay restitution due to indigence “shall not be grounds for denial of diversion or a finding that the defendant has failed to comply with the terms of diversion.” (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.36, subd. (f)(1)(D); 1001.96, subd. (b).)

The theft diversion statute provides that a condition of diversion may include “[m]aking adequate restitution or an appropriate substitute for restitution to the establishment or person from which property was stolen at the face value of the stolen property, if required by the program.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.81, subd. (e)(2).) The bad check diversion statute contains a similar provision that states that a condition of diversion may include “[f]ull restitution being made to the victim.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.64.) Comparatively, the statutes that established diversion for

individuals with developmental disabilities, parental diversion, military diversion, primary caregiver diversion, and drug diversion are silent on victim restitution. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.20 et seq.; 1001.70 et seq.; 1001.80; 1001.83; 1000.)

This bill's proponents argue that the individual diversion statutes are inconsistent with respect to their approach to victim restitution which has resulted in courts frequently not ordering victim restitution. They contend that placing the authority to order diversion within the general restitution statute—Penal Code section 1202.4—will ensure more even application and provide an avenue for enforcement after the period of diversion has ended.

This bill amends Penal Code section 1202.4 to provide a right to restitution for victims of crimes where the defendant participates in a diversion program. Because existing law requires victim compensation after a conviction, and a defendant who participates successfully in a diversion program would not have a conviction for the underlying offense, courts may only order restitution if the individual diversion statute authorizes it. This bill applies the same rights to a hearing to determine the amount of restitution, if any, as exists for defendants who have been convicted of a crime. Consistent with the diversion statutes that explicitly provide for restitution, this bill prohibits a defendant's inability to pay restitution due to indigence or mental disorder from being used as grounds for denial of diversion or a finding that the defendant has failed to comply with the terms of diversion. Finally, the bill provides that if the defendant completes diversion, a restitution order may be enforced pursuant to Penal Code section 1214. Section 1214 states that any portion of a restitution fine that remains unsatisfied after a defendant has completed diversion is enforceable by the California Victim Compensation Board.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

San Diego County District Attorney's Office (source)
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Police Chiefs Association

California Reserve Peace Officers Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
League of California Cities
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

ACLU California Action
California Public Defenders Association
Debt Free Justice California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 4/20/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Elhawary, Garcia, Hart, Kalra, Lee, McKinnor, Patterson, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins, Ward

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /

6/10/26 16:58:19

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 2455
Author: Haney (D), Fong (D) and Lee (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/3/26
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/9/26
AYES: Rubio, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle,
Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Hurtado

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Bruce Lee Day

SOURCE: Bruce Lee Foundation
Chinese Historical Society of America
Stand with Asians

DIGEST: This bill designates May 17 of each year as a day having special significance called Bruce Lee Day, and this bill encourages all public schools and educational institutions on Bruce Lee Day to conduct exercises remembering the life of Bruce Lee, recognizing his accomplishments, and familiarizing pupils with the contributions he made to the state. This bill requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as Bruce Lee Day.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Indicates that for each day designated and set apart as a day having special significance, all public schools and educational institutions are encouraged to observe and conduct suitable commemorative exercises. Indicates that it is the

intent of the Legislature that the commemorative exercises be integrated into the regular school program and be conducted by the school or institution within the amount of time otherwise budgeted for educational programs. (Education Code (EC) § 37222)

- 2) Designates a number of days as days having special significance, including the following days recognizing specific individuals: John Muir Day (April 21), Harvey Milk Day (May 22), Ronald Reagan Day (February 6), and Dolores Huerta Day (April 10). (EC § 37222.10 – 37222.21)
- 3) Requires public schools to close on a number of holidays, including January 1, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Lincoln Day, Washington Day, Memorial Day, July 4, Labor Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, December 25, all days designated by the Governor and President for a public fast, thanksgiving, or holiday, any special or limited holidays on which the Governor provides that the schools close, and any other day designated as a holiday by the governing board of a local school district. (EC § 37220)
- 4) Requires, for some specified holidays for which schools are required to close (Dr. Martin Luther King Day, Lincoln Day, Washington Day), that schools conduct exercises in commemoration. (EC § 37220)
- 5) Authorizes public schools to close on other days if the governing board, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding reached through collective bargaining, agrees to close schools for that purpose. These days are Cesar Chavez Day (March 31), Native American Day (fourth Friday in September), Genocide Remembrance Day (April 24), Diwali (the 15th day of the month of Kartik in the Hindu lunar calendar). (EC § 37220.5 and 37220.7)
- 6) Requires public schools to remain open on specified days—unless otherwise closed due to a governing board of a school district designating a day as a holiday—and to celebrate the significance of those days with appropriate commemorative exercises. These days are the anniversary of the adoption of the United States Constitution, the birthdays of Luther Burbank (March 7) and Susan B. Anthony (February 15), and the death of Crispus Attucks (March 5). (EC § 37221)

This bill:

- 1) Designates May 17 of each year as a day having special significance called Bruce Lee Day, which means that all public schools and educational

institutions are encouraged to observe that day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises.

- 2) Encourages all public schools and educational institutions on Bruce Lee Day to conduct exercises remembering the life of Bruce Lee, recognizing his accomplishments, and familiarizing pupils with the contributions he made to the state.
- 3) Requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as Bruce Lee Day.
- 4) Makes finding and declarations related to the life of Bruce Lee as a trailblazing Chinese American martial artist, actor, and filmmaker; for his contributions to the Chinese American community, including his influence in the San Francisco Bay Area and other regions of the state; his status as the first Asian American actor to play a leading role in a Hollywood movie; and his commitment to civil rights, racial solidarity, and community.

Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, “many Asian Americans report feeling marginalized or excluded in American society. According to a 2021 Pew Research Center survey, approximately one-third of Asian Americans say they have been subjected to racial slurs or jokes, and many report feeling treated as “foreigners” regardless of how long they or their families have lived in the United States.

During Bruce Lee’s lifetime, these barriers were even more pronounced. Asian actors were often limited to stereotypical or minor roles, rarely appearing as leading figures on screen. Lee’s success fundamentally challenged those norms, opening doors for generations of Asian American performers and creators.

Despite his profound cultural influence and his roots in San Francisco, California has never formally recognized Bruce Lee’s contributions to representation and cultural progress. ... [This bill recognizes] one of the most influential Chinese Americans in California history.”

- 2) *State has designated multiple days as having special significance.* For days that the state has designated and set apart as having special significance, all public schools and educational institutions are encouraged to observe that day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises. Currently, the state has

designated a dozen separate days as having special significance. These days of special significance differ from holidays for which all public schools are required to close, as well as days for which a school's governing board makes a local decision to close. If this bill is to be enacted, all public schools and educational institutions would be encouraged to observe Bruce Lee Day and to conduct suitable commemorative exercises in recognition of Bruce Lee's life and accomplishments.

- 3) *Other dates recognizing Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) communities.* The state has recognized the cultural heritage and contributions of AAPI communities by designating and setting apart other days as having special significance to the AAPI communities, including Lunar New Year and the Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, and the state recognizes that public schools may be closed for Diwali, which is on the 15th day of the month of Kartik in the Hindu lunar calendar of each year. In addition, the Governor issues a proclamation every May declaring the month as Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.
- 4) *Arguments in support.* According to a letter submitted to this committee from Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California, "According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, about one-third of Asian Americans have reported feeling treated as "foreigners" and have been subjected to racist rhetoric. Additionally, the AANHPI community faced heightened levels of anti-Asian hate during the COVID pandemic. Approximately 4 in 10 U.S.-born Asian Americans know of an Asian individual who was threatened or attacked since the pandemic first began.

During Bruce Lee's lifetime, these challenges were even more significant. Asian American representation in the film and media space was very limited to minor roles or roles that paint him as the villain. Lee's success challenged these stereotypes, paving the way for generations of Asian American performers and artists. Despite Lee's impact on California, the state has never formally recognized his contributions. This bill will be the first bill in our state to honor a Chinese American."

According to a letter submitted to this committee from the San Francisco Chinese Chamber of Commerce, "Bruce Lee was more than a martial artist or film icon. He represented confidence, discipline, innovation, and cultural pride at a time when Asian Americans were often overlooked or misrepresented in mainstream American society. Through his work, he helped

redefine how Asian Americans were viewed not only in entertainment, but also in broader public life. His influence transcended generations, cultures, and borders, making him one of the most recognizable cultural ambassadors of Chinese and Asian heritage in modern history.

Bruce Lee also holds a unique and deeply personal connection to San Francisco's Chinese-American community. He was born at Chinese Hospital in Chinatown, an institution founded in the 1800s to serve immigrant communities during a time when Chinese Americans faced widespread discrimination and limited access to healthcare. The Chinese Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco was among the founding community institutions that helped establish and support Chinese Hospital, making this recognition especially meaningful and historically significant to our organization and community.

California is home to one of the largest and most diverse Asian American communities in the nation. Recognizing Bruce Lee's legacy reflects the values of inclusion, perseverance, and cultural exchange that continue to shape our state. Designating "Bruce Lee Day" would also provide an opportunity for schools, community organizations, and future generations to learn about the historical challenges Asian Americans faced and the contributions they have made to California's cultural and economic fabric."

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 268 (Kalra, Chapter 358, Statutes of 2025) adds Diwali to the list of state holidays, authorizes public schools and educational institutions throughout the state to close on Diwali, and authorizes state employees to elect to take specified leave in recognition of Diwali.

AB 2596 (Low, Chapter 792, Statutes of 2022) recognizes Lunar New Year as a state holiday and authorizes eligible state employees to elect to receive eight hours of holiday credit for that date in lieu of receiving eight hours of personal credit, as specified.

AB 1775 (Furutani, Chapter 241, Statutes of 2010) designates January 30 of each year as Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, a day having special significance.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Bruce Lee Foundation (co-source)
 Chinese Historical Society of America (co-source)
 Stand with Asians (co-source)
 Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
 Asian Law Alliance
 Asian Leaders Alliance
 Asian Pacific Islander Council of San Francisco
 ASIAN, Inc.
 BeChinatown
 Center for Asian American Media
 Chinese Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
 Chinese Hospital
 Contemporary Asian Theater Scene
 EMPIRE Distribution Inc.
 Oakland Chinatown Chamber of Commerce
 One APIA Nevada
 Rose Pak Community Fund
 San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Democratic Club
 San Francisco Travel Association
 Sunset Chinese Cultural District
 Teamsters Local 665
 The 1990 Institute
 The Asian American Foundation
 United Playaz
 #MakeItBay

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Boerner, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schultz, Sharp-

Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks,
Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Berman, Bonta, Dixon, Flora, Harabedian,
Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/10/26 16:58:20

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 2539
Author: Ramos (D)
Introduced: 2/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/9/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Hurtado

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Tribal-state gaming compacts: ratification

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill extends the review period for tribal-state gaming compacts submitted during a joint recess from the 15th day to the 20th day after the Legislature reconvenes. Current law provides that any tribal-state gaming compact, executed after the 1999 compacts, is deemed ratified if the compact is substantially similar to a previously approved compact, unless either house of the Legislature rejects the compact within 30 days of its submission. If the 30-day review period expires during a joint recess of the Legislature, current law extends the review period until the 15th day following the Legislature's reconvening.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, under the federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA), for the negotiation and execution of tribal-state gaming compacts for the purpose of authorizing certain types of gaming on Indian lands with the state.

- 2) Authorizes the Governor to negotiate and conclude tribal-state gaming compacts, subject to ratification by the Legislature.
- 3) Provides that any other tribal-state gaming compact entered into between the state and a federally recognized Indian tribe that is executed after September 10, 1999, is ratified if it is identical in all material respects to any of the compacts expressly ratified by these provisions and if the compact is not rejected by each house of the Legislature within 30 days of the date of the submission of the compact to the Legislature by the Governor. If the 30-day period ends during a joint recess of the Legislature, existing law extends the period to reject the compact until the 15th day following the day that the Legislature reconvenes.

This bill extends the review period for tribal-state gaming compacts submitted during a joint recess from the 15th day to the 20th day after the Legislature reconvenes.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "this bill makes a technical change allowing for additional time if a compact is before the legislature and the exclusive period ends during recess. This would provide an additional five days of the current 15 following when the legislature reconvenes."

Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) to provide a statutory basis for the operation and regulation of gaming on Indian lands. IGRA provides that an Indian tribe may conduct gaming activity on Indian lands if the activity "is not specifically prohibited by federal law and is conducted within a State which does not prohibit such gaming activity."

IGRA distinguishes between three classes of gaming (Class I, Class II, and Class III) and provides for different forms of regulation for each class. Class I gaming includes "social games" for minor prizes or "traditional forms of Indian gaming." Class II gaming is defined as including bingo and card games that are explicitly authorized by the laws of the state, or that are not explicitly prohibited by the laws of the state and are played at any location in the State, so long as the card games are played in conformity with those laws and regulations. Class III gaming includes such things as slot machines, casino games, and banked card games such as blackjack and baccarat. Class III gaming may only be conducted under terms of a compact negotiated between an Indian tribe and a State.

IGRA was enacted against a legal background in which Indian tribes and individuals generally are exempt from state taxation within their own territory. IGRA provides that with the exception of assessments permitted under the statute, to defray the State's costs of regulating gaming activity, IGRA shall not be interpreted as conferring upon a State authority to impose any tax, fee, charge, or other assessment upon an Indian tribe to engage in Class III activity. Nor may a State refuse to enter into negotiations based on the lack of authority to impose such a tax, fee, charge, or other assessment.

When a tribe requests negotiations for a Class III compact, IGRA requires the State to negotiate with the Indian tribe in good faith. IGRA provides a comprehensive process to prevent an impasse in compact negotiations, which is triggered when a tribe files suit alleging that the State has refused to negotiate or has failed to negotiate in good faith.

Before 2000, the California Constitution prohibited Class III gaming. In 2000, California voters approved Proposition 1A, which had been proposed by the Governor and passed by the Legislature. Proposition 1A amended the California Constitution to permit the Governor to negotiate compacts with federally recognized Indian tribes for certain Class III gaming activities. Because non-Indian parties were still forbidden from operating gaming facilities, Proposition 1A granted Indian tribes a "constitutionally protected monopoly on most types of Class III games in California."

Compact Ratification Process in California. The California Constitution, as amended by Proposition 1A in 2000, authorizes federally recognized Indian tribes to conduct and operate slot machines, lottery games, and banked and percentage cards games on Indian lands, provided that all of the following conditions are met:

- 1) The Governor and an Indian tribe enter into a tribal-state compact;
- 2) The Legislature approves the compact; and
- 3) The federal government approves the compact.

