2025-26 SESSION

SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 2025

OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-1520

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Monday, June 30, 2025.

Note	Measure	Author	Location
+	SB 39	Weber Pierson	Unfinished Business
	SCR 11	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 28	Grove	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 61	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 78	McGuire	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 80	Niello	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 84	Blakespear	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 85	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 93	Ochoa Bogh	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 95	Choi	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 96	Wahab	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 5	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 6	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 21	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 32	Wahab	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 50	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 50	Bonta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 78	Chen	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
	AB 103	Gabriel	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 120	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 124	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 127	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 128	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 132	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 141	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 142	Committee on Budget	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 234	Calderon	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 263	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 293	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 321	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 344	Valencia	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 348	Krell	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 361	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 391	Michelle Rodriguez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 414	Pellerin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 417	Carrillo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 437	Lackey	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 438	Hadwick	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 439	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 483	Irwin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 503	Mark González	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 516	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 523	Irwin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 581	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 596	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 628	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

\+ ADDS
RA Revised Analysis
* Analysis pending

Note	Measure	Author	Location
	AB 639	Soria	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 677	Bryan	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
	AB 709	Jeff Gonzalez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 711	Chen	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
	AB 870	Hadwick	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 952	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 962	Hoover	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 990	Hadwick	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1008	Addis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1114	Ávila Farías	Consent Calendar Second Legislative Day
RA	AB 1125	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1150	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 1213	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1374	Berman	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1384	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1523	Committee on Judiciary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 2	Jackson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 30	Jackson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 32	Carrillo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 40	Fong	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 61	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 70	Pellerin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 77	Davies	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 90	Gipson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 92	Mark González	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 3	Schiavo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 5	Lee	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 10	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS
RA Revised Analysis
* Analysis pending

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: SB 39
Author: Weber Pierson (D)
Amended: 2/11/25
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 8-0, 3/19/25
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Dahle, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez

SUBJECT: Cosmetic safety: Vaginal or vulvar products

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill exempts vaginal or vulvar products containing boric acid from the ban on cosmetic products as created by AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020) and amended by AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023) if specified conditions are met.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law requires, pursuant to the federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act), cosmetics produced or distributed for retail sale to consumers for their personal care to bear an ingredient declaration. (21 Code of Federal Regulations 701.3)

Existing state law:

1) Defines, pursuant to the Sherman Act, "cosmetic" as any article, or its components, intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to, the human body, or any part of the human body, for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance. Further, the law makes it unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or offer for sale any cosmetic that is adulterated

or for any person to adulterate any cosmetic. (Health & Safety Code (HSC) § 109900)

2) Requires, pursuant to the Safe Consumer Cosmetic Act (Cosmetics Act), a manufacturer of a cosmetic that is subject to regulation by the federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to submit to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) a list of its cosmetic products sold in California that contain any ingredient that is a chemical identified as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. (HSC § 111792)

3) Requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), under the state's Green Chemistry regulations, to establish a process to identify and prioritize chemicals or chemical ingredients in consumer products that may be considered a chemical of concern. (HSC § 25252)

4) Requires DTSC to develop and maintain a list of Candidate Chemicals that exhibit a hazard trait and/or an environmental or toxicological endpoint and is either a) found on one or more of the statutorily specified authoritative lists or b) is listed by DTSC using specified criteria. (California Code of Regulations § 69502.2 (b))

5) Prohibits a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains 24 specified intentionally added chemical ingredients commencing January 1, 2025. Further, prohibits a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains 41 specified intentionally added chemical ingredients commencing January 1, 2027. (HSC § 108980)

This bill:

1) Exempts vaginal or vulvar products from the prohibitions of manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product containing the intentionally added ingredients specified in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (19) of subdivision (b) of Section 108980 of the HSC if any of the specified conditions are met including:

    a) The product undergoes clinical trials for regulation by the United States FDA.
    b) The product has a pending new drug application under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

c) The product becomes regulated as a drug by the FDA.
d) The product has passed definitive third-party placebo-controlled double-blind safety trials.

2) Makes related findings and declarations.

Background

1) *Regulatory requirements for California's cosmetics.* Prior to 2020, California had two laws governing the safety of cosmetics: The Sherman Act and the Cosmetics Act. These laws focused on the identification and notification of hazardous chemicals in cosmetics and outlawing the tampering of products. The Sherman Act prohibits the manufacture, sale, delivery, hold, or offer for sale of any cosmetic that is adulterated and makes it unlawful for any person to adulterate any cosmetic. The Cosmetic Act, established by SB 484 (Migden, Chapter 729, Statutes of 2005), requires the manufacturer, packer, and/or distributor of cosmetic products to provide the CDPH a list of all cosmetic products that contain any ingredient known or suspected to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. CDPH does not have any enforcement authority over the manufacturers that are covered, so compliance may be lacking.

2) *Chemical bans for cosmetics*. Over the past several years, California has shifted its approach to the regulation of cosmetics. Section 108980 of the Health and Safety Code, as established by AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023) and AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020), prohibits the manufacture, sale, delivery, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of 65 intentionally added ingredients. This approach is meant to reflect the hazard-based, regulatory framework of the European Union (EU) and leads to the banning of hazardous chemicals in cosmetics. On September 15, 2022, the European Commission (EC) published Regulation EU 2022/1531 to amend Cosmetics Regulation EC No. 1223/2009 for the use of certain ingredients classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic, or toxic for reproduction (CMR substances) in cosmetic products.
   These regulations require EU member states to prohibit the marketing of cosmetic products containing these ingredients. The scope of products covered under the EU's definition of cosmetics is broader than the scope of products covered under California's definition of cosmetics.

3) *The use of boric acid in suppositories.* Boric acid is a naturally occurring chemical that is associated with antifungal activity and can quickly kill 50-90%

of certain fungi.[1] Boric acid suppositories (BAS) are gelatin capsules of boric acid applied intravaginally and said to address vaginal odor and infections, such as yeast infections and bacterial vaginosis. BAS are marketed as a natural remedy and an alternative to pharmaceuticals. They are sometimes encouraged for use when other viable treatment options have been exhausted and for stubborn and recurrent infections.[2] Boric acid is recommended for use against atypical species of fungi and more severe infections.[3] Only 5-10% of yeast infections are caused by atypical species.[3] The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommend the use of boric acid in a gelatin capsule only after recurrence of a yeast infection caused by atypical fungi species and after longer periods of treatment via other methods.[3,4] BAS are considered to be effective as experimental results have demonstrated that these products can lead to relief from symptoms of vaginal infections within 48 hours.[5]

Though useful in suppositories, boric acid has been considered reproductively toxic over the last 50 years.[6] Boric acid was added to the List of Substances Prohibited in Cosmetic Products (Annex II) in the EU in 2022. There, it is classified as a reproductive toxicant and BAS is currently not available for purchase in the EU. Boric acid is also identified as a Candidate Chemical for the California DTSC. The Expert Panel for Cosmetic Ingredient Safety concluded that boric acid in concentrations less than or equal to 5% is safe.[5] The capsules of BAS typically contain 0.6 grams of boric acid and are considered safe for use as 15 grams of boric acid can have toxic effects.[7,8] Because BAS are administered intravaginally, the risk of introducing the toxic chemical to other parts of the body is lower, however, there is a risk of introducing the toxic chemical into the bloodstream if there is damage to the

[1] Prutting, S. M., & Cerveny, J. D. (1998). Boric acid vaginal suppositories: a brief review. Infectious diseases in obstetrics and gynecology, 6(4), 191.
[2] Iavazzo, C., Gkegkes, I. D., Zarkada, I. M., & Falagas, M. E. (2011). Boric acid for recurrent vulvovaginal candidiasis: the clinical evidence. Journal of women's health, 20(8), 1245-1255.
[3] Paavonen, J. A., & Brunham, R. C. (2020). Vaginitis in nonpregnant patients: ACOG practice bulletin number 215. Obstetrics & Gynecology, 135(5), 1229-1230.
[4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). Vulvovaginal Candidiasis. www.cdc.gov/std/treatment-guidelines/candidiasis.htm#print
[5] Writer, C. I. R. (2024). Safety Assessment of Boric Acid and Sodium Borate as Used in Cosmetics.
[6] Chapin, R. E., & Ku, W. W. (1994). The reproductive toxicity of boric acid. Environmental health perspectives, 102(suppl 7), 87-91.
[7] Farfán-García, E. D., Castillo-Mendieta, N. T., Ciprés-Flores, F. J., Padilla-Martínez, I. I., Trujillo-Ferrara, J. G., & Soriano-Ursúa, M. A. (2016). Current data regarding the structure-toxicity relationship of boron-containing compounds. Toxicology letters, 258, 115-125.
[8] Sevim, Ç., & Kara, M. (2022). Boron and boron-containing compounds toxicity. In The Toxicity of Environmental Pollutants. IntechOpen.

vaginal wall.[1,5] There are side effects of BAS including increased irritation, burning, and vaginal discharge.

Boric acid use is not recommended for pregnant women, as there is limited data on its harmful effects. Experts recommend that affected individuals consult their healthcare provider before using BAS to treat infections. Researchers claim that BAS should not be considered for the first-line treatment of uncomplicated vaginal infections because of insufficient data, controversy surrounding safety, and the availability of safer and effective treatments.[1] Because of its potential ability to impair fertility, researchers also suggest boric acid be considered a last option in exceptional cases for non-pregnant women.[9,10] The alternatives to BAS include prescribed antifungal and antibacterial medication, probiotics, and diets incorporating fermented food.

4) *A controversial capsule.* BAS are currently not approved by the U.S. FDA and have not been rigorously tested to ensure that they are safe and effective for use. Their status with the FDA classifies BAS as homeopathic products, which are not required to be reviewed by the FDA. Homeopathic products tend to pose higher risks to public health because they may contain unsafe ingredients, undergo improper and unregulated manufacturing, have contamination, and lack labels that inform consumers of risks and side effects. BAS also tend to be marketed to treat and prevent infections, which could qualify these products as drugs. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, products marketed in this manner and without FDA approval would violate federal law. In 2018, the FDA issued a warning to a manufacturer of a BAS product sold by the sponsor of this bill (pH-D Feminine Health) claiming that the online marketing of their product characterized their product as a drug. This was based on the manner in which the product is administered and the ailments it addresses. The manufacturer argued that the product has long been considered a cosmetic and should be regulated as such. The sponsor also alleges that they were advised incorrectly on acceptable marketing. As a result, the FDA required the product to undergo clinical trials and the manufacturer began to market the product as a cosmetic that solely addresses vaginal odor.

   In 2024, a class action lawsuit was filed against manufacturers for illegally selling BAS marketed to treat and prevent infections without FDA approval.

---

[9] Donders, G., Sziller, I. O., Paavonen, J., Hay, P., de Seta, F., Bohbot, J. M., ... & Mendling, W. (2022). Management of recurrent vulvovaginal candidosis: Narrative review of the literature and European expert panel opinion. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology, 12, 934353.

[10] Farr, A., Effendy, I., Frey Tirri, B., Hof, H., Mayser, P., Petricevic, L., ... & Mendling, W. (2021). Guideline: vulvovaginal candidosis (AWMF 015/072, level S2k). Mycoses, 64(6), 583-602.

Additionally in 2024, Women's Voices for the Earth, on behalf of several health and advocacy organizations, issued a letter of concern to a healthcare manufacturer to remove boric acid from their intimate care products over concerns of reproductive safety and to stop the spread of misinformation. This class action lawsuit is still pending.