The State of California in 1999 and 2000 entered into over 60 tribal-state gaming compacts with tribes in California pursuant to IGRA. These compacts are collectively referred to as the 1999 Compacts. Existing law provides that any other tribal-state gaming compact, executed after the 1999 Compacts, is deemed ratified if the compact is identical in all material respects to a compact previously ratified by statute, unless either house of the Legislature rejects the compact within 30 days

of its submission. If the 30-day review period expires during a joint recess of the Legislature, existing law extends the review period until the 15th day following the Legislature's reconvening.

This bill extends the review period for tribal-state gaming compacts submitted during a joint recess from the 15th day to the 20th day after the Legislature reconvenes.

Prior/Related Legislation

AB 2695 (G.O. 2012) would have repealed and renumbered sections of the Government Code relating to Indian gaming into one stand-alone Title in the Government Code. (Held in the Senate Inactive File)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Berman, Bonta, Dixon, Flora, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
6/10/26 16:58:21

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 2556
Author: Boerner (D)
Introduced: 2/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Evidence: credibility of witnesses and evidence affected or excluded by extrinsic policies

SOURCE: San Diego County District Attorney's Office

DIGEST: This bill eliminates exceptions related to sex offenses occurring in a state prison or local detention facility from the Rape Shield Law.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) States that only relevant evidence is admissible, and except as otherwise provided by statute, all relevant evidence is admissible. (Evidence (Evid.) Code, §§ 350, 351.)
- 2) Defines “relevant evidence” as evidence, including evidence relevant to the credibility of a witness or hearsay declarant, having any tendency in reason to prove or disprove any disputed fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action. (Evid. Code, § 210.)
- 3) Authorizes a court in its discretion to exclude evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will necessitate

undue consumption of time or create substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing the issues, or of misleading the jury. (Evid. Code, § 352.)

- 4) Provides that the court or jury may consider in determining the credibility of a witness any matter that has any tendency in reason to prove or disprove the truthfulness of the witness's testimony at the hearing, except as otherwise provided by statute. Provides that this includes but is not limited to the following:
 - a) The witness's demeanor while testifying and the manner in which the witness testifies.
 - b) The character of their testimony.
 - c) The extent of their capacity to perceive, to recollect, or to communicate any matter about which the witness testifies.
 - d) The extent of their opportunity to perceive any matter about which the witness testifies.
 - e) The witness's character for honesty or veracity or their opposites.
 - f) The existence or nonexistence of a bias, interest, or other motive.
 - g) A statement previously made by the witness that is consistent with their testimony at the hearing.
 - h) A statement made by the witness that is inconsistent with any part of their testimony at the hearing.
 - i) The existence or nonexistence of any fact testified to by the witness.
 - j) The witness's attitude toward the action in which they testify or toward the giving of testimony.
 - k) The witness's admission of untruthfulness. (Evid. Code, § 780.)
- 5) Requires, for specified sex offenses, if evidence of sexual conduct of the complaining witness is offered to attack the credibility of the complaining witness, the following procedures be followed:
 - a) A written motion must be made by the defendant to the court and prosecutor stating that the defense has an offer of proof of the relevance of evidence of the sexual conduct of the complaining witness that is proposed to be presented and of its relevance in attacking the credibility of the complaining witness.
 - b) The written motion must be accompanied by an affidavit in which the offer of proof must be stated. The affidavit must be filed under seal and only unsealed by the court to determine if the offer of proof is sufficient to order a

- hearing, as specified. After that determination, the affidavit must be resealed by the court.
- c) If the court finds that the offer of proof is sufficient, the court must order a hearing out of the presence of the jury, if any, and at the hearing allow the questioning of the complaining witness regarding the offer of proof made by the defendant.
 - d) At the conclusion of the hearing, if the court finds that evidence proposed to be offered by the defendant regarding the sexual conduct of the complaining witness is relevant and not inadmissible, the court may make an order stating what evidence may be introduced by the defendant, and the nature of the questions to be permitted. The defendant may then offer evidence pursuant to the order of the court.
 - e) An affidavit resealed by the court must remain sealed, unless the defendant raises an issue on appeal or collateral review relating to the offer of proof contained in the sealed document. If the defendant raises that issue on appeal, the court must allow the Attorney General and appellate counsel for the defendant access to the sealed affidavit. If the issue is raised on collateral review, the court must allow the district attorney and defendant's counsel access to the sealed affidavit. The use of the information contained in the affidavit is limited solely to the pending proceeding. (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (a)(1)-(5).)
- 6) Defines “complaining witness” as: the alleged victim of the crime charged, the prosecution of which is subject to this law; or, an alleged victim offering testimony of a sex offense, as specified. (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (b)(1).)
- 7) Defines “evidence of sexual conduct” as portions of a social media account about the complaining witness, including any text, image, video, or picture, which depict sexual content, sexual history, nudity or partial nudity, intimate sexual activity, communications about sex, sexual fantasies, and other information that appeals to a prurient interest, unless it is related to the alleged offense. (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (b)(2).)
- 8) Provides that the rape shield hearing procedure is required in prosecutions for rape, aiding and abetting rape, sodomy, oral copulation, child molestation, continuous sexual abuse of children, and sexual penetration except if the alleged crime occurs in a state prison or local detention facility. (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (c)(1).)

- 9) Requires the rape shield hearing process when presenting uncharged misconduct evidence and an alleged victim testifies as a victim of sexual battery, rape, unlawful sexual intercourse, aggravated sexual abuse of a child, incest, sodomy, oral copulation, child molestation, continuous sexual abuse of a child, sexual penetration, masturbation in public, or annoying or molesting a child, except if the crime is alleged to have occurred in a local detention facility or state prison. (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (c)(2).)
- 10) Provides that in a criminal action, evidence of the character or a trait of character (in the form of an opinion, evidence of reputation, or evidence of specific instances of conduct) of the victim of the crime for which the defendant is being prosecuted is not made inadmissible by other restrictions if: offered by the defendant to prove conduct of the victim in conformity with the character or trait of character; offered by the prosecution to rebut evidence adduced by the defendant. (Evid. Code, § 1103, subd. (a).)
- 11) Provides that in any prosecution for rape, aiding and abetting rape, sodomy, oral copulation, or sexual penetration, or for assault with intent to commit, attempt to commit, or conspiracy to commit a crime defined in any of those provisions, except where the crime is alleged to have occurred in a local detention facility or in a state prison, opinion evidence, reputation evidence, and evidence of specific instances of the complaining witness' sexual conduct, or any of that evidence, is not admissible by the defendant in order to prove consent by the complaining witness. (Evid. Code, § 1103, subd. (c)(1).)

This bill eliminates exceptions related to sex offenses that take place in a state prison or local detention facility from the rape shield law.

Background

The Rape Shield Law was passed in California in 1974. The Legislature created limitations on the introduction of evidence in specific sex-related cases to recognize that victims of sex-related offenses deserve heightened protection against “surprise, harassment, and unnecessary invasions of privacy.” (*People v. Fontana* (2010) 49 Cal. 4th 351, 362-63, citing *People v. Rioz* (1984) 161 Cal.App.3d 905, 916-17.) The crimes that implicate the Rape Shield Law are: sexual battery, rape, unlawful sexual intercourse with a minor, spousal rape, incest, sodomy, oral copulation by force, sexual abuse of a child under 14 or a dependent person, continuous sexual abuse of a child, forcible penetration with a foreign object, indecent exposure, and annoying or molesting a minor.

The Rape Shield Law generally prohibits the introduction of evidence against an alleged victim about that person's prior sexual conduct, sexual reputation, or manner of dress in order to show that the person consented to the sexual act in question. (Evid. Code, § 1103, subd. (c).) However, impeachment evidence of an alleged victim, or a witness, that relates to sexual conduct may be introduced by following a specified procedure—filing a written motion with the court in a criminal jury trial where the judge will make a ruling on admissibility of that evidence. (Evid. Code, § 782.) Other impeachment evidence intended to attack the credibility of a witness that is not sexual in nature is not required to be vetted first by a judge.

Most evidence of alleged sexual misconduct by a victim is not admissible. Even if it is proper impeachment evidence, courts usually find that it is more prejudicial than probative.

One exception in the Rape Shield Law pertains to alleged conduct that occurs in-custody (also known as the “detention” exception.) (Evid. Code, § 782, subd. (c)(1)-(3).) Evidence Code section 782, subdivision (c)(1) provides that the rape shield requirements apply:

In a prosecution under Section 261, 262, 264.1, 286, 287, 288, 288.5, or 289 of, or former Section 288a of, the Penal Code, or for assault with intent to commit, attempt to commit, or conspiracy to commit any crime defined in any of those sections, *except if the crime is alleged to have occurred in a local detention facility*, as defined in Section 6031.4 of the Penal Code, *or in the state prison*, as defined in Section 4504.

Evidence Code section 1103, subdivision (c)(1), similarly states that character evidence is inadmissible except as provided:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this code to the contrary, and except as provided in this subdivision, in any prosecution under Section 261 or 264.1 of the Penal Code, or under Section 286, 287, or 289 of, or former Section 262 or 288a of, the Penal Code, or for assault with intent to commit, attempt to commit, or conspiracy to commit a crime defined in any of those sections, *except where the crime is alleged to have occurred in a local detention facility*, as defined in Section 6031.4, *or in a state prison*, as defined in Section

4504, opinion evidence, reputation evidence, and evidence of specific instances of the complaining witness' sexual conduct, or any of that evidence, is not admissible by the defendant in order to prove consent by the complaining witness.

The detention exception was added by SB 23 (Watson, Chapter 726, Statutes of 1981), to account for consensual sex acts between incarcerated individuals in cases where one of the individuals claimed rape in order to avoid punishment (because participating in an act of sodomy or oral sex in carceral settings is unlawful).

This bill eliminates exceptions related to sex offenses that take place in a state prison or local detention facility from Evidence Code sections 782 and 1103.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

San Diego County District Attorney's Office (source)
California District Attorneys Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 4/16/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Berman, Bonta, Dixon, Flora, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 16:58:21

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2561
Author: Valencia (D)
Amended: 4/23/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/8/26
AYES: Cabaldon, Jones, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes,
Umberg, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Operating systems and applications: privacy settings

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits an operating system or application from undoing a user's affirmative configuration of a privacy setting without the user's consent.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 1.)
- 2) 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. (Civ. Code § 1798.100 et seq.)
- 3) Defines "personal information" for purposes of the CCPA as information that identifies, relates to, describes, is reasonably capable of being associated with,

or could reasonably be linked, directly or indirectly, with a particular consumer or household. The CCPA provides a nonexclusive series of categories of information deemed to be personal information, including biometric information, geolocation data, and “sensitive personal information.” (Civ. Code § 1798.140(v)(1).)

- 4) Defines “consent” for purposes of the CCPA as any freely given, specific, informed, and unambiguous indication of the consumer’s wishes by which the consumer, or the consumer’s legal guardian, a person who has power of attorney, or a person acting as a conservator for the consumer, including by a statement or by a clear affirmative action, signifies agreement to the processing of personal information relating to the consumer for a narrowly defined particular purpose. Acceptance of a general or broad terms of use, or similar document, that contains descriptions of personal information processing along with other, unrelated information, does not constitute consent. Hovering over, muting, pausing, or closing a given piece of content does not constitute consent. Likewise, agreement obtained through use of dark patterns does not constitute consent. (Civ. Code § 1798.140(h).)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits an operating system or an application from undoing a user’s affirmative configuration of a privacy setting without the user’s consent.
- 2) Defines the relevant terms:
 - a) “Application” means a software program, mobile app, or desktop app that collects, processes, or stores personal information about a user in the state and that provides privacy settings allowing the user to control the collection, use, sharing, or disclosure of that personal information.
 - b) “Consent” and “personal information” have the same meaning as laid out in the CCPA.
 - c) “Privacy setting” means any user-configurable option within an application’s privacy, or similarly labeled, menu that governs the application’s collection, use, sharing, disclosure, retention, or processing of the user’s personal information.

Background

Consumer data collection has become an inescapable feature of modern digital life, with operating systems, applications, and online services continuously gathering information about your location, browsing habits, purchase history, device usage,

and even physical activity. This is often done in ways that are not immediately visible to the average user. Tech companies, advertisers, and data brokers aggregate this information to build detailed profiles that can influence everything from the ads a consumer sees to the prices they are offered, and in some cases, the data is sold to or accessed by third parties the consumer never interacted with.

Privacy settings on operating systems such as Windows, macOS, iOS, and Android allow users to review and set permissions granted to apps, limit location tracking, disable telemetry and diagnostic sharing, and restrict ad personalization. At the app level, consumers generally have the ability to control access to their camera, microphone, contacts, and storage, and to opt out of data sharing features.

This bill ensures that those consumers who take advantage of these options and configure their privacy settings are having their preferences honored. This bill prohibits an operating system or application from undoing a user's affirmative configuration of a privacy setting without the user's consent.

This bill is author sponsored. No timely support or opposition has been received.

Comments

Given the sensitivity of the information that can be exposed when using electronic devices, privacy settings are extremely important tools for consumers, providing them some modest measure of control over the flow of their information.

Microsoft details the privacy settings available for Windows and how they work:

Windows privacy settings let you control which apps can access your personal data and device features—such as your location, camera, microphone, contacts, and calendar—so you can decide what information apps can use and when.

...

Each privacy setting controls access to a specific type of data, such as your location, camera, or contacts. You can turn access on or off for individual apps.

If you turn off access for an app, that app can't use the related data or feature.¹

¹ Microsoft, *Windows privacy settings that apps use*, <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/windows/windows-privacy-settings-that-apps-use-8b7f2cf4-c359-bf99-0f69-2123cc9ddfc1>.

Identifying the growing importance of privacy to consumers, Apple has instituted a number of more protective privacy settings for users. For example, these settings can limit data tracking by applications downloaded to consumer devices:

App Tracking Transparency.

Your devices carry the story of your life. We believe you should have a choice in how apps track and share your data with other companies for advertising or with data brokers.

Starting with iOS 14.5 and iPadOS 14.5, apps are required to ask your permission when they want to track you across apps and websites owned by other companies. You can change your preference for any app or prevent apps from asking for permission entirely in Settings.²

This bill seeks to ensure consumers' configuration of these settings is respected. It prohibits an operating system or an application from undoing a user's affirmative configuration of a privacy setting without the user's consent. While this protection only applies to settings that a user affirmatively configures, rather than those privacy settings that may be the default, it provides some additional layer of protection for consumers.

According to the author:

AB 2561 strengthens privacy protections for consumers by ensuring that software companies and applications do not change privacy settings without their consent. The overwhelming majority of Californians strongly desire data minimization. However, many software systems and apps change user's privacy settings, most notably after an update. If a user is savvy enough to notice a difference in their settings, the onus falls on them to troubleshoot the issue and re-adjust their privacy setting to what it was prior to the update. AB 2561 would prioritize user's privacy rights and ensure they remain in control of their data.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

² Apple, *Control is yours*, <https://www.apple.com/privacy/control/>.

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bennett, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548
6/10/26 16:58:22

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2636
Author: Pacheco (D)
Amended: 3/16/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Pérez

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-0, 5/7/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Juveniles

SOURCE: California Police Chiefs Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California

DIGEST: This bill requires the court to consider, for purposes of determining suitability of a minor for deferred entry of judgement (DEJ), whether the minor is charged with carrying a loaded firearm in public.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, generally, that a minor who is between 12 years of age and 17 years of age, inclusive, when the minor violates any law defining a crime, is subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and to adjudication as a ward. (Welfare (Welf.) & Institutions (Inst.) Code, § 602, subd. (a).)
- 2) Requires, whenever a case is before the juvenile court for a determination of whether a minor may be adjudicated as a ward because of the commission of a felony offense, the minor to be considered for DEJ if all of the following circumstances apply:

- a) The minor has not previously been declared to be a ward of the court for the commission of a felony offense;
 - b) The offense charged is not a Section 707(b) offense;
 - c) The minor has not previously been committed to the custody of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), Division of Juvenile Facilities;
 - d) The minor's record does not indicate that probation has ever been revoked without being completed;
 - e) The minor is at least 14 years of age at the time of the hearing;
 - f) The minor is eligible for probation; and,
 - g) The offense charged is not rape, sodomy, oral copulation, or an act of sexual penetration when the victim was prevented from resisting due to being rendered unconscious by any intoxicating, anesthetizing, or controlled substance, or when the victim was at the time incapable, because of mental disorder or developmental or physical disability, of giving consent, and that was known or reasonably should have been known to the minor at the time of the offense. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (a).)
- 3) Requires the prosecuting attorney to review their file to determine whether the minor is eligible for DEJ based on the factors listed above, and if so determined, requires the prosecuting attorney to file a declaration with the court or state for the record the grounds upon which the determination is based. Requires this information to be available to the minor and their attorney. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (b).)
- 4) Authorizes the court, upon a finding that the minor is also suitable for DEJ and would benefit from education, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts, to grant DEJ. Requires the court to make these findings on the record where DEJ is granted. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (b).)
- 5) Provides that a person is guilty of carrying a loaded firearm when the person carries a loaded firearm on the person or in a vehicle while in any public place or on any public street in an incorporated city, city and county, or in any public place or on any public street in a prohibited area of an unincorporated area of a county or city and county. (Pen. Code, § 25850, subd. (a).)
- 6) Provides that carrying a loaded firearm in public is punishable as follows:
- a) Where the person previously has been convicted of any felony, or of any specified firearm-related offenses, as a felony.

- b) Where the firearm is stolen and the person knew or had reasonable cause to believe that it was stolen, as a felony.
- c) Where the person is an active participant in a criminal street gang, as a felony.
- d) Where the person is not in lawful possession of the firearm, or is within a class of persons prohibited from possessing or acquiring a firearm, as a felony.
- e) Where the person has been convicted of a crime against a person or property, or of a narcotics or dangerous drug violation, as an alternate felony-misdemeanor (hereinafter “wobbler”).
- f) Where the person is not listed with the Department of Justice (DOJ) as the recorded owner of the handgun, as a wobbler.
- g) In all others cases, as a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail not to exceed one year, by a fine not to exceed one \$1,000, or by both. (Pen. Code, § 25850, subd. (c).)

This bill requires the court to consider, for purposes of determining suitability of a minor for DEJ, whether the minor is charged with carrying a loaded firearm in public.

Background

DEJ is a post-adjudication, pre-disposition diversion program. Under existing law, certain juvenile offenders are eligible for DEJ. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790.) For DEJ, a minor must admit each allegation in the petition, and the judgment is deferred while the minor is placed on probation for one to three years. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 791.) While on probation, certain terms and conditions related to the minor’s treatment and rehabilitation are imposed. Upon the successful completion of the terms of probation, the charge or charges against the minor are dismissed, the arrest upon which the judgment was deferred is deemed never to have occurred, and any records in the possession of the juvenile court are required to be sealed, except as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 793, subd. (c).) If it appears to the prosecuting attorney, the court, or the probation department that the minor is not performing satisfactorily in the assigned program or is not complying with the terms of the probation, or that the minor is not benefiting from education, treatment, or rehabilitation, the deferred entry of judgment is lifted and the court will schedule a dispositional hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 793, subd. (a).)

In order to be eligible for DEJ, a minor must meet the following requirements: (1) the minor has not previously been declared to be a ward of the court for the

commission of a felony offense; (2) the offense charged is not a serious or violent felony listed in Welfare and Institutions Code section 707 (b); (3) the minor has not previously been committed to the custody of the Division of Juvenile Justice; (4) the minor's record does not indicate that probation has ever been revoked without being completed; (5) the minor is at least 14 years of age at the time of the hearing; (6) the minor is eligible for probation under Penal Code section 1203.06; and (7) the offense charged is not one of several specified sex offenses. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (a).) The prosecuting attorney is required to make a determination regarding a minor's eligibility for DEJ, and if the minor is eligible, the prosecuting attorney must notify the court, the minor, and the minor's attorney. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (b).) The juvenile court must then decide if the minor is suitable for DEJ. A minor is suitable for DEJ if the judge finds that the minor would benefit from court-ordered education, rehabilitation, and treatment efforts. (*Ibid*).

Under existing law, a person who personally used a firearm during the commission or attempted commission of specified offenses is ineligible for DEJ. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790, subd. (b); Pen. Code, § 1203.06.) This bill requires the court to consider whether the offense charged is an offense of carrying a loaded firearm in public in making its DEJ suitability determination. Existing law does not enumerate specific factors for the court to consider in its suitability determination. It appears the court has broad discretion to grant when the court makes a finding that the minor would benefit from education, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts. It is unclear whether this new consideration is to be made in conjunction with the court's determination that the minor would benefit from education, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts, or if it is to be considered separately and how the court is to weigh that fact in its determination.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

California Police Chiefs Association (co-source)
Chief Probation Officers' of California (co-source)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Police Chiefs Association

California Reserve Peace Officers Association
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

ACLU California Action
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148
San Francisco Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT: According to the Chief Probation Officers of California, one of the bill's co-sponsors:

In California, under Welfare & Institutions Code 790, Deferred Entry of Judgment (DEJ) for juveniles is a path for first-time, nonviolent felonies where the minor admits guilt, completes programming, and has their charged dismissed and their case sealed if successfully completed, thereby enabling the youth to avoid a formal conviction. While DEJ plays a role within the continuum of juvenile justice responses, it is not structured or designed to address more serious offenses. As DEJ is intended for first time nonviolent offenses, there are current offenses excluded from eligibility in recognition of the seriousness of the offense and the types of interventions that are necessary, including existing firearms offenses.

With an uptick in serious and violent juvenile crime, and impacts in communities from juvenile gun offenses, it is imperative to address these types of crimes through structured rehabilitative programming and accountability to address and mitigate future risk of adult re-offense. In 2016, 1 in 10 juvenile arrests were for a violent felony. In 2024, 1 in 5 arrests were for a violent felony. Additionally, in regards to recent juvenile violent felony data from 2021 to 2024 (the period following the closure of DJJ), violent felony arrests went up 69.28%.

Despite existing law already prohibiting minors from possessing firearms and making it a wobbler, current DEJ eligibility does not expressly exclude possession of a loaded firearm, thereby allowing this offense to be eligible for a program designed for low-level first-time offenses. Carrying a loaded firearm carries great consequence to the community and it is imperative that more structured court interventions are utilized in these cases to address the rehabilitation and safety needs of youth committing these offenses.

This bill represents a balanced and necessary change to ensure that courts are giving consideration to this specific offense of carrying a loaded firearm when looking at the appropriate disposition for these cases. It prioritizes public safety while preserving rehabilitative opportunities for youth through more structured juvenile court interventions. This change ensures that California's response to juvenile firearm possession is aligned with best practices in youth risk management and other efforts to reduce juvenile and community gun violence.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION: La Defense writes:

Juvenile DEJ offers an opportunity for youth to have their case dismissed and records sealed upon successful completion of treatment and supervision in a community setting. Eligible youth must admit all allegations charged and waive the right to a speedy jurisdictional hearing. If a youth subsequently commits a felony offense or two or more misdemeanors, the deferred judgment will be imposed. Under existing law, a juvenile court may consider whether a youth charged with a first-time, non-violent offense would benefit from education, treatment, and rehabilitation when determining whether to grant DEJ. AB 2636 impedes this process, requiring the court to consider whether the offense charged includes possession of a

loaded firearm, making it less likely that youth charged with a first offense will be able to benefit from these programs.

While reducing gun possession among youth should be a priority, this bill increases punishment for youth without improving public safety. Despite an uptick in gun sales during the pandemic, the share of U.S. youth who carry guns has decreased. At the same time, responses to youth charged with weapon possession have grown increasingly punitive over the last decade, with juvenile courts increasingly less likely to provide diversion and more likely to choose detention, especially for youth of color. Rather than keeping us safer, removing opportunities for education, treatment, and rehabilitation is likely to worsen gun violence and other crime. Reducing gun possession among youth requires comprehensive initiatives involving community partners, not punitive responses that make the problem worse.

Targeted diversion is a proven solution, especially for youth charged with a first offense. It is well-established that longer periods of confinement produce higher rates of recidivism for youth. Recently, the Office of Youth and Community Restoration recognized that community-based alternatives to incarceration reduce further system involvement, decrease life disruption, and promote positive health and social outcomes. Moreover, diversion is especially effective for youth with little prior involvement in the justice system. Given the developmental status of minors, programs that help improve critical thinking and judgement skills have been shown to substantially lower violence among at-risk youth. Further, programming designed specifically for youth facing gun possession charges is highly effective in preventing recidivism.

AB 2636 will reduce opportunities for youth charged with a first-time, non-violent offense to participate in these programs and receive the services they need, increasing the number of youth incarcerated at juvenile detention facilities and driving up costs without providing a benefit to public safety. This is especially troublesome when the state's own agency responsible for guiding the transition away from youth incarceration has recognized the extensive benefits of diversion, education, treatment, and rehabilitation for youth offenders.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-0, 5/7/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly,

Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Chen, Elhawary, Flora, Hart, Hoover, Kalra, Lee, McKinnor, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
6/10/26 17:00:44

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

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 2726
Author: Fong (D)
Amended: 4/13/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/3/26

AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: School facilities: disposal of surplus technology property

SOURCE: Foothill-De Anza Community College District

DIGEST: This bill authorizes school districts, county offices of education (COEs), and community college districts to establish streamlined processes for disposing of surplus technology property, including through online auctions, trade-in or buyback programs, negotiated sales, and donations, while requiring governing boards to adopt policies addressing competition, data security, and environmentally responsible disposal practices.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the governing board of a school district or community college district to sell personal property that is no longer needed, is being replaced, or is unsuitable for school use, subject to specified notice and bidding requirements.
- 2) Authorizes school districts to conduct sales of personal property through public auction, including auctions conducted by private auction firms.
- 3) Authorizes school districts to sell low-value personal property through private sale or donate property that lacks sufficient value to justify sale costs.

- 4) Authorizes school districts to dispose of personal property for replacement purposes through bid processes that include trade-in credits toward replacement equipment.
- 5) Requires proceeds from the sale of school district personal property to be deposited into specified district funds.
- 6) Prohibits a county superintendent of schools from disposing of COE personal property valued over \$25,000 without an independent valuation, public advertisement, county board review, and county board approval.
- 7) Requires county superintendents of schools to report dispositions of COE personal property valued under \$25,000 to the county board of education through quarterly reports.
- 8) Requires school districts to maintain an inventory of equipment exceeding specified value thresholds, including information regarding acquisition, location, and disposal.

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes school districts, COEs, and community college districts to declare district-owned technology to be “surplus technology property.”
- 2) Authorizes surplus technology property to be disposed of through any of the following methods if authorized by locally adopted governing board policy:
 - a) Public auction, including online auctions;
 - b) Sealed bid sales;
 - c) Structured trade-in or buyback programs with vendors or manufacturers;
 - d) Negotiated sales to public agencies, nonprofit organizations, or private entities when determined to be in the best interest of the educational agency and reasonably calculated to yield fair market value; and
 - e) Donations to public agencies or nonprofit public benefit corporations.
- 3) Requires governing boards, prior to disposing of surplus technology property, to adopt policies and procedures that address:
 - a) Determinations that technology is no longer needed or suitable for use;

- b) Competition or market testing requirements;
 - c) Compliance with state and federal student and employee data privacy requirements, including device wiping and data sanitization; and
 - d) Compliance with restrictions attached to state or federal categorical funding sources.
- 4) Requires school districts, COEs, and community college districts, to the extent practicable, to structure technology disposal practices in ways that:
- a) Maximize financial return or value; and
 - b) Minimize electronic waste while promoting recycling, refurbishment, and reuse.
- 5) Specifies that this bill does not limit any existing authority related to the disposal of personal property.
- 6) Defines “technology” broadly to include electronic, digital, or electromechanical equipment and associated software, licenses, or services used for instructional, administrative, operational, facilities, public safety, laboratory, or related purposes.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the author, “Today’s students rely on technology to learn and teachers use multimedia channels for teaching. School districts that do not upgrade technology disadvantage teachers and students when equipment break down, operate inefficiently, or do not contain the most modern programs. Existing law establishes a process for disposing surplus real property such as school buildings or land, but does not provide a process for disposing surplus technology such as computers or laptops. AB 2627 establishes a process for school districts, county offices of education and California Community College Districts to dispose surplus technology, including the opportunity to participate in trade-in or buy back programs. These programs help reduce waste while allowing school districts to leverage surplus property to reduce costs for new equipment.”

Modern technology procurement cycles may not align neatly with traditional surplus property statutes. Existing law governing the disposal of school and community college personal property was largely developed around conventional surplus assets and traditional public sale processes. Educational technology, however, operates differently than many other forms of district property. Devices

such as laptops, tablets, servers, networking equipment, and instructional technology systems often depreciate rapidly, are replaced on short refresh cycles, and may retain more value within vendor trade-in or buyback arrangements than through traditional auction processes.

As schools and colleges have become increasingly dependent on technology for instruction, administration, testing, communication, and campus operations, local educational agencies (LEAs) have begun using procurement practices that resemble those commonly used in the private sector and broader public procurement environments. This bill appears intended to clarify that LEAs may use more flexible and modern disposal methods for outdated technology equipment, while still requiring local governing board oversight and policy adoption.

The bill reflects the growing scale of technology management responsibilities within LEAs. LEAs now manage large inventories of devices and technology infrastructure that, in many cases, did not exist when California's surplus property statutes were originally enacted. One-to-one student device programs, classroom technology integration, cybersecurity infrastructure, audiovisual systems, surveillance systems, and remote learning investments have significantly increased both the volume and complexity of technology assets maintained by schools and colleges.