Comments

1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, "SB 39 will allow boric acid to continue to be used in vaginal and vulvar products sold in the State of California, and ultimately nationwide, as national retailers do not sell state-specific products. These products are marketed as cosmetics and are used by healthcare providers to treat two of the most common issues affecting women: vaginal yeast infections and vaginal odor. There is robust safety and efficacy data on the use of boric acid products in vaginal and vulvar products. For example, the CDC and Prevention recommends the use of BAS in their current STD guidelines (published 2015). Likewise, The ACOG recommends the use of BAS in vaginal health applications. Boric acid products are readily available at every major retailer in the US. Healthcare providers guide their patients to purchase boric acid products at these retailers. Data shows that in areas where healthcare deserts exist, the sales of boric acid products are significantly higher, as well as healthcare providers instructing their patients to purchase these affordable products. Unless SB 39 is enacted, the ban on boric acid will prohibit women from accessing boric acid products and eliminate a woman's right to choose how to manage her feminine health (especially in disadvantaged populations), eliminating a safe, effective, and accessible non-antibiotic treatment for conditions such as vaginal odor and yeast infections."

2) *Accessibility to over-the-counter medications.* Boric acid suppositories are sold over the counter and do not require a prescription from a healthcare provider. This leaves an option for affected individuals to receive treatment and relief without a visit to the doctor. This is an important consideration given that 8% of women in California do not have access to health insurance and would not be prescribed alternative treatment options.[11] If these products are unavailable to current consumers, there is also the potential for affected individuals to seek boric acid intended for other applications to make homemade suppositories, which could put these individuals at a higher risk. Some research has claimed that BAS could be a safe and economic option for women with recurrent and chronic symptoms of vaginitis when conventional treatment fails with atypical,

[11] KFF (2023). California Women's Health Insurance Coverage Data

resistant strains of fungi.[2,12] However, given that there are concerns surrounding the hazardous nature of boric acid, insufficient data on safety, and that it is listed as a reproductive toxicant on the EU's List of Substances Prohibited in Cosmetic Products and the Candidate Chemical list for DTSC, more transparency could protect consumers and allow them to make an informed choice regarding the substances they introduce into their bodies.

3) *Drugs or cosmetics, boric acid still burns*. Arguments have been made that the products should forgo the rigorous testing and approval process of the FDA because they can be classified as cosmetics. BAS capsules still contain a reproductively hazardous toxicant, so regardless of whether BAS is classified as a drug or a cosmetic, the capsules need to be regulated. It is laudable that the author proposes any exceptions that involve vaginal products containing boric acid to be regulated as a drug by the FDA or undergo safety trials, however, these products will be left on the market unregulated and without a warning label while undergoing clinical trials or pending a new drug application.

4) *When helping hurts: hazard vs. risk.* The controversy surrounding BAS highlights the shortcomings in our approach to not only define potentially hazardous products in statute but also in considering hazards and risks. The prohibited chemicals in the EU Directive are evaluated based on hazard, or the potential to cause harm, whereas the U.S. evaluates chemicals on risk, or the likelihood to cause harm. This results in outright bans in the EU as opposed to safety assessments and concentration limits in the U.S. AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020) and AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023) were efforts to align California's regulations with hazard-based assessments of the EU rather than risk-based assessments. Though this tends to be unfavorable with industries in California, prohibiting toxic chemicals has led to the development of alternative ingredients or the removal of toxic ingredients in the EU, and furthermore the increase in access to safer products.

   The question before the legislature is to decide whether the risks associated with these products are worth the cost of potentially harming affected individuals. Due to the controversy surrounding boric acid, hazards associated with boric acid, and guidance suggested by experts, the uncodified declarations and findings are partial, uncomprehensive, and do not consider the nuance in the use of BAS.

[12] Mittelstaedt, R., Kretz, A., Levine, M., Handa, V. L., Ghanem, K. G., Sobel, J. D., ... & Tuddenham, S. (2021). Data on safety of intravaginal boric acid use in pregnant and nonpregnant women: a narrative review. Sexually transmitted diseases, 48(12), e241-e247.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 496 (Friedman, Chapter 441, Statutes of 2023) prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027, the manufacture, sale, delivery, holding, or offering for sale in commerce of any cosmetic product containing 41 specified intentionally added ingredients.

AB 2771 (Friedman, Chapter 804, Statutes of 2022) prohibits any person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any per- or polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS).

AB 2762 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2020) prohibits, beginning January 1, 2025, the manufacture, sale, delivery, holding, or offering for sale in commerce of any cosmetic product containing 24 specified intentionally added ingredients.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/20/25)

American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists - District IX
Nutrablast
Ph-d Feminine Health, LLC
The Flex Company

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/20/25)

None received

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108,
3/21/25 16:13:41

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 11
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 11
Author: Cervantes (D)
Amended: 1/30/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Epilepsy Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims November 2025 as Epilepsy Awareness Month and calls upon all Californians to recommit their communities to increasing awareness and understanding of those living with epilepsy.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Epilepsy is a condition of the brain causing seizures. A seizure is a disruption of the electrical communication between neurons. A person is said to have epilepsy if they experience two or more unprovoked seizures separated by at least 24 hours or if the person experiences one seizure and is at a high risk of having more.

2) About one in 10 people in the United States has had a single, unprovoked seizure or has been diagnosed with epilepsy, 3.4 million people in the United States have epilepsy, and over 65 million people worldwide live with epilepsy. One in 26 people will develop epilepsy during their lifetime, and people with certain conditions may be at greater risk for developing epilepsy.

3) One-third of people living with epilepsy have seizures that cannot be controlled with current treatments and all people living with epilepsy have the risk of a potential "breakthrough" seizure.

This resolution proclaims November 2025 as Epilepsy Awareness Month and calls upon all Californians to recommit their communities to increasing awareness and understanding of those living with epilepsy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 2/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 2/10/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
2/14/25 15:42:06

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 28
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 28
Author: Grove (R), et al.
Amended: 3/10/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims September 28, 2025, as Gold Star Mothers' and Families' Day in California.

Senate Floor Amendments of 3/10/25 make a clarifying change to one of the findings in the resolution.

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) All Gold Star families deserve to be recognized by our local, state, and federal leaders for their sacrifices and their dedicated, patriotic support of the United States.

4) Supporting Gold Star families demonstrates the commitment of the American people to those families, now and in the future.

This resolution proclaims that 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.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 109 (Grove, 2024) – Adopted in the Senate.
SR 43 (Grove, 2023) – Adopted in the Senate.
SR 101 (Grove, 2022) – Adopted in the Senate.
ACR 152 (Salas, 2022) – Held in the Senate without further action.
ACR 7 (Salas, Resolution Chapter 131, Statutes of 2021)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/4/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/4/25)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-1520
3/12/25 16:09:25

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 61
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/10/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Military and Veteran Suicide Prevention Awareness

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of September 15, 2025, to September 21, 2025, inclusive, as Military and Veterans Suicide Prevention Awareness Week in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Suicide is a serious and tragic public health problem that can be prevented through increased awareness, resources, and proper treatment. Suicide affects all Americans, but data shows that active duty service members and veterans die by suicide at much higher rates than the civilian population.

2) We must recognize that this tragic epidemic is taking the lives of those who have most heavily borne the burden of protecting and serving their country, in the past and present. In 2014, an average of 20 veterans died by suicide each day, and 6 of the 20 were users of United States Department of Veterans Affairs services.

3) In the United States Department of Defense's (USDOD) annual reporting for 2023, the military services reported the following for all of 2023: 363 deaths by suicide for active military members; 69 deaths by suicide for military reserve members; and 91 deaths by suicide for members of the National Guard.

4) The Defense Suicide Prevention Office in the USDOD is working diligently to reduce these staggering numbers through an integrated and holistic approach to suicide prevention, intervention, and postvention utilizing a range of medical and nonmedical resources.

5) This resolution endeavors to promote awareness of the problem of suicide and the particular epidemic facing the military population, and encourages active duty service members, veterans, service providers, advocates, and the people of the State of California to work together to continue to educate the public on how to recognize the warning signs and improve the outreach to, and treatment of, individuals at risk for suicide.

This resolution proclaims September 15, 2025, to September 21, 2025, inclusive, as Military and Veteran Suicide Prevention Awareness Week in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 4/23/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 4/23/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
4/23/25 16:30:33

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: SCR 78
Author: McGuire (D)
Introduced: 5/13/25
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Umberg, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta, Gonzalez

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SUBJECT: Detective Sergeant Ed Wilkinson, Deputy Sheriff Brent Jameson, and Deputy Sheriff Bliss Magly Memorial Overcrossing

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates the overcrossing on State Route 101 at Airport Boulevard, at postmile 26.356, in the County of Sonoma as the Detective Sergeant Ed Wilkinson, Deputy Sheriff Brent Jameson, and Deputy Sheriff Bliss Magly Memorial Overcrossing.

ANALYSIS:

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

Senate Transportation Committee Policy:

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

1) The person being honored must have provided extraordinary public service or some exemplary contribution to the public good and have a connection to the community where the highway or structure is located.

2) The person being honored must be deceased or a former elected public official who has been out of office for at least 25 years.

3) The naming must be done without cost to the state. Costs for signs and plaques must be paid by local or private sources.

4) The author or co-author of the resolution must represent the district in which the facility is located, and the resolution must identify the specific highway segment or structure being named.

5) The segment of highway being named must not exceed five miles in length.

6) The proposed designation must reflect a community consensus and be without local opposition.

7) The proposed designation may not supersede an existing designation unless the sponsor can document that a good faith effort has uncovered no opposition to rescinding the prior designation.

This resolution:

1) Recounts the lives and careers of Detective Sergeant Ed Wilkinson, Deputy Sheriff Brent Jameson, and Deputy Sheriff Bliss Magly.

2) Designates overcrossing No. 20 0297 on State Route 101 at Airport Boulevard, at postmile 26.356, in the County of Sonoma as the Detective Sergeant Ed Wilkinson, Deputy Sheriff Brent Jameson, and Deputy Sheriff Bliss Magly Memorial Overcrossing.

3) Requests Caltrans to determine the cost of appropriate signs consistent with the signing requirements for the state highway system showing this special designation and, upon receiving donations from nonstate sources sufficient to cover that cost, to erect those signs.

Comments

1) *Purpose of the resolution.* According to the author, "Detective Sergeant Wilkinson, Deputy Jameson, and Deputy Magly served Sonoma County with distinction and made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. They leave a proud legacy as pioneers of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office helicopter unit, which has since flown thousands of life-saving missions. Detective Sergeant Wilkinson, Deputy Jameson, and Deputy Magly are fondly remembered by friends, family, loved ones, and the broader County of Sonoma community, and it is fitting that they be memorialized with this memorial overcrossing. We honor their memories and those of all law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty."

2) *Background.* On April 17, 1977, Detective Sergeant Edward Francis Wilkinson was returning to the helicopter hangar at the Sonoma County Airport after searching for a missing nine-year-old girl when the helicopter ran out of fuel and crashed into a field on Barnes Road, approximately one-half mile south of River Road. After his death in the line of duty while piloting the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office helicopter "Angel-1," the Wilkinson Valor Award was created in Detective Sergeant Wilkinson's memory to honor fellow officers for acts of heroism and courage above and beyond the call of duty. Detective Sergeant Wilkinson, who was a 17-year veteran of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office, started the sheriff's helicopter program and was its first pilot. The helicopter program is still in existence and has been credited with saving many lives through its search and rescue, law enforcement, and medical air ambulance services.

   Deputy Sheriff Brent Charles Jameson and Deputy Sheriff Bliss Steven Magly were killed in the line of duty on October 23, 1980, when their Sonoma County Sheriff's Office helicopter, "Angel-2," crashed and burned in heavy fog approximately one-half mile south of the Sonoma County Airport between River Road and Laughlin Road. Deputy Jameson was piloting the aircraft, with Deputy Magly serving as observer, on a search mission for a shooting suspect in the area of Ludwig Avenue, east of Llano Road, between the Cities of Sebastopol and Santa Rosa.