Managing these assets involves more than simply disposing of obsolete equipment. LEAs must balance fiscal stewardship, data security, environmental considerations, and operational continuity when replacing technology systems. This bill attempts to create a more tailored statutory framework specifically for surplus technology property, rather than relying exclusively on broader personal property disposal statutes that may not fully contemplate the operational realities of modern educational technology management.

Data security considerations distinguish technology disposal from other forms of surplus property. Unlike many other forms of district property, surplus technology may contain sensitive student, employee, or operational data. Improper disposal practices can create cybersecurity and privacy risks, particularly when devices contain stored records, login credentials, communications, or access to cloud-based systems.

For this reason, this bill requires governing boards to adopt policies addressing secure data deletion, device wiping, and verification of sanitization prior to transfer to third parties. These provisions recognize that technology disposal is not solely a property management issue, but also a data governance and information security issue. As LEAs continue to experience increased cybersecurity threats and

heightened responsibilities regarding student data privacy, these requirements may help ensure that more flexible disposal authority is accompanied by appropriate safeguards.

This bill raises broader questions regarding sustainability and lifecycle management of educational technology. California schools and colleges replace substantial quantities of electronic equipment on a recurring basis. As technology refresh cycles accelerate, educational agencies face increasing pressure to manage electronic waste responsibly while also maximizing the residual value of aging equipment.

This bill encourages recycling, refurbishment, reuse, and trade-in arrangements that may both reduce disposal costs and extend the useful life of technology equipment. In practice, some devices that no longer meet the operational needs of a school district or community college may still retain educational or charitable value elsewhere. This bill's authorization for negotiated sales and donations may create additional pathways for reuse while also helping educational agencies recover value from outdated equipment.

At the same time, this bill maintains guardrails requiring competition or market testing and fair value considerations, reflecting the Legislature's longstanding interest in ensuring public assets are disposed of transparently and in the public interest.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/4/26)

Foothill-De Anza Community College District (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/4/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo,

Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward,
Wicks, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Chen, Flora, Wallis, Wilson

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105

6/8/26 16:04:27

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

CONSENT

Bill No: ACR 1
Author: Quirk-Silva (D) and Mark González (D), et al.
Introduced: 12/2/24
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/3/26
AYES: Weber Pierson, Valladares, Caballero, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove,
Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez
NO VOTE RECORDED: Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas

SUBJECT: K-Ginseng Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims October 23, 2025, and the same date each year thereafter, as K-Ginseng Day in the state.

ANALYSIS:

This resolution:

1) Makes the following declarations:

- a) Ginseng’s history is deeply intertwined with ancient Korean medical traditions where it was first documented in medical texts over two millennia ago and recognized as a key component in restoring and maintaining the body’s balance;
- b) Asian ginseng is native to East Asia, including China, Japan, and Korea, and has been used for health-related purposes in traditional medicine for thousands of years. Korean ginseng is also called “insam”;
- c) The Korean Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and the Korea Ginseng Association designated October 23 as Ginseng Day in 2016, and ginseng festivals are held yearly in Geumsan, Ganghwa, and Punggi, which are representative ginseng regions;

- d) Korean red ginseng is especially recognized for its superior quality and effectiveness, representing the legacy of herbal wellness traditions passed down through generations and symbolizing vitality and holistic wellness in modern life;
 - e) Korean red ginseng, originating from traditional herbal practices, was historically valued by royalty and scholars for its benefits in nourishing the body and enhancing cognitive functions, and is still regarded as an essential supplement for promoting health and longevity;
 - f) Among ginseng varieties, Korean red ginseng is steamed to concentrate its active ingredients and improve absorption, providing enhanced benefits for energy, immune health, heart function, and mental sharpness;
 - g) Today, Korean red ginseng is widely used across the world, offering a full range of benefits for overall health and well-being;
 - h) The effects of Korean red ginseng extend beyond physical health, offering benefits such as reducing fatigue, promoting emotional well-being, and enhancing mental clarity, which is crucial in today's fast-paced society;
 - i) During challenging times, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, many people have turned to natural remedies, such as Korean red ginseng, to address blood health, stress, fatigue, and immune health;
 - j) Incorporating Korean red ginseng into daily routines, along with exercise, a balanced diet, and other holistic practices, enhances natural energy, focus, and resilience, promoting a healthier lifestyle;
 - k) In addition to being a cultural and medicinal staple, Korean red ginseng's integration into various forms from teas and soups to supplements and skincare has broadened its accessibility, allowing individuals to incorporate its benefits into their daily routines easily; and,
 - l) Individuals of all ages and backgrounds throughout California and beyond recognize Korean red ginseng for its ability to promote vitality and strengthen both the body and mind.
- 2) Resolves that the Legislature proclaims October 23, 2025, and the same date each year thereafter, as K-Ginseng Day in the State of California.
- 3) Resolves that the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

According to the author of this resolution:

K-Ginseng Day celebrates not just the health benefits of Korean ginseng, but the deep cultural ties between South Korea and the United States. By honoring this tradition, we recognize the contributions of Korean-Americans and promote a shared commitment to wellness and cultural appreciation within the State of California.

Background

Ginseng. Ginseng is a perennial herb native to the Far East, including Korea, northeastern China, and far-eastern Siberia. According to a 2022 article titled, “Ancient herbal therapy: A brief history of *panax ginseng*” in the *Journal of Ginseng Research*, ginseng was discovered over 5,000 years ago in the mountains of Manchuria, China, with references to ginseng found in books dating back more than two millennia. In traditional Chinese medicine, ginseng is considered a cure for all ailments. The most widely used ginseng species worldwide are Korean ginseng, also referred to as *panax ginseng*, which is native to the Korean Peninsula and northern China; as well as American ginseng, or *panax quinquefolius*, which is native to the United States and Canada. Ginseng is largely divided into three types: fresh ginseng, red ginseng, and white ginseng. Red ginseng is only manufactured in Korea, so it is commonly referred to as Korean Red Ginseng. Red ginseng is produced from fresh ginseng by steaming it without peeling the roots and subsequently drying it. The South Korean Ministry of Food and Drug Safety, formerly known as the Korea Food & Drug Administration, recognizes red ginseng for its six health functions: improving immunity, improving fatigue, improving blood circulation, enhancing memory, antioxidation, and improving the health of post-menopausal women.

The National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health (NIH) states that although the amount of research on Asian ginseng for various conditions has gradually increased over recent years, most of the clinical trials have been small, with fewer than 200 participants involved, and shorter than three months. Larger multicenter studies that last longer than three months are needed to improve the clinical evidence of Asian ginseng for different conditions. NIH outlined the following findings for studies regarding the health impacts of ginseng:

- a) A small amount of research suggests that Asian ginseng may improve cognitive function in middle-aged adults;
- b) A very small amount of preliminary research suggests that Asian ginseng extract may help reduce the risk of developing the flu, but not the severity or duration of symptoms;

- c) A 2023 review of 19 studies (2,413 participants) suggests that Asian ginseng alone may have a small beneficial effect on general fatigue not related to specific diseases; and that certain ginseng herbal formulas containing other ingredients may be beneficial for chronic fatigue, but not ginseng alone;
- d) A 2022 review of 20 studies (1,295 participants) found that Asian ginseng improved many cardiometabolic factors in people with prediabetes and diabetes, but research on the use of Asian ginseng for improving blood sugar control in those with diabetes is overall inconclusive and conflicting;
- e) Some research indicates that taking oral Asian ginseng seems to improve sexual function in those with erectile dysfunction;
- f) The majority of research shows that Asian ginseng does not improve athletic performance; and,
- g) Although there is interest in using Asian ginseng for many other conditions, including aging, asthma, and anxiety, there is not sufficient reliable information to show whether it may help treating any of these conditions.

NIH also highlights that some experts recommend against oral use of Asian ginseng for infants, children, and women who are pregnant or breastfeeding. One of the chemicals in ginseng has been found to cause birth defects in animals.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/4/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/4/26)

None received

Prepared by: Margarita Niemann / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
6/8/26 16:04:27

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

CONSENT

Bill No: ACR 94
Author: Patel (D), et al.
Introduced: 6/2/25
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/3/26

AYES: Weber Pierson, Valladares, Caballero, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove,
Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez

NO VOTE RECORDED: Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 7/14/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Antimicrobial resistance

SOURCE: bioMérieux

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes antimicrobial resistance (AMR) as a public health crisis requiring urgent and sustained action, and urges specified state agencies to explore funding mechanisms to support research and development initiatives addressing AMR, particularly in underserved and high-risk communities.

ANALYSIS:

This resolution:

- 1) Makes the following declarations:
 - a) AMR is a growing public health threat that undermines the effectiveness of life-saving medications, leading to an estimated 35,000 deaths annually in the U.S., according to the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC);
 - b) AMR poses a significant public health challenge in California as, annually, the state experiences approximately 360,000 illnesses and nearly 4,500 deaths due to infections from antimicrobial-resistant pathogens;

- c) 60% of intensive care unit infections in the state demonstrate resistance to key antibiotics, particularly in urban areas and among vulnerable populations;
- d) The overuse and misuse of antibiotics in human medicine, veterinary practices, and agriculture significantly contribute to the development of resistant microorganisms, making infections harder to treat and increasing the risk of the spread of disease, severe illness, and death;
- e) A global action plan to tackle the growing problem of resistance to antibiotics and other antimicrobial medicines was endorsed at the 68th World Health Assembly in May 2015, with a key objective being to improve awareness and understanding of AMR through effective communication, education, and training;
- f) November 18 to 24 of each year, inclusive, is World AMR Awareness Week, a global campaign that is recognized annually to improve awareness and understanding of AMR and encourage best practices among the public, stakeholders, and policymakers, who all play a critical role in reducing the further emergence and spread of AMR;
- g) California is a leader in adopting policies to address AMR, including the enactment of SB 1311 (Chapter 843, Statutes of 2014) and SB 27 (Chapter 758, Statutes of 2015), which restricted the use of medically important antibiotics in livestock and was associated with a measurable 7.1% reduction in extended-spectrum cephalosporin resistance in human *E. coli* infections;
- h) California state policy already mandates antimicrobial stewardship programs in hospitals and skilled nursing facilities, and supports surveillance, prevention, and education efforts to contain AMR, but further action is needed to close gaps in rural and underserved communities and to strengthen statewide coordination;
- i) Rapid and accurate diagnostic testing is essential to reduce inappropriate antibiotic use, ensuring that patients receive effective treatment while limiting the spread of resistant bacteria and supporting California's antimicrobial stewardship programs that have been recognized for improving patient outcomes and reducing resistance;
- j) Medicaid programs provide health care coverage to millions of low-income Californians, making them critical stakeholders in addressing AMR through coverage policies and education initiatives that can reduce disparities in health outcomes;
- k) Public and private stakeholders must collaborate to implement policies that encourage the development and use of innovative diagnostic tools and stewardship programs; and,

- 1) Effective action to combat AMR requires a multipronged approach that includes surveillance, prevention, education, research, and equitable access to health care.
- 2) Resolves that the Legislature recognizes AMR as a public health crisis requiring urgent and sustained action.
- 3) Resolves that the Legislature encourages integration of antimicrobial stewardship programs into state Medicaid (Medi-Cal) policies, including incentives for providers to utilize rapid diagnostic testing and adhere to evidence-based prescribing guidelines.
- 4) Resolves that the Legislature urges state health care agencies to collaborate with federal entities, health care providers, academic institutions, and other stakeholders to enhance the development, accessibility, and affordability of advanced diagnostic tools to combat AMR.
- 5) Resolves that the Legislature supports the implementation of public education campaigns to raise awareness about AMR, the importance of appropriate antibiotic use, and the role of diagnostics in improving health outcomes.
- 6) Resolves that the Legislature urges the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), and California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHSA) to explore available funding mechanisms to support research and development initiatives addressing AMR, particularly in underserved and high-risk communities.
- 7) Resolves that the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Governor, the Secretary of CHHSA, the Director of CDPH, the Director of DHCS, the State Medicaid Director, other relevant stakeholders to promote awareness and collaboration in combating AMR, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

According to the author of this resolution:

This resolution is crucial because AMR presents a significant and escalating public health emergency. In the U.S., it results in over 2.8 million infections and 35,000 deaths each year, with approximately 360,000 illnesses and nearly 4,500 deaths occurring in California alone. These alarming outcomes stem from

the overuse of antibiotics and structural inequities that limit access to diagnostics, stewardship, and education. This resolution recognizes AMR as a pressing crisis that demands immediate and sustained action. It advocates for integrating stewardship practices into Medi-Cal, incentivizing the use of rapid diagnostics, and promoting public education—especially in underserved and high-risk communities. The resolution seeks to align state initiatives with federal and academic expertise while also advancing targeted research and development funding. Based on thorough research and data from California, this resolution aims to close critical gaps in current law. Its goals include reducing unnecessary antibiotic use, preventing resistant infections, improving patient outcomes, and safeguarding vulnerable populations.

Background

AMR. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), AMR occurs when germs such as bacteria, viruses, fungi, and parasites no longer respond to antimicrobial medicines. Antimicrobials, which include antibiotics, antivirals, antifungals, and antiparasitics, are medicines used to prevent and treat infectious diseases in humans, animals, and plants. As a result of drug resistance, antibiotics and other antimicrobial medicines become ineffective, making infections difficult or impossible to treat, and increasing the risk of disease spread, severe illness, disability, and death. AMR is a natural process that happens over time through genetic changes in germs. Its emergence and spread is then accelerated by human activity, mainly through the misuse and overuse of antimicrobials to treat, prevent or control infection, animals, and plants.

WHO states that AMR is one of the top global public health and development threats, and estimates that bacterial AMR was directly responsible for 1.27 million global deaths in 2019 and contributed to 4.95 million deaths. According to CDPH, more than 2.8 million illnesses and 35,000 deaths are attributed to AMR in the U.S. each year. Among Californians, this translates to roughly 360,000 illnesses and nearly 4,500 deaths. AMR remains a problem for all countries at all income levels, as its spread does not recognize country borders. Additional contributing factors for AMR include lack of access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene for both humans and animals; poor infection and disease prevention and control in homes, healthcare facilities and farms; poor access to quality and affordable vaccines, diagnostics and medicines; lack of awareness and knowledge; and lack of enforcement of relevant legislation. People living in low-resource settings and vulnerable populations are especially impacted by both the drivers and the consequences of AMR.

Overuse and misuse of antibiotics. As previously stated, WHO emphasizes that misuse and overuse of antimicrobials in humans, animals, and plants are the primary drivers in the development of drug-resistant pathogens (germs). The CDC defines antibiotics as drugs that kill certain kinds of germs called bacteria and stop their growth. In health care, antibiotics are one of the most powerful drugs for fighting life-threatening bacterial infections. Although AMR naturally occurs, the overuse and misuse of antibiotics promote AMR. According to a study in the PubMed Central Journal conducted between 2010 and 2015, at least 28% of antibiotics prescribed in outpatient settings are considered unnecessary. Another study in BMJ Journals that analyzed data from 2000 to 2021 found that inappropriate antibiotic use is highly prevalent across all countries regardless of national income level, with a third of global antibiotic consumption potentially due to unnecessary prescription.

The Mayo Clinic asserts that while antibiotics are designed to treat infections caused by bacteria, they do not treat infections caused by viral infections. For example, an antibiotic is the correct treatment for strep throat, because it is caused by a bacterial infection. However, an antibiotic would not be the correct treatment for sore throats caused by viral infections, such as from the flu or COVID-19. When someone takes an antibiotic for a viral infection, the antibiotic attacks the helpful bacteria in your body rather than the actual viruses. This can then promote AMR properties in harmless bacteria that can be shared with other bacteria; or it can create an opportunity for potentially harmful bacteria to replace harmless ones. Furthermore, if someone stops taking the antibiotic earlier than recommended, then it can also promote the spread of AMR properties among the remaining harmful bacteria. The Mayo Clinic furthers that the proper use of antibiotics, often referred to as antibiotic stewardship, can help maintain the effectiveness of current antibiotics, extend the life span of current antibiotics, protect people from AMR infections, and avoid side effects from using antibiotics incorrectly.

Lack of development of new antibiotics. For many years, the introduction of new antibiotics outpaced the development of AMR. In recent years, however, the pace of AMR has led to a growing number of health care problems. WHO states that the lack of development of new antimicrobial treatments is inadequate to address the mounting threat of AMR. A 2021 report by the WHO describes the pharmaceutical pipeline particularly for new antibiotics remains stagnant. This presents a serious challenge in overcoming the escalating issue of AMR, and leaves individuals increasingly vulnerable to even the simplest of bacterial infections. To demonstrate, since 2017, only 12 antibiotics have been approved, 10 of which belong to existing classes with established mechanisms of AMR. Much of the

innovation in antibiotics is driven by small- and medium-sized companies, who struggle to find investors to finance late-stage clinical development for regulatory approval. WHO emphasizes the need for urgent and concerted investments in research and development by governments and private companies to accelerate and expand the pipeline for antibiotics.

AMR in livestock. A 2025 article titled, “Livestock Antibiotics Use and AMR” published in the *Antibiotics Journal* highlights that AMR in livestock is a growing global concern that threatens both human and animal health. The overuse and misuse of antibiotics in livestock production has led to an increased rate in the development of AMR bacterial strains in animals, which can be spread to humans through the consumption of contaminated animal products, direct contact, or environmental exposure. Antibiotics in livestock are frequently used for growth promotion, disease prevention and control, and metaphylactic use (the mass administration of medication to an entire herd of animals to both treat the clinically sick animals while simultaneously preventing the spread of disease to the rest of the exposed animals).

SB 27 (Hill, Chapter 758, Statutes of 2015). In 2009, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) aimed to address the contribution of antimicrobial use in the rearing of food-producing animals to AMR by initiating a series of regulatory guidance documents. At the time, the FDA’s approach did not address use for disease prevention, which raised concerns that these drugs would be continued to be used on a routine, untargeted basis to treat an unconfirmed or suspected disease. SB 27 was the first bill in the country to specifically address these uses. SB 27 prohibits the administration of medically important antimicrobial drugs to livestock unless ordered by a licensed veterinarian through a prescription or veterinary feed directive, and prohibits the administration of a medically important antimicrobial drug to livestock solely for the purposes of promoting weight gain or improving feed efficiency. SB 27 also requires the Department of Food and Agriculture to develop antimicrobial stewardship guidelines and best management practices on the proper use of medically important antimicrobial drugs, among other related provisions.

A 2023 study analyzing the impact of SB 27 published in *JMIR Publications*, the researchers found that SB 27 was associated with a 7.1% reduction in extended-spectrum cephalosporin (ESC) resistance in human *E. coli* infections. Resistance to the more extensively used classes of antibiotics to treat *E. coli*, however, did not change. In fact, the article states that more research is needed to determine the role

of SB 27 in the observed reduction in ESC resistance to E. coli in human populations, particularly as additional states implement similar legislation.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/4/2026)

bioMérieux (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/4/2026)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 7/14/25

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Ávila Farías, Schultz

Prepared by: Margarita Niemann / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
6/8/26 16:04:28

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 107
Author: Bauer-Kahan (D)
Introduced: 7/15/25
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/9/26

AYES: Becker, Seyarto, Allen, Cabaldon, Grove, Laird, Reyes

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 9/13/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: The Diablo Range

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution (1) recognizes the importance of the Diablo Range as a unique landscape deserving of amplified consideration, and (2) commends the Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) and its departments, organizational stakeholders, and individuals across the state in their collective efforts to elevate awareness involving the benefits and values of the Diablo Range.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Law:

- 1) Directs CNRA to combat the biodiversity and climate crisis by, among other things, establishing the California Biodiversity Collaborative and establishing the 30x30 goal (Executive Order No. N-82-20).
- 2) Codifies the 30x30 goal (Public Resources Code § 71450).
- 3) Declares that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States (54 United States Code (USC) § 320101).

This resolution:

- 1) Makes a number of findings, including:
 - a) The Diablo Range encompasses more than 3.5 million acres of diverse lands;
 - b) The Diablo Range is an intact wildlife habitat corridor of statewide significance supporting species such as the California condor, tule elk, golden eagle, mountain lion, and blunt-nosed leopard lizard, as well as endemic plants like the Mount Diablo globe lily;
 - c) Over 10 million people reside in communities around the Diablo Range and therefore, in addition to the mountain range's rich biodiversity, it has also been identified as a new and largely untapped recreational resource to serve the growing adjacent populations;
 - d) The Diablo Range affords California one of its best opportunities to meet the state's goal to conserve 30% of California's lands and coastal waters by 2030 (i.e., the 30x30 goal) and to address the climate crisis, by strategic land management and conservation practices to help more Californians connect with nature;
 - e) The Diablo Range contains significant cultural resources important to native people and the history of California; and
 - f) Recognizing the Diablo Range as a California conservation priority will build momentum for future efforts and considerations to designate the Diablo Range as a national monument.
- 2) Resolves that:
 - a) The Legislature recognizes the importance of the Diablo Range as a unique landscape deserving of amplified consideration; and
 - b) Commends and supports CNRA and its departments, organizational stakeholders, and individuals across the state in their collective efforts to elevate awareness involving the benefits and values of the Diablo Range.

Background

Diablo Mountain Range. According to the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee, California's Diablo Mountain Range sits within the Central California Foothills and Coastal Mountains ecoregion, which has a Mediterranean climate and associated vegetation communities of grassland, chaparral, and oak woodlands.

The Diablo Range stretches from the eastern San Francisco Bay area to State Route 46, passing through Contra Costa, Alameda, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, Stanislaus, Merced, San Benito, Fresno, Monterey, Kings, San Luis Obispo, and Kern counties. The range is named after Mount Diablo in Contra Costa County. According to the Save Mount Diablo (SMD) website, the Diablo Range covers 5,400 square miles and has many peaks, some of which are taller than Mount Diablo with the tallest peak being San Benito Mountain at 5,241 feet.

National Monuments. This resolution notes that the Diablo Range, given its critical wildlife habitat corridors, natural resources, cultural significance, and proximity to population centers causing development pressures, calls for an elevated vigilance and investment in management projects to reduce fire threats. Additionally, it suggests that recognizing the Diablo Range as a California conservation priority will build momentum for efforts to designate the Diablo Range as a national monument.

The Federal Antiquities Act (act), passed in 1906, authorizes the President to establish national monuments. Specifically, the act gives the President the authority to “declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government to be national monuments” (54 USC § 320301(a)). National monuments may be administered by the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Bureau of Land Management. Since 1906, U.S. presidents have used their authority under the Antiquities Act to set aside land almost 300 times.

In California, there are nearly 20 national monuments, including Berryessa Snow Mountain, Cabrillo, California Coastal, Carrizo Plain, Castle Mountains, César E. Chávez, Devils Postpile, Fort Ord, Giant Sequoia, Lava Beds, Mojave Trails, Muir Woods, Saint Francis Dam Disaster, Sand to Snow, San Gabriel Mountains, Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains, and Tule Lake.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1426 (Kalra, Bauer-Kahan, 2025) of the current legislative session, would have required the Wildlife Conservation Board to establish the Diablo Range Conservation Program. AB 1426 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SJR 16 (Padilla, Chapter 208, Statutes of 2024), urges the President to use the Antiquities Act of 1906 to establish the Chuckwalla, Joshua Tree, and Kw’tsán National Monuments.

SJR 17 (Allen, Chapter 209, Statutes of 2024), urges the President to use the Antiquities Act of 1906 to establish the Sáttítla National Monument.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

Californians for Western Wilderness
East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy
Fresno Chaffee Zoo
Golden Gate Bird Alliance
Institute for Historical Ecology
Livermore Hill Hikers
Mak-warép Ohlone Land Conservancy
Mount Diablo Bird Alliance
Protect San Benito
Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance
Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency
Save Mount Diablo
Sierra Club

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, “The Diablo Range is one of California’s most ecologically and recreationally significant landscapes. The range is home to many diverse habitats that support hundreds of native plant and wildlife species, including rare and threatened species found nowhere else in the world. This range also serves as a crucial wildlife corridor, connecting ecosystems across the state and strengthening the region’s climate reliance. Beyond its ecological value, the Diablo Range provides critical natural benefits such as clean water, carbon storage, and expansive open space that supports recreation and public enjoyment. Recognizing the Diablo Range as a priority for conservation ensures the protection of its biodiversity, ecosystems, and natural resources for generations to come.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 9/13/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick,

Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Elhawary, Flora, McKinnor, Patterson, Solache, Ta

Prepared by: Edith Hannigan / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/10/26 16:52:25

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 119
Author: Ta (R), et al.
Introduced: 1/12/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Black April Memorial Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Black April Memorial Month and encourage the Vietnamese Heritage and Freedom Flag to be flown throughout the state.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) For many Vietnam and Vietnam-era veterans who were directly involved in the war and Vietnamese Americans who have settled in the United States, the Vietnam War was a tragedy full of great suffering and loss of American, Vietnamese, and Southeast Asian lives.
- 2) The combined United States and South Vietnamese fatalities among military personnel during the Vietnam War reached more than one-half million, with approximately 800,000 additional troops being wounded in combat. Millions of Vietnamese civilians suffered casualties and death as a result of the extended conflict.
- 3) In the late 1970s to mid-1980s, thousands of Vietnamese risked their lives by fleeing Vietnam aboard small wooden boats. These emigrants reached refugee camps in Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Hong Kong, while approximately one-half of the people fleeing Vietnam in search of freedom and democracy perished at sea.
- 4) Today, more than 600,000 Vietnamese residents live in California, with the largest concentration of Vietnamese residents found outside of Vietnam residing in the County of Orange.

- 5) Human rights, religious freedom, democracy, and protection against threats of aggression are important concerns of Vietnamese Americans and Vietnamese communities worldwide stemming from abuse of human rights that continue to occur in Vietnam in the areas of child labor, human trafficking, religious and political persecution, suppression of the press, unlawful deprivation of life, forced disappearances, and land seizure, among others.
- 6) Vietnamese American communities throughout California will commemorate April 30, 2026, as Black April, a day of remembrance and rededication to the principles of freedom, including freedom of religion, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and internet freedom.

This resolution recognizes the 51st anniversary of the Fall of Saigon, and encourages that the Vietnamese Heritage and Freedom Flag, which is recognized by the state of California as a symbol of the Vietnamese community's continued struggle for freedom and liberty for the people of Vietnam, be flown throughout the state.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 106 (Cortese, 2026) – Adopted in Senate.

ACR 6 (Ta, Resolution Chapter 52, Statutes of 2025)

SCR 100 (Nguyen, Resolution Chapter 124, Statutes of 2024)

SCR 8 (Nguyen, Resolution Chapter 52, Statutes of 2023)

ACR 5 (Ta, Resolution Chapter 48, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:53

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 123
Author: Chen (R), et al.
Amended: 4/21/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Duanwu Jie

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes June 19, 2026, as Duanwu Jie, also known as the Dragon Boat Festival, and celebrates the cultural contributions and rich heritage of the communities who observe this important festival.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Duanwu Jie, also known as the Dragon Boat Festival, is a holiday with more than 2,000 years of history and deep cultural significance
- 2) Observed on the fifth day of the fifth lunar month, Duanwu Jie is traditionally associated with honoring the poet and statesman Qu Yuan, whose legacy represents loyalty, integrity, and devotion to the public good.
- 3) Duanwu Jie is most famously marked by dragon boat races in which teams paddle in unison to the rhythm of drums symbolizing cooperation and perseverance.
- 4) Families and communities also celebrate by preparing and sharing zongzi, which is sticky rice wrapped in bamboo leaves, which reflects tradition, care, and togetherness. In many households, people hang herbs or wear protective charms, which are customs rooted in wishes for good health.
- 5) Today, Duanwu Jie continues to be celebrated around the world, bringing people together across generations and cultures.

This resolution recognizes June 19, 2026, as Duanwu Jie and celebrates the cultural contributions and rich heritage of the communities who observe this important festival.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:01

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 124
Author: Ta (R), et al.
Introduced: 1/20/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Vietnam Human Rights Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates May 11, 2026, as Vietnam Human Rights Day in support of efforts to achieve freedom and human rights for the people of Vietnam. The measure encourages Californians to commemorate the day with appropriate activities, including, but not limited to, rallies, ceremonies, and discussions.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) May 11, 2026, is the 36th anniversary of the issuance of the Manifesto of the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights in Vietnam.
- 2) The Manifesto, which calls upon Hanoi to respect basic human rights, accept a multiparty system, and restore the right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government through free and fair elections, reflects the will and aspirations of the people of Vietnam.
- 3) According to the United States Census for 2020, more than 675,235 Vietnamese people live in California, with the largest concentration of Vietnamese residents found outside of Vietnam residing in the County of Orange.
- 4) Vietnam Human Rights Day focuses on highlighting human rights violations, promoting human rights issues in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and recognizing the efforts of Vietnamese dissidents.

This resolution encourages Californians to commemorate the day with appropriate activities, including, but not limited to, rallies, ceremonies, and discussions.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 118 (Ta, Resolution Chapter 67, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 45 (Ta, Resolution Chapter 45, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Flora, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:15

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 143
Author: Pacheco (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/19/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: California Cities Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of April 19, 2026, to April 25, 2026, inclusive, to be California Cities Week, and encourages all Californians to be involved in their communities and be civically engaged with their local government.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Cities first arose when eight California municipalities incorporated in 1850 to provide essential safety and health services to the rapidly growing population of the territory of California, due to the periods of economic prosperity and immigration that followed the Gold Rush and both world wars.
- 2) Cities provide millions of Californians with essential services, including public libraries, fire departments, police departments, emergency medical and disaster response, parks and recreation, childcare, community and human services programs, solid waste and recycling management, water, sewer, utilities, land use planning, housing, economic development, transportation planning, maintenance of streets and roads, telecommunications, and more.
- 3) Today, California's 483 cities and towns vary in size and scope and serve diverse communities throughout the state, from small rural neighborhoods to large urban regions.