   Deputy Jameson had served with the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office for six years and had previously served with the Novato Police Department for three years. Deputy Magly had served with the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office for three years. In order to honor Deputy Jameson and Deputy Magly, scholarships

were opened in their names at Santa Rosa Junior College to assist deserving criminal justice students. Furthermore, the annual Sonoma County Sheriff's Office awards banquet was started as a result of this tragedy as a way to properly recognize the outstanding work of the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office, and the first banquet was dedicated to Deputy Jameson and Deputy Magly. Deputy Jameson and Deputy Magly were posthumously awarded Gold Medals of Valor.

Pioneered by Detective Sergeant Wilkinson in the 1960s, the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office helicopter unit has since flown thousands of life-saving missions. Today, the helicopter unit responds to an average of 1,000 missions annually and is one of the busiest single-aircraft rescue helicopter programs in the country. Detective Sergeant Wilkinson, Deputy Jameson, and Deputy Magly are fondly remembered by friends, family, loved ones, and the broader County of Sonoma community.

3) *Consistent with committee policy*. This resolution is consistent with the Senate Transportation Committee policy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

Prepared by: Isabelle LaSalle / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
6/26/25 9:03:12

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 80
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 80
Author: Niello (R), et al.
Amended: 5/20/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Frontotemporal Degeneration Awareness Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the week of September 21 to September 28, 2025, inclusive, as Frontotemporal Degeneration Awareness Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The Association for Frontotemporal Degeneration (AFTD) reports that Frontotemporal Degeneration (FTD) is a terminal and incurable neurodegenerative disease affecting the frontal and temporal lobes, causing impairments to speech, personality, behavior, and motor skills that constitutes a major public health concern.

2) It takes an average of 3.6 years from the initial symptoms to get an accurate diagnosis of FTD, with an average life expectancy of 7 to 13 years after the initial symptoms. FTD strikes people as young as 21 years of age and as old as 80 years of age, with the largest percentage of those affected being in their 40s to 60s, rendering people in the prime of life unable to work or function normally.

3) While there has never been a global epidemiology study of FTD, it is estimated that more than 60,000 people are affected in the United States today.

4) It is imperative that there be greater awareness of this serious disease, and more must be done to increase activity at the local, state, and national levels.

This resolution proclaims the week of September 21 to September 28, 2025, inclusive, as Frontotemporal Degeneration Awareness Week.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 116 (Jones, Resolution Chapter 96, Statutes of 2024)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/27/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/27/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
5/27/25 17:45:37

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 84
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 84
Author: Blakespear (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/19/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: California Rail Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes May 2025 as California Rail Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Since California become the 31st state in 1850, rail has been historically important in connecting communities to the rest of the nation and growing economic opportunity, making rail services a vital public infrastructure that is intrinsically linked to many of the state's most important goals and celebrated successes.

2) There are five local agencies responsible for operating regional rail services: the Southern California Regional Rail Authority operating Metrolink, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board operating Caltrain, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission operating the Altamont Corridor Express, the North County Transit District operating COASTER, and the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit District operating Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit.

3) The California State Rail Plan establishes a long-term vision for passenger and freight rail services across the state, recognizing the urgency of developing a rail network by 2050 that is zero emission, provides reliable and frequent service, and is interconnected as part of a multimodal transportation ecosystem.

4) The California State Rail Plan has set a goal of providing nearly 200 million daily passenger-miles on a statewide rail network by 2050.

5) The California State Rail Plan has identified $65 billion in federal, state, local, and private investment to be completed in the state over the next 10 years, and

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

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

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/22/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/22/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
5/27/25 17:45:39

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 85
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 85
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/22/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Latino Veterans Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims September 20, 2025, as Latino Veterans Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The history of California veterans of Latino descent abounds with acts of heroism and exhibits a heritage of valor that has brought honor and earned the gratitude of our country.

2) The bravery of countless Latinos in World Wars I and II and the conflicts of Korea and Vietnam is consistent with the greatest acts of heroism known in our history, as exemplified by the 200th and the 515th Coast Artillery Battalions, which were comprised of a majority of Latinos, many of whom were from California, who fought to the bitter end at Bataan in World War II.

3) Today, Latinos make up more than 17% of America's fighting force. Since the beginning of this century, Latinos have been among the boots on the ground in antiterrorism operations.

4) Latino veterans, both men and women, have shown and continue to show a superb dedication to the United States, evidenced by the award of over 60 Congressional Medals of Honor.

This resolution proclaims September 20, 2025, as Latino Veterans Day.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 101 (Archuleta, Resolution Chapter 108, Statutes of 2022)
SCR 37 (Archuleta, Resolution Chapter 123, Statutes of 2021)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/3/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/3/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/4/25 20:37:13

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 93
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 93
Author: Ochoa Bogh (R), et al.
Introduced: 6/9/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: First Responders' Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares October 28, 2025, as First Responders' Day and urges all Californians to observe and promote the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the contributions of first responders in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) First Responders' Day recognizes the heroic men and women who make it their business to take immediate action when disaster strikes and play an integral role in making a positive difference in appalling circumstances.

2) California's first responders react swiftly and courageously to emergencies, often putting their own lives at risk to ensure the safety and well-being of others, whether responding to natural disasters, accidents, medical emergencies, or public health and safety threats.

3) As a direct result of their extensive training, rapid emergency deployment, and coordinated efforts, first responders save lives every day.

4) First responders deserve our gratitude and respect for their commitment to preserving the peace and securing the safety of California residents and visitors.

This resolution declares October 28, 2025, as First Responders' Day and urges all Californians to observe and promote the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the contributions of first responders in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/18/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/18/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/18/25 16:38:35

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 95
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 95
Author: Choi (R), et al.
Introduced: 6/13/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Soju Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes and establish September 20, 2025, and every September 20 thereafter, as Soju Day in this state.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Soju, a traditional Korean distilled beverage, holds a significant cultural, historical, and social importance, not only within the Korean community but increasingly across the United States.

2) Korean immigrants have contributed immensely to the economic, social, and cultural fabric of our state, and the recognition of Soju Day will further highlight and celebrate their contributions.

3) 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.

4) It is a unique characteristic of soju as a spirit that brings people together and symbolizes the sharing of joy.

This resolution encourages 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.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/26/25 9:03:13

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 96
Author: Wahab (D), et al.
Introduced: 6/18/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Southeast Asian Americans: resettlement

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution commemorates 50 years since Southeast Asian refugees began resettling in the United States, honors their sacrifices, recognizes their contributions, uplifts the principles of second chances, rehabilitation, and integrational healing for Southeast Asian Americans who resettled in the United States and California, and resolves the Legislature's continued pursuit of comprehensive policies for Southeast Asian American communities.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) 2025 marks 50 years since the beginning of the resettlement of Southeast Asian refugees to the United States.

2) Southeast Asian Americans comprise more than 3 million individuals in the United States and include, but are not limited to, the Cham, Hmong, Khmer, Khmer Kampuchea Krom, Khmer Loeu, Khmu, Lahu, Lao, Iu Mien, Montagnards, Phutai, Pnong, Tai Dam, Tai Deng, Tai Lue, Vietnamese, and ethnic Chinese with Southeast Asian heritage.

3) California is home to the largest population of Southeast Asian Americans in the nation, including approximately 36% of Vietnamese Americans, 34% of Cambodian Americans, 25% of Laotian Americans, 33% of Hmong Americans, and 71% of Iu Mien Americans.

4) Decades of conflict in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, including wars and political upheaval, resulted in the displacement of millions of individuals. Over 1.2 million Southeast Asian refugees arrived in the United States between 1975 and the mid-2000s, seeking safety from conflict, persecution, and displacement.

5) Despite the challenges they have faced in the United States, Southeast Asian Americans have persisted and made enduring contributions to the economic, educational, scientific, civic, and cultural fabric of California and the nation.

This resolution recognizes the contributions of Southeast Asian Americans to the economic, educational, military, political, and social culture of the United States.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/26/25 9:03:14

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: SJR 5
Author: Becker (D)
Introduced: 4/22/25
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Dahle, Hurtado, Menjivar, Pérez
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez, Padilla

SUBJECT: Enteric methane reduction solutions: cattle industries

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution states California's commitment to advancing innovative solutions that reduce enteric methane emission while preserving the economic sustainability of California's cattle industries, among other things.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Directs California Air Resources Board (CARB) to implement a comprehensive short-lived climate pollutant strategy to achieve, among other goals, a reduction in the statewide emissions of methane by 40% below 2013 levels by 2030 SB 1383, (Lara, Chapter 395, Statutes of 2016). (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 39730.5)

2) Requires CARB, in consultation with the California Department of Food and Agriculture, to adopt regulations to reduce methane emissions from livestock and dairy operations by up to 40% below the dairy and livestock sectors' 2013 levels by 2030. (HSC § 39730.7)

3) Dictates that enteric methane emissions reductions be achieved only through incentive-based mechanisms until CARB, in consultation with California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), determines that a cost-effective

and scientifically proven method of reducing enteric emissions is available and that adoption of the enteric emissions reduction method would not damage animal health, public health, or consumer acceptance. (HSC § 39730.7)

This resolution:

1) Briefly describes enteric methane emissions from livestock, the variety of solutions that are under consideration for addressing them, and the challenges associated with implementing those solutions.

2) Makes claims about the potential impacts and considerations involved in marketing and selling cattle products vis-à-vis enteric methane reduction solutions.

3) States that California remains committed to advancing innovative solutions in enteric methane emission reduction and encouraging enteric methane emission reduction solutions.

4) Urges the United States Congress to explore advancing innovative enteric methane emission reduction solutions and encourage their use.

Background

1) *Methane is a significant contributor to climate change.* Methane is considered a short-lived climate pollutant because it does not stay in the atmosphere as long as carbon dioxide does (it lasts about a decade vs. centuries for carbon dioxide). However, its much higher warming potential (28 times that of carbon dioxide when considered over 100-year timescales, 84 times over 20-year timescales) and continuous replenishment in the atmosphere (60% of methane emissions are estimated to be due to human activity) make it an important element in climate change mitigation strategies. Methane also degrades local air quality and contributes to ozone formation.

   The largest sources of methane in California are landfills, leakage from the oil and gas sectors, and the dairy and livestock industries. CARB estimates that the dairy and livestock sector accounts for about 55%. Enteric methane from dairy and livestock constitutes about 30% of the state's methane emissions. Enteric methane is a by-product of the natural digestive process occurring in ruminant animals such as cattle. When microbes decompose and ferment food and fibers in the digestive tract of the animal, they release methane which is then released into the atmosphere.

What are we doing about methane? In 2016, the Legislature enacted SB 1383, which recognizes the immediate climate benefits of reducing SLCPs. In the 2017 Scoping Plan Update, the plan for achieving GHG reductions in the state, CARB described that SLCP reductions would account for about one-third of the cumulative GHG emissions reductions the state is relying on to achieve the statewide 2030 GHG emissions target established under SB 32.

The 2022 Scoping Plan Update contained no such analysis of relative contributions to achieving the state's climate goals, but did state:

"The state is expected to achieve roughly half of the SB 1383 targeted emissions reductions by 2030 through strategies currently in place. As directed by the Legislature under SB 1383, state agencies focused on voluntary, incentive-based mechanisms to reduce SLCP emissions in the early years of implementation to overcome technical and market barriers. *Under this "carrot-then-stick" strategy, incentives are replaced with requirements as the solutions become increasingly feasible and cost-effective. To meet legislated targets, more aggressive action is needed*." [emphasis added]

2) *How do we moo-ve forward?* Enteric methane emissions can be reduced through genetic selection, diet modification, and feed additives. Of these, feed additives offer the greatest potential for sector-wide methane emissions reductions because they potentially deliver considerable methane emissions reductions shortly after adoption. In comparison, strategies like diet modifications, feed efficiency improvements, and selective breeding require a relatively long time to achieve significant emissions reductions. Unlike manure management strategies, these strategies can be implemented at existing operations with minimal need to modify facility design and without significant upfront capital requirements or changes to land use. This makes these strategies potentially attractive for dairy and livestock operations, especially rented or leased operations.