This resolution proclaims the week of April 19, 2026, to April 25, 2026, inclusive, to be California Cities Week, and encourages all Californians to be involved in their communities and be civically engaged with their local government.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 44 (Pacheco, Resolution Chapter 66, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 137 (Pacheco, Resolution Chapter 65, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 54 (Pacheco, Resolution Chapter 61, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/5/26)

California Municipal Utilities Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/5/26)

None received

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

5/6/26 13:50:30

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 149

Author: Hart (D), Addis (D) and Bennett (D), et al.

Introduced: 2/25/26

Vote: 21

SUBJECT: 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 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.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) 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 5/5/26)

Audubon California
Azul
Black Surf Santa Cruz, Inc.
Business Alliance for Protecting the Pacific Coast
California Coastal Protection Network
California Coastkeeper Alliance
Center for Biological Diversity
City Surf Project
County Park Friends
Environment California
Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
Environmental Defense Center
Environmental Protection Information Center
Fish On
Heal the Bay
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
Monterey Bay Aquarium
Mujeres De La Tierra
Natural Resources Defense Council
Orange County Coastkeeper
Outdoor Outreach
Paddle for Peace
Queer Surf
Salted Roots
Save Our Shores
Surfrider Foundation
Un Mar De Colores
Wildcoast

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/5/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/6/26 13:50:31

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 158
Author: Solache (D), et al.
Introduced: 3/5/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Donate Life Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Donate Life Month in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The Legislature has established an official state organ and tissue donor registry that has become the largest in the world, with almost 20,000,000 people signed up to save and heal the lives of others after death, although there is work to be done with our growing population of over 40,000,000.
- 2) One thousand eight hundred fifty-three Californians became organ donors in 2025 and over 4,000 lifesaving transplants were performed in our state that year. Tragically, more than 800 people died while waiting due to the shortage of available organs.
- 3) Donate Life California's vision is that one day all Californians will embrace organ, eye, and tissue donation as their personal responsibility.

This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Donate Life Month in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 51 (Hart, Resolution Chapter 60, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/5/26)

Donate Life California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/5/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/6/26 13:50:32

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 159
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Introduced: 3/10/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Indigent defense

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution affirms the fundamental importance of indigent defense to due process, equal justice, and democratic governance, recognize public defenders as essential protectors of constitutional rights and the rule of law, and encourages the development of statewide approaches to indigent defense.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The California Constitution independently guarantees due process of law and the right to counsel in criminal proceedings; Section 15 of Article I of the California Constitution provides that a defendant in a criminal cause has the right to the assistance of counsel.
- 2) California's indigent defense system is primarily county-based, and the state does not provide comprehensive or reliable statewide funding to ensure that public defense systems are adequately staffed and resourced to meet constitutional standards.
- 3) State-controlled funding mechanisms and grant programs have historically provided significantly greater support to prosecution-related functions than to indigent defense, reinforcing disparities and limiting counties' ability to achieve functional parity between prosecution and defense.
- 4) Persistent underfunding and lack of parity undermine the fairness and reliability of the justice system, contribute to delays and inefficiencies, increase the risk of wrongful convictions, and erode public trust in the courts.
- 5) California has both a constitutional obligation and a moral responsibility to ensure that its indigent defense systems are adequately funded, appropriately

staffed, and capable of providing effective representation consistent with constitutional mandates.

This resolution affirms the fundamental importance of indigent defense to due process, equal justice, and democratic governance, recognize public defenders as essential protectors of constitutional rights and the rule of law, and encourages the development of statewide approaches to indigent defense.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/12/26)

ACLU California Action

California Public Defenders Association

Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union

Smart Justice California, A Project of Beyond Impact

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/12/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:53

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 163
Author: Ramos (D), et al.
Introduced: 3/19/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Missing and Murdered Indigenous People Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates the month of May 2026 as California's Missing and Murdered Indigenous People Awareness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) In the Federal Bureau of Investigation's 2024 Missing American Indian and Alaska Native Persons Data Report, there were 10,248 reported incidents of Native people who had gone missing, of which 5,614 were females and 6,871 were juveniles.
- 2) Today, there is still little data on the epidemic of missing and murdered indigenous people. The data that is available tends to be incomplete and inadequate. Current statistics by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that about 57% of these homicides happened in urban areas and about 43% happened in rural areas.
- 3) Since 2023, the Yurok Tribe has hosted the Missing and Murdered Indigenous People (MMIP) Summit to bring together tribal leaders from across the state, MMIP survivors, and victim advocates, as well as state lawmakers, federal partners, law enforcement, and academic researchers to identify solutions to stop the crisis and to bring awareness, education, and action by giving a voice to California's missing and murdered indigenous people and their families.

This resolution designates the month of May 2026 as California's Missing and Murdered Indigenous People Awareness Month.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 39 (Ramos, Resolution Chapter 60, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 133 (Ramos, Resolution Chapter 69, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 25 (Ramos, Resolution Chapter 76, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

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

5/20/26 14:08:02

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 167
Author: Hadwick (R), et al.
Introduced: 3/26/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: World Agritourism Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 16, 2026, as World Agritourism Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California is the nation's leading agricultural state, producing more than 400 commodities and annually contributing tens of billions of dollars to the state's economy.
- 2) Agritourism activities, such as farm tours, harvest festivals, farm stays, pumpkin patches, u-pick operations, farmers' markets, and agricultural education programs, help Californians better understand where their food comes from and the hard work required to produce it.
- 3) Rural communities throughout California benefit from agritourism through increased visitation, local spending, and support for small businesses.
- 4) Agritourism plays an important role in educating young people about agriculture, natural resources, conservation, and the importance of preserving California's agricultural heritage.
- 5) World Agritourism Day is celebrated internationally to highlight the value of agritourism in supporting farmers, strengthening rural communities, and promoting sustainable agricultural practices.

This resolution recognizes May 16, 2026, as World Agritourism Day and encourages all Californians to visit local farms and ranches, support agricultural producers, and learn more about the vital role agriculture plays in our state.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:16

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 173
Author: Carrillo (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/8/26
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/8/26
AYES: Wahab, Archuleta, Arreguín, Caballero, Grayson, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi, Niello, Strickland, Umberg

SUBJECT: Sister state: State of Jalisco

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recommits to formalizing the sister state relationship between the State of Jalisco in Mexico and the State of California.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law establishes, via Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 (Heuso, Resolution Chapter 70, Statutes of 2014) a sister state relationship with the State of Jalisco in Mexico and California, acknowledging the economic opportunities in high technology manufacturing, agriculture, tourism, amongst other important industries.

This resolution:

- 1) Recognizes the mutually beneficial educational, economic and culture exchanges between the State of Jalisco and State of California.
- 2) Continues the long-standing cross-national collaboration and goodwill between California and Jalisco in addressing immigration policies while maintaining liberties and due process for all residents in California granted by the state Constitution regardless of immigration status.

3) Promotes mutual respect for the residents of the bordering states.

Background

This resolution recommits to formalizing the sister-state relationship between California and Jalisco by embracing the shared investments in high technology manufacturing, agriculture ties, and cultural traditions and tourism. Recognized as “Mexico’s Silicon Valley”, Guadalajara, located in the State of Jalisco, is the largest technology center in Mexico, known as a major Latin and North American hub, and is a main producer of software, electronics and digital products. This burgeoning electronics market aligns with California’s technology sector promoting job creation and sustainable innovation in both regions. The cultural traditions and heritage that originated in Jalisco have permeated California in displays of mariachi music, charreadas (Mexican rodeos), the Mexican Hat Dance, and the wide brimmed sombrero. The culinary exports from Jalisco to California include a variety of tequilas grown from the indigenous agave plant found in Mexico and a plethora of native dishes, including the meat stew dish of birria.

The historical United States Bracero Program brought agricultural laborers from Jalisco to California enriching the economic relationship and encouraging a deep-rooted generational connection between the states that continues to this day, particularly in agricultural areas located in the Central Valley and in the larger urban areas of Los Angeles. Today, this vast migration connects California and Jalisco through established family networks, cultural ties and shared prosperity encouraging Jalisco immigrants and their relatives to integrate into all sectors of business, participate in their community and contribute to their shared heritage and culture through music, the arts, cultural festivals and cuisine.

ACR 173 supports cooperative research by universities in California and Jalisco enriching this bi-national relationship by promoting bilateral economic development and stimulating employment in Mexican immigrant communities benefiting the residents in both states.

This resolution recognizes the vested interests and economic relationship between the States of Jalisco and California, promotes sustained goodwill and collaboration by continuing bilateral cooperation in the face of shifting federal policies on immigration enforcement, while maintaining mutual respect and honoring civil liberties for the residents in both regions.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

Asociacion De Jaliscienses Unidos En Accion (AJUA)
Mexican-American Policy Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Asociacion De Jaliscienses and Unidos En Accion (AJUA) write in support, “The relationship between California and Jalisco simply makes sense. Cross-border economic ties translate into real benefits for workers, businesses, and families on both sides – so investing in local-level collaboration is a practical, high impact approach. ACR 173 truly aligns with our mission to preserve and promote the Mexican roots in the United States, supporting the migrant community through services, education, culture, guidance and social programs that improve their quality of life.”

The Mexican-American Policy Initiative notes in support, “This state sisterhood is a natural next step in cementing the strong relationship between Jalisco and California. Over 1 million people of Jalisco origin live in California. Jalisco and California share more than just people—they also share a rich, beautiful history shaped by culture and language. A sister-state relationship between the two would create opportunities to promote and share cultural and tourism experiences, while also encouraging joint business growth and workforce development collaboration.”

Prepared by: Anna Billy / B., P. & E.D. /
6/10/26 16:52:25

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 174
Author: Muratsuchi (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/9/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/7/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Student Mental Health Awareness Week in California

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes May 11, 2026, to May 15, 2026, inclusive, as Student Mental Health Awareness Week in California; and be it further.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Mental health issues among children and youth can seriously change how they learn, behave, and handle their emotions throughout their lifespan.
- 2) More than 42% of high school students experienced persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness, a 50% increase in the past decade.
- 3) School counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, school nurses, and other mental health professionals and support staff, including certified wellness coaches, are essential to a well-balanced school-based mental, behavioral, and physical health workforce.
- 4) By elevating the importance of mental and behavioral health in schools and by providing our children and youth with resources, we can dispel the stigma that surrounds mental health and cultivate a supportive and compassionate culture in our schools and communities.
- 5) It is important to set aside a week that recognizes the mental health of students in order to support the needs and well-being of students in California.

This resolution recognizes May 11, 2026, to May 15, 2026, inclusive, as Student Mental Health Awareness Week in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 64 (Rubio, Resolution Chapter 121, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 167 (Juan Carrillo, Resolution Chapter 70, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 29 (Quirk-Silva, Resolution Chapter 77, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/7/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Chen, Flora, Gallagher, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Valencia, Wallis, Wicks

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:02

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 176
Author: Elhawary (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/15/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Second Chance Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Second Chance Month in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Every individual is endowed with human dignity and value. Redemption and second chances are values of California. Restorative justice through healing and rehabilitation can help uplift society.
- 2) An estimated 8 million residents of California have a criminal record. About 35,000 Californians return to their communities from prison every year.
- 3) For individuals returning to their communities from prison or jail, gaining meaningful employment is one of the most significant predictors of successful reentry and has been shown to reduce future criminal activity.
- 4) Many individuals who have been incarcerated struggle to find employment and access capital to start a small business because of collateral consequences, which are sometimes not directly related to the offenses the individuals committed or any proven public safety benefit.
- 5) An individual who has been convicted of certain crimes is often barred from receiving the financial aid necessary to acquire additional skills and knowledge through some formal education programs.
- 6) Those barriers can have an impact on public safety by contributing to recidivism.

- 7) The designation of April 2026 as Second Chance Month may contribute to increased public awareness about the impact of collateral consequences and the need for closure for individuals with a criminal record who have paid their debt.

This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Second Chance Month in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:54

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 178
Author: Flora (R), et al.
Introduced: 4/16/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: National Rendering Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes April 21, 2026, as National Rendering Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The burden of responsibility for feeding the world extends beyond the farm, and rendering plays a critical role in ensuring we can meet the growing global demand for food, feed, and fuel while helping to reduce food waste and loss.
- 2) Up to one-half of each animal produced for meat is not consumed by humans due to North American consumer preferences, and rendering recycles these animal products into valuable ingredients for animal feed, renewable fuels, fertilizers, and other everyday products that would otherwise take up an enormous amount of precious landfill space and create public health concerns.
- 3) Renderers also collect billions of pounds of used cooking oil from restaurants and food manufacturers for upcycling into sustainable fuels, including biodiesel, that power trucks, trains, water vessels, and other vehicles.
- 4) Rendering is an essential, environmentally friendly process that significantly contributes to sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, conserving landfill space, supporting a circular economy, and reducing reliance on imported resources.
- 5) The United States rendering industry annually recycles billions of pounds of material, contributes roughly \$10 billion in annual economic activity across the country, supports thousands of jobs nationwide, including in the State of California, and includes many small businesses that help drive the American economy.

- 6) It is no coincidence that National Rendering Day falls on the day before Earth Day, as renderers, dubbed the “original recyclers,” have been silently cleaning up our communities for centuries by ensuring no part of the animal is wasted and by helping drive forward a circular economy.

This resolution recognizes April 21, 2026, as National Rendering Day and commends the rendering industry and its workers for their vital contributions to environmental stewardship, public health, feeding the world, reducing food waste, and strengthening the economy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/6/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/6/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/6/26 13:50:33

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 179
Author: Flora (R), et al.
Introduced: 4/20/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Wildland-Urban Interface Preparedness and Resilience Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 1, 2026, and the same date annually thereafter, as Wildland-Urban Interface Preparedness and Resilience Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California’s Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) represents an area where homes, communities, and critical infrastructure intermingle with fire-prone wildland vegetation, creating conditions for rapid fire spread, structure-to-structure ignition, and large-loss events across vast areas that are severely at risk for catastrophic wildfire.
- 2) In 2025, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection responded to over 8,000 wildfires that burned over 525,000 acres, resulting in 31 combined civilian and firefighter fatalities.
- 3) WUI areas span more than 7,000,000 acres, represent nearly 14,000,000 people — approximately 1 in 3 California residents — and account for the majority of buildings destroyed in California wildfires, making proactive planning, defensible space maintenance, home hardening, and communitywide mitigation efforts essential to protecting lives, property, and natural resources.
- 4) Ensuring fire-resilient communities requires a shared and enforceable commitment among residents, fire agencies, policymakers, and all levels of government to advance coordinated mitigation, planning, and education efforts across the state.

This resolution proclaims May 1, 2026, and the same date annually thereafter, as Wildland-Urban Interface Preparedness and Resilience Day.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/12/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/12/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:54

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 180
Author: Connolly (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/21/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Compost Awareness Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares that the week of May 3, 2026, to May 9, 2026, inclusive, is designated as Compost Awareness Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California instituted ambitious goals around both organics diversion and compost use through Senate Bill 1383 (Chapter 395 of the Statutes of 2016), recognizing compost as an effective form of resource recovery, waste reduction, reuse and recycling, and pollution reduction.
- 2) Materials such as yard trimmings, vegetable cuttings, biosolids, food scraps, manures, and hay shavings have all been composted and converted into a beneficial product known as compost.
- 3) Applying finished compost is a proven method of growing healthy food, conserving water during extreme drought, providing resiliency during flooding conditions, reducing water consumption and nonpoint pollution, decreasing the dependence on chemical fertilizers, decreasing erosion, and remediating fire-damaged lands.

This resolution introduces The International Compost Awareness Week theme for 2026, “Compost! Feed the Soil that Feeds Us,” to highlight the benefits of composting in agriculture and food production and the role of compost in supporting healthy, nutritious food and, by extension, people and communities. Beyond responsible waste management, composting recognizes the interconnectedness between every person who eats and the earth that provides all

of our food, as well as our agency in feeding the earth our scraps so that the soil may continue to provide for us abundantly.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 70 (Blakespear, Resolution Chapter 126, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 161 (Connolly, Resolution Chapter 90, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 36 (Connolly, Resolution Chapter 78, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/18/26)

None received

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

5/20/26 14:08:03

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 181
Author: Patel (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/21/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Physical Education Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 1, 2026, to May 7, 2026, inclusive, as California Physical Education Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) For purposes of this resolution, “physical education” includes both general physical education and adapted physical education.
- 2) Physical education is an academic discipline that equips California students with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to develop and maintain physical, mental, and social health throughout their lifespan.
- 3) Physical education is an integral component of a well-rounded education in California and nationwide within the Every Student Succeeds Act, contributing to college, military, career, and vocational readiness and supporting a productive, healthy adulthood.
- 4) Scientific evidence indicates that the components of physical fitness are associated with cognitive functions such as attention, memory, self-regulation, and executive functioning, which support academic engagement and learning.
- 5) Substantial evidence shows that California’s children and young people are less active than ever. Physical education is an essential academic discipline to develop cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills that advance their

knowledge, and contribute to their dispositions for physical activity at all stages of life.

This resolution proclaims May 1, 2026, to May 7, 2026, inclusive, as California Physical Education Week to coincide with National Physical Education and Sport Week, to promote high-quality physical education instruction.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/4/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Chen, Flora, Wallis, Wilson

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:55

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 182
Author: Ransom (D), et al.
Amended: 4/27/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Youth Mental Health Awareness Week in California

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates May 3, 2026, to May 9, 2026, inclusive, as Youth Mental Health Awareness Week in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Mental health plays a significant role in the overall well-being of youth, thus the importance to recognize and support mental health services for them.
- 2) Schools have the ability to foster inclusive, safe, supportive, respectful, and empowering environments for students who are suffering from mental illnesses.
- 3) Youth mental health programs should address trauma, while promoting resilience, healing, and the pursuit of academic success for all students.
- 4) Prioritizing mental health in our youth and providing them with resources can help reduce stigma and cultivate a culture of resilience, support, and compassion within schools and communities.
- 5) It is essential to designate a week dedicated to recognizing the mental health of our youth and supporting their well-being.

This resolution designates May 3, 2026, to May 9, 2026, inclusive, as Youth Mental Health Awareness Week in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:04

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 183
Author: Sharp-Collins (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/23/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Black Health Equity Advocacy Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes May 4, 2026, to May 8, 2026, inclusive, and every first week of May thereafter, as Black Health Equity Advocacy Week, and commends the California Black Health Network and other organizations throughout the state for their efforts to improve the health, well-being, and life expectancy of Black Californians.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The life expectancy at birth for Black Californians is 76.2 years of age, five years shorter than the state average and the lowest life expectancy of all racial and ethnic groups.
- 2) Black Californians experience the highest death rates from breast, cervical, colorectal, lung, and prostate cancer compared to all racial groups. Black birthing people in California were six times more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications than White birthing people, 56.2 compared to 9.4 pregnancy-related deaths per 100,000, respectively.
- 3) In an effort to bring awareness to the long-standing structural inequities that negatively impact the health and well-being of Black Californians, as well as to uplift existing efforts to address such inequities and dismantle the environmental and systemic barriers that contribute to disproportionate health outcomes and achieve racial justice, social justice, and environmental justice, the California Black Health Network is recognizing May 4, 2026, to May 8, 2026, and every first week of May thereafter, as Black Health Equity Advocacy Week.

This resolution recognizes May 4, 2026, to May 8, 2026, inclusive, and every first week of May thereafter, as Black Health Equity Advocacy Week, and commends the California Black Health Network and other organizations throughout the state for their efforts to improve the health, well-being, and life expectancy of Black Californians.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 53 (Weber, Resolution Chapter 91, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/12/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/12/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:56

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 184
Author: Rivas (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/27/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Stuttering Awareness and Acceptance Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of May 10, 2026, to May 16, 2026, inclusive, as 2026 Stuttering Awareness and Acceptance Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Stuttering is a speech dysfluency characterized by repetition of sounds, syllables, or words, prolongation of sounds, and interruptions in speech. It is estimated that about 1 percent of the world's population stutters and roughly 3,000,000 Americans stutter.
- 2) When stuttering continues into adulthood, a person may have difficulty communicating with other people and stuttering may affect a person's quality of life, interpersonal relationships, job opportunities, and professional growth.
- 3) The opportunity for inclusiveness is the next logical step in the progress California must make to not only fully support and welcome the voices of people who stutter, but to also show their voices are needed.

This resolution proclaims the week of May 10, 2026, to May 16, 2026, inclusive, as 2026 Stuttering Awareness and Acceptance Week.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:04

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 185
Author: Macedo (R) and Aguiar-Curry (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/27/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Portuguese Heritage Month: Day of Portugal: Day of the Azores

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of June 2026 to be Portuguese Heritage Month and would recognize June 10, 2026, as the Day of Portugal and May 25, 2026, as the Day of the Azores.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The first Portuguese settlers came to California from the Azores Islands in the early 19th century. Waves of Azorean immigrants moved to California just before and during the 20th century, with the first wave arriving around the turn of the century, followed by the second and largest wave between 1958 and 1976, each contributing substantially to establishing agricultural operations, especially dairy, livestock, vegetables, fruit farms, and the tuna industry in southern California.
- 2) California has long been a destination for immigrants from the Azores Islands, creating enduring cultural ties. Today, more than 350,000 persons of Portuguese heritage live in California, approximately 90% of whom are of Azorean descent.
- 3) The California Portuguese American Coalition, established in 2016, fosters civic engagement and public service among Portuguese Americans.
- 4) Cultural traditions such as the Portuguese Holy Ghost Festival and other community celebrations remain vital expressions of heritage and identity in California.
- 5) Portuguese Americans have enriched California's cultural landscape, including contributions to the arts and entertainment industry, the most notable of whom

are Mary Astor, Katy Perry, Tom Hanks, Joe Perry, Nuno Bettencourt, Steve Perry, and Sara Bareilles.

- 6) California maintains a sister-state relationship with the Autonomous Region of the Azores, fostering collaboration in renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, tourism, technology, and cultural exchange.

This resolution declares the month of June 2026 to be Portuguese Heritage Month and recognizes June 10, 2026, as the Day of Portugal and May 25, 2026, as the Day of the Azores.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/10/26 16:17:28

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 186
Author: Chen (R), et al.
Introduced: 4/28/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: California Physical Fitness and Mental Well-Being Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of May 2026 as California Physical Fitness and Mental Well-Being Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Regular physical activity offers substantial improvements in physical health and mental well-being for the majority of Californians, who are not receiving enough physical activity.
- 2) Nearly 25% of the state's adults say they are not physically active, and over two-thirds of California's children fail to meet the physical activity guidelines of engaging in at least one hour of physical activity every day, yet moderate physical activity can substantially reduce the risk of developing or dying from chronic illnesses and diseases.
- 3) Roughly 40% of California adults report having at least one of the five chronic and largely preventable conditions: high blood pressure, heart disease, diabetes, serious psychological distress, or asthma.
- 4) Mental health and physical health are closely connected, with the many well-established benefits of leading an active lifestyle including improved brain health and cognitive function, reduced risk of anxiety and depression, and improved sleep and overall quality of life.
- 5) The Legislature has the unique opportunity to educate the public about the benefits of safe physical activity and places to be active, promote the design of communities and use of spaces that support safe and convenient ways for

people to be physically active, and promote equitable community programs and policies that make it safe and easy for people to walk, bike, or wheelchair roll and be physically active.

This resolution recognizes the need to prioritize, preserve, and promote physical activity in public health policy to improve the physical fitness and mental well-being of all Californians.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 69 (Berman, Resolution Chapter 98, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:16

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 188
Author: Soria (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/29/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/7/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California's Farm Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates May 10, 2026, to May 16, 2026, inclusive, as California's Farm Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) From nurturing careers to building vibrant communities, our agricultural industry is the backbone of California and we honor the dedication and hard work of those in the agricultural sector who help feed the nation and sustain our communities.
- 2) California is the nation's leader in agricultural exports, shipping \$23.6 billion in food and agricultural commodities around the world in 2022, which represents a 4.4% increase from the previous year.
- 3) California is estimated to lose 797,400 acres of agricultural land by 2040, and more than 300,000 acres of it will have been highly productive irrigated cropland, and thus California should continue to work for conservation to preserve California's agricultural heritage.
- 4) A broad approach to agricultural education is vital to ensuring that California agricultural farms and ranches continue to flourish.

This resolution designates May 10, 2026, to May 16, 2026, inclusive, as California's Farm Week.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 75 (Alanis, Resolution Chapter 83, Statutes of 2025)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 5/7/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Chen, Flora, Gallagher, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Papan, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Valencia, Wallis, Wicks

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:05

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 189
Author: Ahrens (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/30/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Foster Youth Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Foster Youth Awareness Month in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California’s children and youth are our hope for the future, and all children deserve a safe, loving, accepting, stable, and nurturing home. Preserving families is the primary goal of the child welfare system.
- 2) A child’s success is best supported in a child welfare system that is family-focused, child-centered, and community-based.
- 3) One-half of all children in foster care have endured four or more adverse childhood experiences such as abuse, neglect, and abandonment, which can negatively impact their health and development.
- 4) California recognizes the enduring and valuable contribution of relatives and foster and adoptive parents who open their hearts, families, and homes to vulnerable children and youth.

This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Foster Youth Awareness Month in California.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 10 (Wahab, Ashby, Rubio, 2025) – Adopted by the Senate.
SCR 147 (Grove, Newman, Wahab, Resolution Chapter 121, Statutes of 2024)
SCR 65 (Ashby, Resolution Chapter 102, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/19/26)

California Alliance of Child and Family Services

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/20/26 14:08:06

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 190
Author: Ortega (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/30/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: California Day of the Teacher

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 13, 2026, as the California Day of the Teacher.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Today, we recognize that teachers continue to face significant challenges, as their workloads continue to increase; their schools and school districts are under-resourced and subject to budget cuts; and their wages and benefits lag behind those of comparable professionals.
- 2) In 2026, the California Teachers Association published “The State of California’s Public Schools: A Survey of TK-12 Educators” (survey), which contained the results of over 2,000 member surveys and reported that 80% of those educators surveyed reported that schools in California do not have enough resources to meet the needs of pupils.
- 3) The California Teachers Association survey found that 88% of educators surveyed reported insufficient funding for schools and low pay for educators, while 78% reported their classrooms were overcrowded.
- 4) According to the State Department of Education, California is facing a teacher shortage, with more than 10,000 vacancies statewide, showing the dire need to retain teacher.
- 5) To continue educating the population of California, teacher grant programs are necessary to provide the training and mentorship needed to encourage teachers to remain in classrooms.

- 6) Long ago California recognized the immeasurable value of our teachers, and the second Wednesday in May has traditionally been recognized as the California Day of the Teacher, a special observance that honors teachers and the teaching profession.

This resolution urges all Californians to observe the Day of the Teacher by taking the time to remember and honor all individuals who give the gift of knowledge through teaching.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:17

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 195
Author: Gabriel (D), Addis (D), Ahrens (D), Bauer-Kahan (D), Berman (D),
Haney (D), Irwin (D), Krell (D), Lowenthal (D), Pellerin (D), Blanca
Rubio (D), Ward (D) and Zbur (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/4/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Jewish American Heritage Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 2026 as Jewish American Heritage Month in California and would commend the Jewish American community for its profound contributions to California's growth, innovation, and diversity, and would state that the Legislature encourages all Californians to celebrate Jewish American Heritage Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) May is nationally recognized as Jewish American Heritage Month, first proclaimed in 2006, celebrating more than 350 years of Jewish contributions to the United States and underscoring our nation's commitment to religious liberty.
- 2) Jewish Californians have built thriving agricultural enterprises and retail institutions, helped establish the first department stores and nonprofit organizations in Los Angeles, and pioneered the motion picture industry that defined Hollywood, led by figures such as Louis B. Mayer and Jack Warner.
- 3) Jewish Americans have played a significant role in the labor movement in California, advocating for fair wages, safe working conditions, and workers' rights, including leadership in the garment, retail, and entertainment industries in Los Angeles and across the state, where Jewish labor organizers and attorneys helped strengthen protections for immigrant and working-class communities and supported the growth of unions representing film, service, and manufacturing workers, building on the national labor leadership of Sidney

Hillman, whose work helped advance workers' rights and labor protections across the United States.

- 4) Today, approximately 1.2 million Jews live in California—the nation's second-largest Jewish population—including growing numbers of multiracial, Asian American and Pacific Islander, and Latino Jews, sustaining a vibrant and diverse network of synagogues, schools, social service agencies, museums, and cultural centers.
- 5) Jewish American Heritage Month invites Californians of every background to explore Jewish history, culture, and resilience, honoring generations who helped forge “a more perfect union” and continue to advance the cultural, economic, and civic life of our state and nation.

This resolution encourages all Californians to celebrate Jewish American Heritage Month by deepening their understanding of Jewish history and culture, participating in appropriate programs and ceremonies, and standing united against antisemitism.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 178 (Becker, 2026) – Held at Assembly Desk.

SR 47 (Stern, 2025) – Adopted in Senate.