   CARB calculates that methane emissions reductions from enteric fermentation present an opportunity to achieve significant methane emissions reductions, potentially at a cost of approximately $50 per metric ton on a carbon dioxide equivalent basis. This is far lower than most technological carbon dioxide removal methods, which typically range between $200 and $2,000 per ton of carbon dioxide today (costs which are expected to fall as the technology matures and the market scales).

Comments

1) *Purpose of this resolution.* According to the author, "Enteric Methane produced by cattle is a significant contributor to our Climate challenge and it demands innovative solutions. This resolution strikes an important balance. Recognizing the reality of climate change and the need to reduce enteric methane emissions, while acknowledging that solutions must be economically viable for our agricultural producers. This resolution is California's commitment to innovative solutions that support sustainable agriculture practices while urging the United States Congress to explore reducing enteric methane emissions."

2) *Sacrifice zones and environmental justice.* Dairy farms make bad neighbors. According to an article published in April 2021 in Discover Magazine:

> On days when the air pollution is especially bad, a mother in Tulare County, California – where cows outnumber people two to one – forbids her children from going outside. The woman, who declined to be named for fear of reprisal from her neighbors in the dairy industry, said that nearly everyone in her family, including herself, suffers from a combination of severe allergies and asthma, overlapping illnesses that cause sleepless nights, sick days and weekly doctor's appointments.
>
> She runs an air filtration system in their home to protect her children from the toxic fumes wafting off freeways, oil wells, and cow feedlots… Worried about water contamination as well, she also drives 20 miles to buy four gallons of clean water each week… she doesn't use it for cooking and would never allow anyone in her family to drink it. Dealing with pollution is a daily struggle.

   Regardless of the anticipated methane reductions from innovative solutions or the validity of the GHG accounting surrounding dairy biogas, it should be remembered that methane and milk are not the only things leaving dairy farms, and the admittedly abstract notion of "greater global atmospheric warming," is not the only victim.

3) *Using all the tools in the tool belt to reduce agricultural emissions*. Under SB 1383, CARB was expressly prohibited from imposing regulations (i.e. using "sticks") on methane emissions from sources included in the bill until January 1, 2024. Rather, they were only permitted to use incentive-based programs (i.e.

"carrots") to reduce agricultural methane emissions—both enteric and from manure. Even after January 1, 2024, CARB is only authorized to implement regulations to meet the 2030 methane reduction target if CARB (in consultation with CDFA) determines the regulations are technologically and economically feasible, cost-effective, include provisions to minimize and mitigate potential leakage, and include an evaluation of the achievements made by incentive-based programs.

Incentives are not the only option. The Danish government recently announced a plan to tax livestock emissions starting in 2030, with a proposed rate of $100 per cow per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent. Danish farmers will be able to avoid this taxation by using three main commercially available additive options.[1] Ultimately, this is a question of who should pay. When taxes are imposed (as proposed in Denmark), farmers will ultimately either pay the tax or pay for one of the other compliance options, and these costs will likely be passed through to the consumers of the products. When financial incentives alone are used to encourage the adoption of the same solutions, the farmers incur no additional costs and so no higher prices would be expected for consumers. Nevertheless, the money must come from somewhere, and if those incentives are paid for out of other pots of money (say a general fund or a climate-specific fund) then that necessarily means there is less money available for something else.

This resolution states that voluntary incentives should be among the range of strategies considered to reduce the impact of any cost drivers to cattle industries. While it is entirely understandable that the agricultural industry would prefer to only be moved to action through carrots rather than sticks, and it is certainly possible that goals can be reached through voluntary action alone, the Legislature should not take tools off the table for achieving our ambitious methane emission reduction goals. This resolution reflects that all options should be weighed in reaching our methane emission reduction goals.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/19/25)

California Climate and Agriculture Network

[1] UC Davis College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. State of the Science: Reduce Methane from Animal Agriculture. May 19-20, 2024

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

Prepared by: Eric Walters / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
6/23/25 17:40:02

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SJR 6
Author: Cortese (D), Richardson (D) and Stern (D)
Introduced: 4/24/25
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 7-2, 6/23/25
AYES: Ashby, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg, Weber Pierson
NOES: Choi, Strickland
NO VOTE RECORDED: Menjivar, Niello

SUBJECT: Federal funding for essential state infrastructure, technology, and economic development

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges President Donald J. Trump and Congress to protect and maintain the historic investments made possible by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

1) The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, also known as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021, authorizes approximately $1.2 trillion in federal spending, including $110 billion for repairing and upgrading highways, bridges and major infrastructure projects, $39 billion for the modernization of public transit, with $66 billion invested in railway infrastructure programs within the Department of Transportation, $550 billion in new investments including $65 billion to expand broadband access, particularly in underserved and rural areas, $55 billion to replace lead pipes and improve water systems nationwide and $73 billion to modernize the electric grid and support clean energy initiatives, among numerous other provisions. (Public Law 117-58)

2) The Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors (CHIPS) Act of 2022 provides approximately $280 billion in new funding for the CHIPS for America fund to support the domestic research and manufacturing of semiconductors in the United States for which it appropriates $52.7 billion, includes $39 billion in subsidies for chip manufacturing in the U.S. and $13 billion for semiconductor research and workforce training, invests $174 billion in public sector research in science and technology including, among other provisions, advancing human spaceflight, quantum computing, biotechnology, and experimental physics. (Public Law 117-167)

3) The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 provides various tax credits and incentives and reforms, including allowing the government to negotiate certain Medicare prescription drug prices, caps out-of-pocket insulin costs at $35 per month, extends enhanced Affordable Care Act premium subsidies, imposes a 15 percent minimum tax on corporations with profits exceeding $1 billion, introduces a 1 percent excise tax on corporate stock buybacks, allocates $80 billion to the IRS to enhance tax enforcement and compliance efforts, provides tax credits for various clean energy efforts like home improvements and electric vehicles, funds research and development in clean energy technologies, and allocates $369 billion for clean energy initiatives through 2032, aiming to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40% below 2005 levels by 2030 and achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. (Public Law 117-169)

This resolution:

1) Urges President Donald J. Trump and Congress to protect and maintain the historic investments made possible by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

2) Makes various declarations about the importance of federal investments and highlights the benefit to California and specific California programs from federal action. States that investments made possible by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 are expected to deliver tens of billions of dollars of direct funding to support the households, infrastructure, and economy of California, and additionally make hundreds of billions of dollars available through competitive grant programs, rebates, and tax incentives to California consumers and businesses. States that the loss of these investments will directly harm

residents, households, businesses, the environment, and the infrastructure of California that Californians rely on.

3) Highlights various challenges to the state's Gross Domestic Product, air quality, and energy costs if federal investments and programs are repealed.

4) States that as of January 2025, California has been awarded $63 billion from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, not including funds going to California cities, air and water districts, or other political subdivisions.

5) States that The High Speed Rail Authority has been awarded more than $3.1 billion in competitive grant awards under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to advance construction of the Merced to Bakersfield segment of the high-speed rail project.

6) States that California has been awarded up to $1.2 billion from the federal Department of Energy through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to support the Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems (ARCHES) to build a clean hydrogen supply chain.

7) States that California was allocated over $1.8 billion from the federal Department of Commerce through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to deploy or upgrade high-speed internet networks to ensure that all Californians, including those in rural, agricultural, and underserved communities, have access to reliable, affordable, high-speed internet service necessary for economic prosperity in the digital age.

8) States that Seven ports in California have been awarded more than $1 billion from the federal Environmental Protection Agency through the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 for the deployment of zero-emission port infrastructure and climate and air quality planning projects, including the ports of Los Angeles, Oakland, Oxnard, Hueneme, Redwood City, San Diego, San Francisco, and Stockton.

Background

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021, also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, was enacted by the 117th Congress and signed into law on November 15, 2021 H.R. 3684). The act authorizes approximately $1.2 trillion in federal spending over five years to modernize America's infrastructure. The act

provides federal funding aimed at revitalizing the nation's infrastructure, amongst other provisions, including $110 billion for repairing and upgrading highways, bridges and major infrastructure projects, $39 billion for the modernization of public transit, with $66 billion invested in railway infrastructure programs within the Department of Transportation. After negotiated congressional amendments the bill included $550 billion in new investments including $65 billion to expand broadband access, particularly in underserved and rural areas, $55 billion to replace lead pipes and improve water systems nationwide and $73 billion to modernize the electric grid and support clean energy initiatives.

The CHIPS and Science Act was enacted by the 117th Congress and signed into law by on August 9, 2022 (H.R. 4346). The act provides approximately $280 billion in new funding for the CHIPS for America fund to support the domestic research and manufacturing of semiconductors in the United States for which it appropriates $52.7 billion. To strengthen the American supply chain the act includes $39 billion in subsidies for chip manufacturing in the U.S. and $13 billion for semiconductor research and workforce training. It also invests $174 billion in public sector research in science and technology including, among other provisions, advancing human spaceflight, quantum computing, biotechnology, and experimental physics.

The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 was enacted by the 117th Congress and signed into law on August 22, 2022 (H.R. 5376). The act reduces the federal government budget deficit, lowers prescription drug prices, and invests in domestic energy production while promoting clean energy. The act represents the largest federal investment in climate action and clean energy while also addressing healthcare affordability and tax reform. Health care reforms within the act include provisions allowing Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices, caps out-of-pocket insulin costs at $35 per month and extends enhanced Affordable Care Act premium subsidies through 2025. Tax reforms and revenue measures in the act impose a 15% minimum tax on corporations with profits exceeding $1 billion, introduces a 1% excise tax on corporate stock buybacks and allocates $80 billion to the IRS to enhance tax enforcement and compliance efforts. The act allocates $369 billion for clean energy initiatives through 2032, aiming to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40% below 2005 levels by 2030 and achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.

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

Unknown. This resolution is not keyed fiscal by Legislative Counsel.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

The Climate Reality Project, Bay Area Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, California State Coalition
The Climate Reality Project, Los Angeles Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, Orange County Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, Riverside Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, Sacramento Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, San Diego Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, San Fernando Valley Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, Silicon Valley Chapter
The Climate Reality Project, South Central Coast Chapter

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Supporters write that recent federal actions have frozen or clawed back allocated funding for climate and infrastructure programs. Supporters note that "In 2024, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency paused over $2 billion in IRA funding for clean energy rebates, and the Department of Energy delayed disbursement of funds for grid modernization in multiple states, including California. These unpredictable and politically motivated disruptions undermine our state's ability to deliver on long-term planning and public commitments. As a result, tangible harm is already being felt across California: Rural communities face delays in clean drinking water infrastructure upgrades; Food banks and community resilience programs struggle with reduced capacity; Environmental researchers and public health scientists are facing layoffs; Clean energy projects to improve air quality and reduce asthma in children are stalled and; Natural resource restoration efforts and low-income home energy upgrades have been halted." According to supporters, the CHIPS Act, IRA, and BIL have also catalyzed a manufacturing renaissance in California, helping the state pivot toward a clean, resilient industrial economy. Funding cuts would have serious ripple effects across key sectors." Supporters state that "SJR 6 is not symbolic—it is a strategic and timely declaration that California will not stand idle while lifesaving, job-creating, and future-defining federal investments are arbitrarily

clawed back. It ensures our state remains a leader in climate action, economic equity, and environmental resilience."

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. / 6/23/2025 4:20:59
6/24/25 16:53:03

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SR 21
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 21
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes the month of December as National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) December is National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month.

2) According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), an average of 300 people died in drunk driving crashes during the Christmas through New Year's holiday in the United States.

3) In 2022, 13,524 people died in alcohol-impaired driving traffic deaths according to the NHTSA.

4) The financial burden of alcohol misuse costs the United States an estimated $249 billion per year. NHTSA estimates that drunk driving crashes cost the United States $68.9 billion annually.

This resolution recognizes the month of December as National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Month.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/3/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/3/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
3/5/25 15:32:52

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SR 32
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 32
Author: Wahab (D)
Amended: 4/24/25
Vote: Majority

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 4/22/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Valladares

SUBJECT: Birthright Citizenship

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution sets forth the Senate's opposition to Executive Order No. 14160, which purports to end birthright citizenship in the United States, affirms the Senate's commitment to birthright citizenship, and honors Wong Kim Ark's fight for legal recognition of birthright citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

ANALYSIS:

Existing constitutional law:

1) Provides that the United States Congress has the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States. (U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 4.)

2) Provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. (U.S. Const., 14th amend., § 1.)

This resolution:

1) Declares that:

   a) On January 20, 2025, President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order No. 14160, entitled "Protecting the Meaning and Value of American Citizenship" (the "Executive Order"), which purports to end birthright citizenship for children born to (1) a mother who is unlawfully present or who is lawfully present in the United States but on a temporary basis, and (2) a father who is neither a citizen nor a lawful permanent resident.
   b) The Constitution has granted birthright citizenship for over 150 years, since birthright citizenship was enshrined in the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, ratified after the Civil War to repudiate the infamous decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857) 60 U.S. 393, which held that Black Americans of African descent could never be United States citizens.
   c) Birthright citizenship impacts every child born in California, regardless of race, color, sex, ability, class, parents' national origin, parents' immigration status, or any characteristic, because all persons born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens.
   d) Birthright citizenship is especially important in California, where one in four residents is an immigrant and where about one-half of all children in California have at least one immigrant parent.
   e) Denying birthright citizenship for children of certain immigrants could make hundreds of thousands of children ineligible for federal and state benefits and services such as CalWORKs and CalFresh, would damage their educational, economic, and health prospects, and would undermine community safety, political participation, and the economy.
   f) The unconstitutional Executive Order could block these children's access to United States passports, social security cards, free lunch programs, health care, and federal student aid, and denying these fundamental needs jeopardizes the well-being of these children and harms the broader community, leading to devastating social, political, and economic consequences.
   g) After the Executive Order was announced, California joined 18 other states, the City and County of San Francisco, and the District of Columbia in suing to block the Executive Order on the ground that it violates the Fourteenth Amendment to, and Article I of, the United States Constitution, the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act.

h) The Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of birthright citizenship was affirmed over 125 years ago in the landmark United States Supreme Court decision *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (1898) 169 U.S. 649, involving San Francisco-born Chinese American Wong Kim Ark.
i) Wong Kim Ark was born in 1873 at 751 Sacramento Street in Chinatown in the City and County of San Francisco to parents Wong Si Ping and Wee Lee, who owned a grocery store but were unable to naturalize as United States citizens due to prevailing anti-Chinese policies.
j) In 1895, Wong Kim Ark returned from visiting his family in China and, upon reentry, was denied admission on the false basis that he was not a citizen of the United States and was ordered to be deported under the Chinese Exclusion Acts.
k) The Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association in San Francisco hired an attorney to fight Wong Kim Ark's unlawful detention and the case was ultimately decided on March 28, 1898, which held that the Fourteen Amendment to the United States Constitution establishes birthright citizenship, with very few exceptions.
l) The Supreme Court's opinion in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (1898) 169 U.S. 649 extends birthright citizenship to all persons born in the United States, "including all children here born of resident aliens," and excludes only children born to foreign sovereigns or their ministers; children born on foreign public ships; children born to enemies born within and during a hostile occupation of our territory; and children of members of some sovereign Indian tribes.
m) Wong Kim Ark's legacy and historic fight for justice ensured the United States Constitution's guarantee of birthright citizenship and empowers children born in California to achieve their full potential as Americans to grow up to become whatever they dream, including President of the United States.
n) The unconstitutional Executive Order ignores over 100 years of precedent and condemns babies to a legal status of statelessness, which will limit their lifetime access to schools, jobs, and medical care and subject them to social isolation, travel restrictions, and exploitation.
o) The unconstitutional Executive Order is just one of President Trump's draconian attempts to scapegoat and instill fear among immigrants, divide immigrants based on arbitrary distinctions, and roll back constitutional rights.
p) All residents, regardless of their immigration status, deserve dignity, fair treatment and due process under the law, and the opportunity to thrive in the

United States, and this belief serves as the foundation for state and local sanctuary laws in California, including the California's Values Act of 2017.

2) Resolves the following by the Senate of the State of California:

   a) The Senate hereby opposes the unconstitutional Executive Order purporting to end birthright citizenship as enshrined in the United States Constitution.
   b) The Senate affirms its commitment to birthright citizenship and recognizes and honors Wong Kim Ark's fight to affirm the fundamental right of birthright citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
   c) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

> Immigrants are the backbone of our workforce and economy, as well as the cultural fabric of our communities. The Executive Order issued by President Trump seeks to overturn a fundamental right established more than 125 years ago that allows every child born in California—in the United States of America—access to the American Dream. My own parents came to this country seeking stability and a better life; what they wanted for me, as a beneficiary of birthright citizenship, was the chance to be anything I could imagine for myself.
>
> In 2023, the Public Policy Institute of California stated that 27% of California residents—10.6 million people—were foreign born. In 2024, the Children's Partnership stated that almost half of the children in California have at least one immigrant parent—that is 4 million children.
>
> These individuals are our neighbors, our doctors, our law enforcement officers, our friends.

We need to stand up and say that no Executive Order by the President of the United States can supersede the US Constitution and the rights of millions of individuals born here in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 4/25/25)

Chinese for Affirmative Action
SEIU California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 4/25/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to SEIU California:

While we do not know the immigration status of our members, ending birthright citizenship would have devastating consequences in California. Without citizenship, many of the children of our members who live in immigrant families and communities would find themselves without access to important social programs like CalFresh, CalWORKS, and student financial aid. They would grow up without passports, social security cards, access to jobs, and the right to vote. This would perpetuate racial inequality, make them vulnerable to exploitation, and lead to widespread economic, social, and political marginalization.

Efforts to end birthright citizenship is just one of the many ways the Administration has used xenophobic rhetoric and cruel executive actions to wreak havoc on immigrant communities and fuel racial profiling and anti-immigrant harm.

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
4/25/25 10:13:48

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SR 50
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 50
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/29/25
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: California Hydrogen Fuel Cell Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates October 8, 2025 as "California Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day," to recognize the importance of hydrogen and fuel cell technologies in building a cleaner, more resilient, and sustainable future for all Californians.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Hydrogen, with an atomic mass of 1.008, is the most abundant element in the universe.

2) Hydrogen fuel cells, which generate electricity using hydrogen and hydrogen-rich fuels, are clean, efficient, safe, and resilient technologies currently being utilized in stationary and backup power generation and zero-emission transportation, including light-duty vehicles, public transit buses, delivery fleets, industrial equipment, marine vessels, and emerging applications like aviation and rail.

3) California is a national and global leader in the advancement and deployment of hydrogen and fuel cell technologies. Hydrogen fuel cells have contributed to major scientific and engineering achievements, including in aerospace, in which California plays a historic and ongoing role.

4) Stationary fuel cells are being deployed across California to ensure energy resilience and reduce dependence on fossil fuels, providing businesses and communities with reliable power during planned and unplanned outages.

5) Fuel cell technologies can significantly reduce water consumption compared to traditional thermal power generation methods that rely on large volumes of

water for steam production and cooling, making fuel cells a more water-efficient solution for clean power generation.

6) The innovation and ingenuity of Californians are essential to realizing a clean hydrogen economy that benefits the environment, public health, and the state's workforce.

This resolution designates October 8, 2025 as "California Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day," to recognize the importance of hydrogen and fuel cell technologies in building a cleaner, more resilient, and sustainable future for all Californians.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/11/25 15:58:50

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 50
Author: Bonta (D)
Amended: 4/2/25 in Assembly
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/9/25
AYES: Ashby, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Niello, Strickland, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas, Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pharmacists: furnishing contraceptives

SOURCE: Essential Access Health, National Health Law Program, and Birth Control Pharmacist

DIGEST: This bill, an urgency measure, authorizes a pharmacist to furnish over-the-counter contraceptives (OTCs) without the standardized procedures or protocols required for prescription-only self-administered hormonal contraceptives.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes a pharmacist to furnish self-administered hormonal contraceptives, in accordance with standardized procedures or protocols developed and approved by the Board of Pharmacy (the Board) and Medical Board of California (MBC) and emergency contraception drug therapy, in accordance with standardized procedures or protocols developed by the pharmacist and an authorized prescriber who is acting within his or her scope of practice or standardized procedures or protocols developed and approved by both the Board and MBC. Requires a pharmacist to complete specified training and

comply with information disclosure requirements for emergency contraception furnishing. (Business & Professions Code (BPC) § 4052.3)

2) Requires a pharmacist to provide an oral consultation to a patient or the patient's agent in any care setting whenever the prescription drug has not previously been dispensed to a patient; however, a pharmacist is not required to provide oral consultation when a patient or the patient's agent refuses such consultation. (Title 16 California Code of Regulations § 1707.2)

This bill:

1) Authorizes a pharmacist to furnish OTCs without the standardized procedures or protocols required for prescription-only self-administered hormonal contraceptives.

2) Clarifies that current law requiring pharmacists to comply with standardized procedures or protocols for furnishing self-administered hormonal contraceptives applies only to contraceptives requiring a prescription.

3) States the necessity of this bill taking effect immediately in order to quickly ensure equitable access to over-the-counter birth control for all Californians.

Background

As noted in its recent sunset review oversight report to the Legislature, the Board is estimated to regulate over 50,700 pharmacists, 1,300 advanced practice pharmacists, 4,400 intern pharmacists, and 65,700 pharmacy technicians across a total of 32 licensing programs. In addition to regulating personal professionals, the Board oversees and licenses related business entities, including pharmacies, clinics, wholesalers, third-party logistic providers, and automated drug delivery systems.

SB 493 (Hernandez, Chapter 469, Statutes of 2013) authorized pharmacists to perform additional functions according to specified requirements, including furnishing self-administered hormonal contraceptives based on a state protocol developed jointly by the Board and MBC, pursuant to guidelines of the Centers for Disease Control, among other services.

In July 2023, the FDA announced its approval of the medication Opill, a norgestrel tablet to prevent pregnancy. Opill was the first daily oral contraceptive approved for use in the United States without a prescription, significantly increasing access

by allowing patients to purchase oral contraceptive medicine at local pharmacies over-the-counter. This approval significantly increased availability and access to birth control for women and other patients seeking to prevent pregnancy.

However, the over-the-counter status of Opill has complicated the implementation of related efforts to increase access to contraception, specifically those related to health coverage and reimbursement. In 2022, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 523 (Leyva, Chapter 630, Statutes of 2022), which requires a health care service plan or health insurer to provide point-of-sale coverage for over-the-counter FDA-approved contraceptive drugs, devices, and products at in-network pharmacies without cost sharing or medical management restrictions. Because Medi-Cal generally requires a prescription to reimburse for medications, even those approved as over-the-counter by the FDA, patients are not able to take advantage of this legislation when accessing Opill directly from a pharmacy.