HR 40 (Gabriel, 2023) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:18

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 196
Author: Solache (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/4/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Small Business Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares May as California Small Business Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California is home to more than 4.1 million small businesses, representing over 99% of all businesses in the state, and serving as the foundation of the world's fourth largest economy.
- 2) Small businesses in California employ approximately 7.5 million workers, nearly one-half of the state's private workforce, driving innovation, creating jobs, and serving as vital pillars of local communities.
- 3) Forty-seven percent of California's small businesses are owned by individuals from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, reinforcing the state's commitment to inclusive economic opportunity.
- 4) Minority-owned small businesses contribute nearly \$193 billion in economic output per year, supporting 2.5 million jobs in California each year and generating \$28.7 billion in tax revenue, which helps fund essential services such as education, infrastructure, and housing.
- 5) Small businesses in California have demonstrated exceptional resilience and adaptability, successfully navigating one of the most competitive landscapes in the nation, while continuing to lead in sectors such as clean energy, biotechnology, food innovation, and digital commerce.

This resolution declares May as California Small Business Month, in celebration of the contributions small businesses make to our economy, culture, and communities.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 76 (Solache, Resolution Chapter 101, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 198 (Villapudua, Resolution Chapter 110, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 80 (Villapudua, Resolution Chapter 166, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

Immigrants Rising

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Flora, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:18

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 197
Author: Stefani (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/4/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Italian American Heritage Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of October 2026 as Italian American Heritage Month, and, among other things, encourages all citizens, schools, public institutions, and community organizations in California to observe Italian American Heritage Month with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and educational programs, as specified.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The State of California is home to one of the largest populations of Italian Americans in the United States, and their enduring legacy has significantly shaped the cultural, economic, and social fabric of our great state.
- 2) Italian immigrants began arriving in California in significant numbers around the time of California's official statehood in the mid-19th century, many of whom played vital roles in the development of the state's agricultural, fishing, winemaking, and construction industries, laying the foundations for California's prosperity and global economic significance.
- 3) The contributions of Italian Americans extend far beyond labor and industry, and notable Italian American Californians have made distinguished contributions in public service, science, business, banking, law, medicine, and sports. It is fitting and proper for all Californians to recognize and honor the achievements and contributions of Italian Americans and their vital role in the development and prosperity of our state.

This resolution encourages all citizens, schools, public institutions, and community organizations in California to observe Italian American Heritage Month with

appropriate ceremonies, activities, and educational programs that celebrate and preserve the rich legacy of Italian American heritage.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/10/26 16:17:29

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 198
Author: Patel (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/5/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

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) In the United States, maternal depression is the most common complication of pregnancy, yet also one of the most underdiagnosed obstetrical complications in the country. Maternal mental health disorders encompass a range of mental health conditions, such as depression, anxiety, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, and postpartum psychosis.
- 2) 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.
- 3) Fewer than 15% of identified cases of maternal mental health disorders are treated as a result of the shortage of screening providers who are available or able to provide necessary treatment, and also as a result of personal, structural, and systemic barriers within the health care system.
- 4) 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 dedicates the month of May 2026 as Maternal Mental Health Awareness Month.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 161 (Weber Pierson, Resolution Chapter 73, Statutes of 2026)

ACR 78 (Patel, Resolution Chapter 102, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 70 (Pellerin, Resolution Chapter 94, Statutes of 2023)

SCR 63 (Hurtado, Resolution Chapter 101, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/26/26)

California Perinatal Wellness Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/26/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/14/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Flora, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/27/26 16:29:19

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 200
Author: Alanis (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/6/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 5/21/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Missing Children's Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This measure declares May 25, 2026, as Missing Children's Day in the State of California, recognize the efforts of families, law enforcement, and organizations that work to bring missing children home, and proclaims that every child deserves a safe childhood.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) May 25th has been nationally recognized as National Missing Children's Day since 1983 and internationally recognized as International Missing Children's Day since 2001.
- 2) The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) was established by John and Revé Walsh after the abduction and murder of their six-year-old son Adam when they channeled their painful experience of losing Adam to create NCMEC in 1984.
- 3) In 2025, the NCMEC received more than 32,000 reports of missing children, including 1,842 reports of missing children from California.
- 4) The NCMEC manages the America's Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response (AMBER) Alert Secondary Distribution Program and, as of December 2025, more than 1,300 children have been recovered as a result of AMBER Alert activations.

This resolution declares May 25, 2026, as Missing Children's Day in the State of California, recognizes the efforts of families, law enforcement, and organizations, such as the NCMEC, that work to bring missing children home, and proclaims that every child deserves a safe childhood.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 24 (Alanis, Resolution Chapter 88, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 199 (Alanis, Resolution Chapter 111, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 77 (Alanis, Resolution Chapter 109, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/1/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/1/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 5/21/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Gabriel, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Lowenthal, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Wicks, Wilson

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/3/26 14:19:47

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 202
Author: Garcia (D)
Introduced: 5/11/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/28/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: 529 College Savings Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 29, 2026, as 529 College Savings Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) For California families that want to save for their children's college education, 529 college savings plans are important tools, offering a diverse range of investment options, tax-deferred growth, and withdrawals free of state and federal taxes when those withdrawals are used for qualified higher education expenses, such as tuition, fees, books, computer equipment, certain room and board costs, and required supplies.
- 2) The ScholarShare 529 College Savings Plan has helped students meet their higher education goals with more than \$1,100,000,000 withdrawn in 2025 alone for qualified higher education expenses and funds distributed directly to over 1,100 colleges and universities.
- 3) When Americans are burdened with student loan debt, they are not able to buy homes, cars, and other products that boost our economy.
- 4) College savings plans, such as the ScholarShare 529 College Savings Plan, help families to limit or eliminate future student loan debt by helping them save for future higher education expenses and allow for savings through college savings plans to be used to pay student loans.

This resolution proclaims May 29, 2026, as 529 College Savings Day.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 85 (Garcia, Resolution Chapter 106, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 177 (Ward, Resolution Chapter 108, Statutes of 2024)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/28/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/10/26 16:17:30

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 203
Author: Hoover (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/11/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 5/21/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Lyme Disease Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Lyme Disease Awareness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Lyme disease is a bacterial infection caused by the spirochete *Borrelia burgdorferi* and is primarily transmitted by the bite of an infected tick. The disease was first identified in North America in the 1970s in Lyme, Connecticut, for which it was named, and since that time, the disease has been found in all 50 states in the United States. The reach of Lyme disease is global, having been reported in more than 60 countries on six continents and several islands.
- 2) In California, the Lyme disease bacterium is transmitted by the western blacklegged tick (*Ixodes pacificus*). Ticks are active year round, especially when it is wet. Thus, this tick is most common in the coastal regions and along the western slope of the Sierra Nevada range, but has been found in 56 of California's 58 counties.
- 3) Recently, three new borrelia species belonging to the Lyme disease spirochetal complex have been described, increasing the number of these bacteria known to occur in California to five, making California the focus of more distinct borrelia species than any other geographical region in the United States. The Legislature finds that Lyme disease presents a health threat to Californians.

This resolution proclaims the month of May 2026 as Lyme Disease Awareness Month.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 84 (Hoover, Resolution Chapter 105, Statutes of 2025)

ACR 170 (Hoover, Resolution Chapter 99, Statutes of 2024)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/2/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/2/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 5/21/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Gabriel, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Lowenthal, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Wicks, Wilson

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/3/26 14:19:48

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 205
Author: Lackey (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/13/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Congenital Cytomegalovirus Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of June 2026 as Congenital Cytomegalovirus Awareness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Congenital cytomegalovirus (cCMV) is a common virus that infects people of all ages and is the most common infectious cause of birth defects in the United States, affecting approximately 1 in 200 infants.
- 2) Despite its prevalence and potential severity, awareness of cCMV among pregnant individuals and the general public remains low.
- 3) Approximately 1 in 5 children born with cCMV will experience permanent health problems, including hearing loss, vision impairment, developmental and motor delays, and other serious medical conditions.
- 4) Increased public awareness and education about cCMV, including preventative hygiene practices during pregnancy, have the potential to reduce transmission and improve maternal and child health outcomes.
- 5) Advocacy organizations, including the National CMV Foundation, along with dedicated California-based advocates and community leaders, are working to increase awareness, support affected families, and advance research efforts related to cCMV.
- 6) The State of California recognizes the importance of collaborative efforts among health care providers, advocacy organizations, and community leaders to improve awareness, prevention, and outcomes related to cCMV.

This resolution encourages health care providers, public health agencies, and community organizations to promote education and awareness of cCMV to improve maternal and child health outcomes across California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/10/26 16:17:30

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 209
Author: Elhawary (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/21/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/28/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Behavioral Health Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes May 2026 as Behavioral Health Awareness Month in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Mental illness is a health condition that impacts our emotional, psychological, and social well-being and affects how individuals think, feel, and act, including how they handle stress, relate to others, and make choices. Behavioral health is the term that recognizes the combination of mental illness and substance use disorder that often impacts an individual.
- 2) Serious mental illness costs Americans approximately \$193.2 billion in lost earnings per year.
- 3) Nearly 20% of children and youth between 3 and 17 years of age, inclusive, in the United States, develop a mental, emotional, developmental, or substance use disorder each year.
- 4) Older adults are at increased risk for cooccurring behavioral health conditions such as depression, anxiety, and substance use disorders due to life transitions, grief, cognitive decline, and chronic medical conditions.
- 5) The integration of behavioral health care, including mental health and substance use treatment, into primary care, housing, and aging services is critical to

meeting the needs of California's diverse and growing adult and older adult populations.

This resolution recognizes May 2026 as Behavioral Health Awareness Month in California to enhance public awareness of behavioral health needs across the lifespan.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 175 (Weber Pierson, 2026) – In Senate Engrossing and Enrolling.

SCR 69 (Weber Pierson, Resolution Chapter 125, Statutes of 2025)

HR 42 (Elhawary, 2025) – Adopted in Assembly.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

California Alliance of Child and Family Services

California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/28/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Calderon, DeMaio, Flora, Irwin, Jackson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez

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

6/10/26 16:17:31

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AJR 29
Author: Berman (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/7/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 6/9/26
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg
NOES: Choi

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/11/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Voting by mail

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This joint resolution states the Legislature's opposition to presidential Executive Order #14399 (EO) relating to vote by mail (VBM) voting and calls on the U.S. Congress to protect the constitutional authority of states to administer their own elections.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, pursuant to the U.S. Constitution, that state legislatures prescribes the times, places, and manner of holding elections for U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Congress may, at any time, make law or alter regulations, except as to the places of choosing U.S. Senators.
- 2) Requires every active registered voter to receive a VBM ballot for any election. Election officials must begin mailing VBM ballots not later than 29 days before the election.
- 3) Requires a county elections official, upon receiving a VBM ballot, to compare the signature on the VBM ballot identification envelope with a signature appearing on any affidavit of registration of the voter, or on any form issued by

an elections official that contains the voter's signature and is part of the voter's registration record. If a signature on a VBM ballot identification envelope is missing or does not compare with the signature(s) on file, a voter is permitted to cure their signature and have their VBM ballot counted.

- 4) Requires, pursuant to federal law, election officers to retain and preserve, for a period of 22 months from the date of any election that included a candidate for federal office, all records and papers relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in such election.
- 5) Requires, pursuant to state law, specified materials from an election that included a candidate for federal office to be preserved for 22 months from the date of the election, including all of the following: voted ballots, VBM voter identification envelopes, provisional ballot voter identification envelopes, spoiled ballots, canceled ballots, and unused VBM ballots surrendered by the voter. These records must be unopened and unaltered during the preservation period, unless an election contest or criminal prosecution commences during that period. These materials must be destroyed or recycled at the end of the preservation period.

This joint resolution:

- 1) States the Legislature's opposition to the EO and calls on the U.S. Congress to protect the constitutional authority of states to administer their own elections.
- 2) Specifies that the Legislature affirms the safety, security, and integrity of California's VBM system and reaffirms the right of every eligible California voter to vote by mail.
- 3) Calls upon the U.S. Congress to reject any federal legislation that would restrict or eliminate VBM options currently available to voters in California and other states, and to protect the constitutional authority of states to administer their own elections.

Background

Executive Order #14399 on Elections. On March 31, 2026, President Trump issued Executive Order #14399, *Ensuring Citizenship Verification and Integrity in Federal Elections*.

The EO directs the Department of Homeland Security and the Social Security Administration (SSA) to compile and provide each state's election official with a "State Citizenship List" of confirmed U.S. citizens. This list would be generated

using federal citizenship and naturalization records, SSA records, and other federal databases, and is intended to identify individuals who are eligible to vote in federal elections in each state.

The EO also requires states to notify the USPS at least 90 days before a federal election if they intend to allow mail-in voting and provides for specific design requirements for VBM ballot envelopes. States would also be required to provide the USPS, at least 60 days before the election, with a list of voters to whom ballots will be sent. It further directs the USPS not to transmit VBM ballots from any individual who is not included on such a state-submitted list.

Finally, the EO directs states and localities to preserve all records and materials related to voter participation in federal elections, including ballot envelopes but excluding cast ballots, for a period of five years.

The EO faced immediate legal challenges. On April 3, 2026, California Attorney General Rob Bonta announced that he was co-leading a coalition of 23 attorneys general and the Governor of Pennsylvania in filing a lawsuit challenging the EO. The lawsuit, which was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, alleges that the EO violates provisions of the U.S. Constitution granting states the authority to determine the times, places, and manner for holding elections for U.S. Senators and Representatives, subject to preemption only by Congress.

Advocate organizations, political entities, and government officials also challenged the EO. The plaintiffs argued the EO will disrupt established election procedures and causes harm to voters. In a separate ruling, a federal judge determined it was premature for the court to intervene and decided not to block the EO because the federal government has not yet acted on the EO in a way that would harm the plaintiffs.

Comments

Author's Statement. Free and fair elections are the foundation of our democracy. When the federal government oversteps its constitutional authority to undermine them, California must push back. Every Californian deserves the right to have their vote counted, and President Trump's EO is a direct attack on that fundamental right. California has built one of the most secure, accessible, and trusted VBM systems in the nation, and our voters — Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike — use it in ever increasing numbers. The Constitution is clear that states run elections, not the White House or USPS. And let's not forget — the same president attacking mail-in voting used it himself just last month in Florida. I

am proud to author this resolution, and I will always fight to protect every Californian's access to the ballot box.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 37 (Berman, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2021) among other provisions, required the mailing of a VBM ballot to every active registered voter, required VBM ballot drop-off locations, and established a seven-day deadline for VBM ballots to be returned if postmarked on or before Election Day.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/9/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/11/26

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

NOES: Chen, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Castillo, Jeff Gonzalez, Hoover, Lowenthal, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Solache, Soria

Prepared by: Scott Matsumoto / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
6/10/26 16:52:24

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