Pharmacists are already authorized to furnish self-administered hormonal contraception, including those requiring a prescription. However, they must do so in accordance with standardized procedures and protocols that can present a barrier to access for patients. To resolve this issue, this bill would clarify that a pharmacist may furnish over-the-counter contraceptives without the standardized procedures or protocols required for prescription-only medications.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

Essential Access Health (co-source)
Birth Control Pharmacist (co-source)
National Health Law Program (co-source)
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists District IX
Asian Americans Advancing Justice, Southern California
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
California Pan - Ethnic Health Network
California Pharmacists Association
California State Board of Pharmacy
California Women's Law Center
Citizens for Choice
City of Alameda
Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
Courage California

Cpca Advocates, Subsidiary of the California Primary Care Association
Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund
Glide
Health Access California
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
Reproductive Freedom for All California
South Asian Network
The Children's Partnership
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
Women's Foundation California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Supporters note that OTC birth control is a valuable tool to expand access to contraception, particularly for communities facing systemic barriers to care. These include rural area residents who must travel long distances to the nearest health care provider, individuals with transportation challenges, those with limited or no paid time off for medical appointments, and underserved populations, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) individuals. AB 50 provides a clear and practical policy solution to fix a systemic barrier to birth control by ensuring equitable access to OTC methods in communities statewide.

The Board writes that it supports the change in pharmacy law to allow pharmacists to prescribe OTC hormonal contraception.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, 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, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Ellis, Flora, Hadwick, Patterson, Sanchez

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. /
6/24/25 16:32:47

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 78
Author: Chen (R)
Introduced: 12/18/24
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 3/10/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Attorney's fees: book accounts

SOURCE: California Association of Collectors

DIGEST: This bill increases the maximum attorney's fees available to a prevailing party in any action on a contract based on a book account that does not provide for attorney's fees and costs.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides that the term "book account" means a detailed statement which constitutes the principal record of one or more transactions between a debtor and a creditor arising out of a contract or some fiduciary relation, and shows the debits and credits in connection therewith, and against whom and in favor of whom entries are made, is entered in the regular course of business as conducted by such creditor or fiduciary, and is kept in a reasonably permanent form and manner and is (1) in a bound book, or (2) on a sheet or sheets fastened in a book or to backing but detachable therefrom, or (3) on a card or cards of a permanent character, or is kept in any other reasonably permanent form and manner. (Code Civil Procedure (Civ. Proc.) § 337a(a).)

2) Excludes "consumer debt" from the above definition. "Consumer debt" means any obligation or alleged obligation, incurred on or after July 1, 2024, of a consumer to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services that are the subject of the transaction are primarily for personal, family, or household purposes and where the obligation to pay appears on the face of a note or in a written contract. (Code Civ. Proc. § 337a.)

3) Provides that, except as otherwise provided by law or where waived by the parties to an agreement, in any action on a contract based on a book account, which does not provide for attorney's fees and costs, the party who is determined to be the party prevailing on the contract shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, as provided, in addition to other costs. The prevailing party on the contract shall be the party who recovered a greater relief in the action on the contract. The court may determine that there is no party prevailing on the contract for purposes hereof. Fees for a prevailing party bringing the action shall not exceed the lesser of: (1) $960 for book accounts based upon an obligation owing by a natural person for goods, moneys, or services which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes; and $1,200 for all other book accounts to which this applies; or (2) 25% of the principal obligation owing under the contract. If the defendant is found to have no obligation owing on a book account, the court shall award that prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees not to exceed $960 for book accounts based upon an obligation owing by a natural person for goods, moneys, or services which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, and $1,200 for all other book accounts to which this section applies. These attorney's fees shall be an element of the costs of the suit. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1717.5(a).)

4) Clarifies that the above does not apply to any action in which an insurance company is a party nor shall an insurance company, surety, or guarantor be liable thereunder for the attorney's fees and costs, except as provided. It also does not apply to any action in which a bank, a savings association, a federal association, a state or federal credit union, or a subsidiary, affiliate, or holding company of any of those entities, or an authorized industrial loan company, a licensed consumer finance lender, or a licensed commercial finance lender, is a party. (Civ. Code § 1717.5(c).)

This bill raises the above fees available in actions on a contract based on a book account from $960 and $1,200 to $1,200 and $1,600, respectively.

Background

The term "book account" means a detailed statement which constitutes the principal record of one or more transactions between a debtor and a creditor arising out of either a contract or a fiduciary relationship, and shows the debits and credits in connection therewith, and against whom and in favor of whom entries are made, is entered in the regular course of business as conducted by such creditor or fiduciary, and is kept in a reasonably permanent form and manner, as provided. It does not include "consumer debt," as defined.

Civil Code section 1717.5 establishes the right to recover attorney's fees in contract actions based on a book account where the underlying contract does not contain an attorney's fees provision. Currently the base amounts set by statute are $960 and $1,200, depending on the type of obligations upon which the book account is based.

This bill raises those amounts to $1,200 and $1,600, respectively.

This bill is sponsored by the California Association of Collectors. No timely support or opposition has been received by the Committee.

Comment

According to the author:

> The intent of AB 78 is to ensure that prevailing parties receive fair compensation for attorney fees in actions based on book accounts. Attorney fees can present a significant financial burden, particularly for individuals who are not in breach of contract yet must hire legal representation. This bill aims to ensure that the prevailing party in such actions is appropriately compensated for attorney fees. Our goal is to increase the compensation amount, as attorney fees have risen in recent years. The current compensation rate has not kept pace with economic changes, and it has been nine years since this system was last updated to reflect the current economy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

California Association of Collectors (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Association of Collectors, the sponsor of this bill, writes:

> California law established statutory attorneys' fees for the prevailing party in any action on a contract based on a book account. Because the amount is fixed in statute it can only be increased by a bill.
>
> The last bill to increase the set fees was SB 363 (Morrell) 2015. It has been ten years since the amount was adjusted.
>
> AB 78 simply increases the established fee based on the CPI over ten years.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 3/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Essayli, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Gallagher, Krell, Lowenthal, Muratsuchi, Ramos, Valencia, Ward

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/27/25 15:57:28

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 103
Author: Gabriel (D)
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Durazo, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Choi, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Budget Acts of 2022, 2023, and 2024

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill is a Budget Bill Junior associated with Budget Acts of 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25. This bill makes technical and substantive changes to the Budget Acts.

ANALYSIS: This bill amends the 2022, 2023, and 2024 Budget Act is to implement the 2025 budget agreement between the Legislature and Administration.

K-12 Education

1) Aligns the appropriation to actual costs for special education programs administered by local educational agencies in 2024-25.

2) Adjusts the required deposit into the Public School System Stabilization Account to $455 million.

Higher Education

3) Reappropriates $2 million to San Francisco Hillel for renovation of the San Francisco Hillel facilities.

4) Appropriates $6 million to the California State University for purposes of implementing legislation related to genealogy determination.

Resources

5) Repeals Control Section 15.00, related to Proposition 4 Early Action Wildfire Funding, and moves appropriations and accompanying provision language for early action wildfire prevention funding approved in AB 100 (Gabriel), Chapter 2, Statutes of 2025, into department-specific budget items.

Energy, Utilities, and Air Quality

6) Eliminates the requirement that the statewide Clean Cars 4 All program shall receive at minimum $125 million of the $255 million appropriated for a suite of equity transportation programs established under the Charge Ahead California Initiative.

Health

7) Authorizes expenditure authority from the Children's Health and Human Services Special Fund of $148.1 million in 2024-25 to support retroactive capitation payments in the Medi-Cal program.

General Government

8) Transfers $4 million appropriated in the 2021 Budget Act for the Accelerate Affordable Housing Production Project at the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) to state operations.

Labor and Workforce

9) Reappropriates up to $22.2 million for support of the Department of Industrial Relations Electronic Adjudication Management System modernization.

Public Safety

10) Reappropriates a total of $419 million General Fund to address a current year deficiency at the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) that is the result of structural and operation shortfalls. Specifically, it reappropriates $318.5 million in unspent General Fund resources from 2022-23 and $39.3 million from 2023-24 to 2024-25. These funds were unspent due to savings associated with vacant positions, population reductions, and prison deactivations. In addition, it reappropriates $61.2 million General Fund within CDCR's 2024-25 budget from programs that have surpluses to programs with projected shortfalls. This will shift funds from programs that are expected to underspend their budget, including parole operations and mental health services, to the programs facing deficits. The reappropriation will fully cover the projected deficit and provide CDCR with $24 million in additional funding as a buffer, should the deficits be higher than projected.

Other

11) Makes various changes to legislative priorities.

12) Makes a variety of other technical changes.

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

This bill makes conforming changes to the 2024, 2023, and 2022 Budget Acts to accompany the overall budget package associated with the three-party budget agreement. All costs and savings related to this bill are reflected in that overall package, which will use either AB 102 or SB 102 to amend the 2025 Budget Act to implement the three party agreement. With the revisions made in the 2025 budget package, the 2024-25 budget will have a total expenditure level of $337.9 billion, with $233.6 billion coming from General Fund.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Elisa Wynne / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:25

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 120
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 13-5, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Durazo, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NOES: Niello, Choi, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Early childhood education and childcare

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: Provides for statutory changes necessary to enact child care and preschool related provisions of the Budget Act of 2025.

ANALYSIS: As part of the 2025-26 budget package, this bill makes statutory changes to implement the budget act. This bill includes the following provisions:

1) Suspends the statutory cost-of-living adjustment for child care and preschool programs in 2025-26. Commencing July 1, 2026, requires all subsidized child care and preschool programs to receive a cost-of-living adjustment as a minimum annual rate increase.

2) For direct contract and voucher-based subsidized child care and preschool programs, establishes reimbursement based on enrollment and families' certified need, as specified.

3) Extends quarterly updates to the Legislature on the implementation of child care rate reform through July 1, 2027.

4) Requires, beginning October 1, 2025, and through July 1, 2027, inclusive, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to update the Legislature quarterly regarding progress on implementation of prospective payment and paying based on enrollment.

5) Establishes legislative intent to cease using a regional market rate for setting child care rates, and instead use an alternative methodology for setting future child care rates, pursuant to the following criteria:

    a) Rates are set pursuant to statute and informed by the alternative methodology.

    b) All subsidized child care and preschool programs are reimbursed under a single rate structure that takes into account a common set of rate elements.

    c) Rate levels are informed by the costs associated with meeting health and safety requirements and program requirements.

    d) Base rates are administered as a per-child amount, with programs able to receive enhancements.

    e) Rates vary by geography, type of care setting, regulatory requirements, time categories, and child age.

6) Clarifies that if a family receiving subsidized child care adds an additional child to the family size, the family's eligibility period shall be extended for at least 12 months.

7) Extends and expands once-per-month, per-child-served monthly rate increases for all subsidized providers, known as cost of care plus, and establishes a formula, based on the statutory cost-of-living adjustment, for increasing these monthly rates in 2025-26.

8) Establishes that if various provisions of this bill are in conflict with a collectively bargained agreement between the state and Child Care Providers United, the collectively bargained agreement shall be controlling, as specified.

9) Makes various technical and conforming changes.

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

Appropriates $88.55 million from the General Fund to CDSS for the purpose of reimbursement based on families' certified need.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Elizabeth Schmitt / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:27

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 124
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Durazo, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Choi, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Public resources trailer bill

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill is the omnibus Resources budget trailer bill. It contains provisions necessary to implement the 2025 Budget Act.

ANALYSIS: This bill:

1) Increases the statutory limits of the Office of Professional Foresters Registration fee schedule, as specified.

2) Requires the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to begin to employ sufficient permanent firefighting personnel to increase the base period hand crew staffing levels. This bill specifies that the department maintains the ability to hire seasonal, temporary firefighters as needed to allow for surge hiring capacity to address emergency fire conditions or other personnel shortages.

3) Authorizes the California Natural Resources Agency, a nonprofit organization, Department of General Services, and Exposition Park to plan, construct, and maintain a memorial to the victims and survivors of the Holocaust at Exposition Park.

4) Requires the Governor's annual Budget Bill to increase the cap on the amount of funding appropriated by the Legislature from the Highway Users Tax Account, Transportation Tax Fund to the State Parks and Recreation Fund from $3.4 million to $12 million.

5) Clarifies that moneys from the Bay Fill Cleanup and Abatement Fund may be expended on technology services, programs, and personnel that directly support the existing authorized uses of this fund.

6) Provides the Department of Water Resources (DWR) authority to contract for the delivery of multi-benefit habitat and environmental outcomes. This authority is intended to enable the department to continue contracting for full delivery of multi-benefit and habitat restoration projects through public-private partnerships based on available funding.

7) Reduces the frequency of Department of Water Resources' report of findings related to the state's groundwater basins (Bulletin 118) to the Governor and Legislature from every five years to 10 years. Bulletin 118 is the state's official publication on the occurrence and nature of groundwater in the state, such as the location, characteristics, use, management status, and conditions, as well as findings and recommendations that support the future management and protection of groundwater.

8) Authorizes tank owners to begin projects while waiting for a final funding agreement for purposes of administrative efficiencies. This will allow them to replace, remove, or upgrade underground storage tanks pursuant to the Replacing, Removing, or Upgrading Underground Storage Tanks (RUST) program.

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

The funding related to the changes in this bill is contained in the 2025 Budget Act.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Joanne Roy / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:29

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 127
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 13-4, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Durazo, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NOES: Niello, Choi, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Grove

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Climate change

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill is the omnibus Climate Change budget trailer bill. It contains provisions necessary to implement the Budget Act of 2025.

ANALYSIS: This bill:

1) Makes a technical adjustment to move the code section for a previously approved increase to the salary of the chairperson of the California Energy Commission (CEC) by five percent for the 2025-26, 2026-27, and 2027-28 years.

2) Extends existing authority and exemptions related to the Demand Side Grid Support Program at the CEC to all fund sources.

3) Amends the Clean Transportation Program at the CEC to eliminate the restriction that block grants or incentive programs be administered by public entities or not-for-profit technology entities and authorizes funding for block grants or incentive programs for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure.

4) Amends the existing certification process for power plants, energy storage systems, and related facilities at the CEC. Specifically, it requires a person submitting an application for certification to submit with the application a nonrefundable deposit of $750,000 and would require the applicant to pay all costs incurred by the Energy Commission in processing the application; require the Energy Commission to provide invoices for additional fees, at least annually, for the actual costs incurred by the Energy Commission in excess of the deposit; increase the annual fee to $70,000 for each year the facility retains its certification; and specify that the petition fee is nonrefundable

5) Extends the CEC's follow-on funding authority for the Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) program to January 1, 2028.

6) Specifies restrictions on operations be applied to facilities constructed and owned by the Department of Water Resources, not just facilities constructed by the department as currently stated in existing statute.

7) Specifies existing deficiency fines and fees are a part of the certification, audit, and compliance programs regulating motor vehicle manufacturers at the California Air Resources Board.

8) Expands the requirement to maintain funding to local air districts using specified funds made available to the state board for the suite of equity transportation programs at the California Air Resources Board from the 2021 and 2022 Budget Acts.

9) Appropriates $132,175,000 from the Air Pollution Control Fund to the California Air Resources Board for the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP), when funds are available from the Hino Consent Decree.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Eunice Roy / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:30

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 128
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 13-5, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Durazo, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NOES: Niello, Choi, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Transportation

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill is the omnibus Transportation budget trailer bill. It contains provisions necessary to implement the Budget Act of 2025,

ANALYSIS: This bill:

1) Authorizes Department of Finance to increase or decrease funding appropriated to the Caltrans' capital outlay support program using items from both the annual Budget Act and any other appropriation, so long as the combined adjustments are cost neutral and limited to the capital outlay support program.

2) Authorizes the Department of Transportation and local authorities to temporarily permit exclusive or preferential use of high occupancy vehicle (HOV), toll, or other lanes for vehicles displaying an identifier issued by the Olympic and Paralympic Games organizers, for the purposes of operating a Games Route Network during the Olympic and Paralympic Games period. This authority shall remain in effect until January 1, 2029.

3) Delays the commencement of the court's additional authority to restrict or suspend a driver's license for specified violations related to sideshows from July 1, 2025 to January 1, 2029.

4) Delays the provisions that allow a driver to tow a 10,000 to 15,000-pound gooseneck trailer with a noncommercial Class C license for recreational purposes, provided they had successfully completed a knowledge exam from January 1, 2027 to January 1, 2029.

5) Eliminates the existing January 1, 2027 deadline to include a solicitation for the applicant to enroll in the National Marrow Donor Program's registry as a bone marrow or blood stem cell donor in driver's license and identification card applications, and instead authorizes DMV and the National Marrow Donor Registry to establish an implementation timeline as part of the required memorandum of understanding.

6) Reestablishes the $1 Business Partner Automation (BPA) system improvement fee which ended on December 31, 2023, to January 1, 2029, when the DMV director determines that sufficient funds have been received.

7) Appropriates $1,000 from the State Highway Account to fund state transportation projects in support of the Games Route Network, as part of the 2028 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Eunice Roy / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:31

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 132
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 27

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 15-1, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Choi, Durazo, Grove, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NOES: Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Taxation

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill is the revenue trailer bill for the 2025-26 Budget. This bill contains various statutory changes necessary to implement the Budget Act of 2025.

ANALYSIS: This bill contains the following statutory changes necessary to implement the Budget Act of 2025:

1) Applies the Marketplace Facilitator Act to include any fee imposed pursuant to the Electronic Waste Recycling Act of 2003, replacing a more specific reference to the covered electronic waste recycling fee, to clarify that any fees collected under the Electronic Waste Recycling Act are to be collected by the marketplace facilitator.

2) Allows the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA), in consultation with the Department of Motor Vehicles, to exempt used car dealers from the requirement to file a separate return with CDTFA when used motor vehicles are sold at a retail establishment, in addition to paying

applicable sales and use taxes to the Department of Motor Vehicles. This exemption may be provided to used car dealers whom:

a) have accounts in good standing with CDTFA and;

b) have sold more than 1,000 or more vehicles at retail in the current or preceding calendar year.

c) Allows exemptions to be made for reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2021.

3) Recasts and restates that the authority for the County of Sonoma, or any city within that county, and the Sonoma County Transportation Authority are determined separately to allow each to increase a transactions and use tax at a rate of no more than 1 percent that, in combination with other transactions and use taxes, would exceed the cap of 2 percent, specified in current law for the combined rate of all taxes imposed in the county. Requires that any ordinance exercising this authority be approved by voters before January 1, 2026.

4) Extends the Pass-Through Entity Elective Tax (PTET) from 2026 to 2030, subject to a trigger if the federal cap on state and local tax (SALT) deductions is extended. Allows business entities to make a late prepayment, subject to a 12.5 percent reduction in the credit generated from the late payment, beginning in the 2026 tax year.

5) Directs any historic rehabilitation tax credits from the 2025 calendar year that are unallocated as of July 1, 2025, plus any amount of unallocated tax credits from the prior year, to be made available within 90 days to applicants with qualified rehabilitation expenditures of $1 million or more for affordable housing projects that were eligible for, but did not receive, a previous tax credit award due to oversubscription.

6) Increases the amount of tax credits available annually for allocation in in the California Film and Tax Credit Program 4.0 from $330 million to $750 million for each of the fiscal years 2025-26 through 2029-30.

a) Excludes from gross income retirement pay up to $20,000 from the federal government for services performed in the uniformed services.

b) Excludes from gross income annuity payments up to $20,000 received pursuant to a United States Department of Defense Survivor Benefit Plan.

c) Qualified taxpayers include individuals whose adjusted gross income does not exceed $125,000 and for a surviving spouse, or spouses filing a joint return whose adjusted gross income does not exceed $250,000 for the same taxable year.

d) Applies for taxable years beginning after January 1, 2025 and before January 1, 2030.

7) Provides an exclusion from gross income for any qualified taxpayer, for settlement amounts received, on or after January 1, 2021 and before January 1, 2030, in connection with a wildfire in the state.

8) Provides an exclusion from gross income for amounts received, on or after March 1, 2024, as compensation for specified costs and losses related to the Chiquita Canyon elevated temperature landfill event in Los Angeles (LA) County.

9) Includes Legislative intent language that costs for the Franchise Tax Board to administer the collection of court-ordered financial payments, as specified in statute, not exceed 20 percent of the amount collected for the 2025-26 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter. This replaces a prior administrative cap of 15 percent.

10) Requires financial institutions to use a single sales factor apportionment formula for purposes of apportioning multi-state income for taxable years beginning January 1, 2025 or later.

11) Renames Part 16 of the Revenue and Taxation Code as the Firearm, Firearm Precursor Part, and Ammunition Excise Tax and provides that it may be known and cited as the California Firearm Excise Tax Law.

a) Clarifies, for purposes of the California Firearm Excise Tax Law, a licensed firearms dealer, firearms manufacturer, or ammunition vendor in this state who transfers physical possession of any firearm, firearm precursor part, or ammunition to a purchaser in this state on behalf of an

out-of-state retailer engaged in business in this state is deemed the retailer, as specified.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: Yes Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

The provisions of this bill result in a net General Fund benefit of approximately $170 million for the 2025-26 fiscal year, including:

1) The provisions of this bill related to the Film and Television Tax Credit expansion are estimated to reduce revenues by $15 million in 2025-26, by $70 million in 2026-27, by $144 million in 2027-28, and by $209 million in 2028-29.

2) The provisions of this bill related to the military retirement pay exclusion are estimated to reduce revenues by $130 million in 2025-26 and by $80 million annually in future years.

3) The provisions of this bill related to the Single Sales Factor for Financial institutions are estimated to increase revenues by $330 million in 2025-26, by $280 million in 2026-27, by $260 million in 2027-28, and by $270 million in 2028-29.

4) The provisions of this bill related to the Wildfire Settlements exclusion are estimated to reduce revenues by $28 million in 2024-25, by $15 million in 2025-26, by $11 million in 2026-27, by $4.4 million in 2027-28, and by $1.3 million in 2028-29.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle

Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Elisa Wynne / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:32

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 141
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 27

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 17-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Niello, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Choi, Durazo, Grove, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Ochoa Bogh, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Cannabis Tax Fund: Department of Cannabis Control: Board of State and Community Corrections grants

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This cannabis trailer bill contains the necessary changes to implement provisions adopted as part of the Budget Act of 2025.

ANALYSIS: This bill makes various statutory changes to implement the general state government provisions of the Budget Act of 2025. Specifically, this bill makes the following statutory changes:

Updates Section 34019 of the Revenue and Taxation Code to allow a shift in funding for costs related to maintaining and operating the track and trace system and for conducting civil and criminal enforcement, to the Cannabis Tax Fund. Also contains a change to the eligibility of local governments related to Board of State and Community Corrections grants.

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

This bill requires funds in the Cannabis Tax Fund, a continuously appropriated fund, to be used for the track and trace system and for conducting civil and criminal enforcement.

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Jessica Uzarski / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:34

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 142
Author: Committee on Budget
Amended: 6/24/25 in Senate
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE BUDGET & FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE: 17-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Wiener, Niello, Allen, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Choi, Durazo, Grove, Laird, McNerney, Menjivar, Ochoa Bogh, Pérez, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill relates to the Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program.

ANALYSIS: This bill extends the surcharge for the Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program (DDTP) until December 31, 2034 and authorizes the California Public Utilities Commission to make recommendations to the Legislature regarding the appropriations for the DDTP.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-17, 3/20/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Hoover, Irwin, Krell, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Eunice Roh / B. & F.R. / (916) 651-4103
6/26/25 16:11:35

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 234
Author: Calderon (D), et al.
Introduced: 1/13/25
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE INSURANCE COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Rubio, Becker, Caballero, Padilla, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Jones

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 4/7/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California FAIR Plan Association governing committee

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires the Speaker of the Assembly and the Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Rules, or their designee, to serve as non-voting, ex officio members of the California Fair Access to Insurance Requirements Plan (FAIR Plan) Governing Committee.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the FAIR Plan to assure the stability of the property insurance market, to assure the availability of basic property insurance, as defined, to encourage maximum use of the normal insurance market in obtaining basic property insurance provided by admitted insurers and licensed surplus line brokers.

2) Provides, as part of the FAIR Plan, for the equitable distribution among admitted insurers of the responsibility for insuring qualified property for which basic property insurance cannot be obtained through the normal insurance market.

3) Stipulates that the FAIR Plan Governing Committee be composed of nine annually elected insurers, as well as the following non-voting members: one representative of insurance agents, one representative of insurance brokers, one representative of surplus lines brokers, and one representative of the public, each appointed by the Governor.

This bill:

1) Requires the Speaker of the Assembly and the Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Rules, or their designee, to serve as non-voting, ex officio members of the FAIR Plan Governing Committee.

2) Would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

Background

FAIR Plan Governing Committee. According to its Plan of Operation, the FAIR Plan is administered by a Governing Committee (Committee), subject to the supervision of the Insurance Commissioner, and operated by a President appointed by the Committee. The nine voting members of the Committee are usually comprised of two members of the American Property Casualty Insurance Association, one member from an insurer owned by shareholders, known as "stock insurers", one member from a non-stock insurer, and five members from at-large insurers. Furthermore, participating insurer members cannot be from the same group under the same management or ownership, as another. These voting members serve for one year or until their successors are elected by the admitted insurers who make up the FAIR Plan. Additionally, the four previously mentioned non-voting members serve on this Committee.

Status of the FAIR Plan's Exposure and Policy Count. According to the FAIR Plan, as of March 2025, the FAIR Plan's total exposure, or total potential for loss, is $599 billion, reflecting a 31% increase since September 2024 (prior fiscal year-end) and a 259% increase since September 2021 (Fiscal Year End 2021). Furthermore, as of March 2025, the FAIR Plan's total number of dwelling and commercial policies is 573,739 reflecting a 23% increase since September 2024 (prior fiscal year-end) and a 139% increase since September 2021 (Fiscal Year End 2021).

FAIR Plan Transparency Update. As of May 2025, the FAIR Plan has made additional operational information available on its website. This information includes its Plan of Operation, Governing Committee membership, certain

financial reports, dwelling and commercial coverage forms, and relevant statutory provisions.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 69 (Calderon, 2025). Would require a broker of record to determine if a FAIR Plan policy can be moved to the voluntary market before the policy is renewed. This bill is pending in Senate Insurance Committee.

AB 1844 (Calderon, 2024). Would have required the Speaker of the Assembly and the Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Rules to serve as non-voting, ex officio members of the Governing Committee, and would have authorized each to name a designee to serve in their place. This bill was not heard in Senate Insurance Committee.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara/California Department of Insurance
California Democratic Party Rural Caucus

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

Consumer Federation of California

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara:

"We must reverse the trend of a growing FAIR Plan if we are going to safeguard the state's admitted insurance market as a whole. While I have made many reforms to the FAIR Plan since I first took office, further improvements are needed to serve its legislatively intended purpose of creating stability in the property insurance market, while providing consumers with the best possible customer service. This is why a crucial element of my Sustainable Insurance Strategy focuses on modernizing a growing FAIR Plan, allowing rates to reflect catastrophe modeling and California reinsurance only if insurers commit to writing more policies in wildfire risk areas. With my support, the Legislature created FAIR Plan Clearinghouse programs for both residential policies (AB 2012, Wood, Chapter 258, Statutes of 2020) and commercial policies (SB 505, Rubio, Chapter 180,

Statutes of 2023), which is a list of policies that companies pull from the FAIR Plan to reduce the numbers. Access to FAIR Plan coverage is more critical than ever as we face the devastating wildfires sweeping across California.
The FAIR Plan was established by the Legislature and Governor – and it must work harder to be more accountable to the public. By establishing additional nonvoting members on the FAIR Plan's Governing Committee, AB 234 will help further needed transparency of this insurance safety net while supporting legislative policymakers' oversight efforts."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to the Consumer Federation of California:

"When compared to most of the other similarly situated 'insurer of last resort' programs in 30+ states, the California FAIR Plan is one of the most opaque, if not the most opaque, of all such programs. Indeed, as recently as March 2025 the current Insurance Commissioner stated that the FAIR Plan needed to be more transparent. But CDI has had this core information for almost three years and is supporting AB 234. Yet the only thing AB 234 does is to add two legislative leaders, or their designees, as non-voting ex officio members of the FAIR Plan Governing Committee. This is wholly insufficient and it is unclear if this would even make any difference at all to transparency.

For AB 234 to make any meaningful public contribution to FAIR Plan transparency it will need to go significantly beyond its current contents. For example, the FAIR Plan should be required to publicly disclose their financial statements, or at least key elements of such financial statements. It needs to significantly open up to be much more transparent, especially in the wake of the FAIR Plan's growing policy count, premium dollars collected and market share. And perhaps before going to all policyholders to cover half of the $1 billion shortfall the FAIR Plan announced earlier this year, FAIR Plan member companies should refund previous year's dividends. Those three items would be a useful beginning to a bill that actually accomplished something meaningful in terms of reforming the FAIR Plan and its operations. However, as currently drafted AB 234 falls far short of what is minimally necessary to truly protect consumers."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 4/7/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin,

Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Castillo, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Lee, Macedo, Ransom, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

Prepared by: Brandon Seto / INS. / (916) 651-4110
6/26/25 16:11:37

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 263
Author: Rogers (D), et al.
Amended: 6/11/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Seyarto, Allen, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NO VOTE RECORDED: Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-17, 5/5/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Scott River: Shasta River: watersheds

SOURCE: California Coastkeeper Alliance, Karuk Tribe, and Yurok Tribe

DIGEST: This bill extends the operation of specified emergency regulations adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) for the Scott River and Shasta River watersheds to January 1, 2031, or until the State Water Board adopts permanent rules establishing and implementing long-term instream flow requirements in the watersheds, whichever occurs first.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes the State Water Board to adopt emergency regulations during times of drought to enforce the reasonable use doctrine, promote water recycling or conservation, curtail diversions due to lack of water availability, or to require reporting on water use. Provides such emergency regulations are not subject to review by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and may only remain in effect for one year. (Water Code (Wat. C.) §1058.5)

2) Provides the adoption, amendment, or repeal of an emergency regulation is not subject to review by OAL. An emergency regulation must still be filed with OAL and takes effect once such filing occurs. Requires the adopting agency to notify interested parties of the pending adoption of an emergency regulation at least five days before submitting the emergency regulation to OAL. (Government Code (Gov. C.) §11346.1)

This bill extends the operation of specified emergency regulations adopted by the State Water Board for the Scott River and Shasta River watersheds to January 1, 2031, or until the State Water Board adopts permanent rules establishing and implementing long-term instream flow requirements in the watersheds, whichever occurs first.

Background

Scott and Shasta tributaries. The Scott and Shasta are important tributaries to the Klamath River, the second largest river in California. These rivers are crucial sources of water for Siskiyou County and have immense economic, ecological, and cultural importance. Siskiyou County is home to 43,500 people. The Scott and Shasta watersheds provide water for agriculture, domestic users, the environment, fire protection, municipalities, Tribal Nations, and recreation. Both rivers provide habitat for commercially significant and culturally important fall-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and Coho salmon (listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and California ESA).

These fisheries have declined substantially compared to historical levels. According to the State Water Board's *Finding of Emergency and Informative Digest: Proposed Scott River and Shasta River Watersheds Emergency Regulation* (Informative Digest), published January 2025, populations of Coho salmon in the Klamath River have declined between 52% and 95%; fall-run Chinook salmon populations have declined between 92% and 96%, spring-run Chinook salmon have declined 98%, and steelhead populations have declined 61%. In May 2021, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) recommended that the State Water Board develop permanent flow standards to protect public trust resources on the Scott River; likewise, in July 2023, CDFW expressed support for the establishment of minimum flows for both the Scott and Shasta Rivers to protect fish populations against further decline.

Importance of fisheries to tribes. Salmon are an essential resource and of cultural significance to Tribes in the Klamath River watershed, including the Yurok Tribe, Karuk Tribe, Quartz Valley Indian Reservation, and Hoopa Valley Tribe. Salmon

populations support tribal subsistence, as well as traditional and ceremonial practices. In recent years, Tribes have severely restricted or closed subsistence, commercial, and ceremonial fisheries. For example, since 2015 the Yurok Tribe has closed its commercial fishery all but one year to preserve fish runs. Additionally, Yurok Tribal leaders decided not to serve salmon at the Tribe's 2023 Klamath Salmon Festival, for the third time since 2016, because the Klamath River's forecasted fish run was one of the lowest on record. According to the *Informative Digest*, the elimination of traditional foods has had adverse impacts on the Karuk Tribe, including adverse health, social, economic, and spiritual effects.

Emergency drought regulations. On May 10, 2021, Governor Newsom declared a drought emergency for 41 counties, including Siskiyou County, where accelerated action was needed to protect public health, safety, as well as the environment. Due to the drought emergency, the State Water Board adopted emergency regulations setting minimum flows on the Scott and Shasta Rivers in August 2021 to protect fish and maintain water quality. These emergency regulations were readopted in 2022, 2024, and earlier this year (emergency regulations can remain in effect for up to one year). While Governor Newsom signed an executive order removing emergency drought provisions in many counties on September 5, 2024, the drought emergency in Siskiyou County remained in place due to continuing dry conditions in the region. On January 7, 2025, the State Water Board readopted an emergency regulation for the Scott and Shasta River Watersheds. The OAL approved the emergency regulation on January 27, 2025, and the emergency regulation will remain in effect through January 27, 2026, unless re-adopted or rescinded.

Economic impact of emergency regulations. According to the State Water Board's fiscal impact analysis of the *Informative Digest*, the estimated loss in revenue (income before expenses are subtracted) to municipal water suppliers from the proposed Emergency Regulation is estimated to be $765,752 ($1,629.26 per acre-feet of water multiplied by 470 acre-feet) for the expected-range scenario, $972,668 ($1,629.26 per acre-feet of water multiplied by 597 acre-feet) for the extreme-drought scenario, and $286,750 ($1,629.26 per acre-feet of water multiplied by 176 acre-feet) for the above-average scenario. Out of an estimated total crop revenue of $316,125,604, the loss in crop sales revenue in 2024 in the Scott and Shasta River watersheds is estimated to be $5,994,000 for the expected-range scenario, $10,014,122 for the extreme-drought scenario, and $152,393 for the above-average scenario.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

California Coastkeeper Alliance (co-source)
Karuk Tribe (co-source)
Yurok Tribe (co-source)
Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
Anchored in Trinidad
Audobon California
California Environmental Voters
California Native Plant Society, Alta Peak Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Tribal Chairpersons' Association
CalWild
Center for Biological Diversity
Clean Water Action
Cleanearth4kids.org
Communitiy Water Center
Defenders of Wildlife
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Defense Fund, Incorporated
Environmental Law Foundation
Environmental Protection Information Center
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of the Eel River
Friends of the Inyo
Friends of the River
Friends of the Shasta River
Golden Gate Salmon Association
Green Policy Initiative
Humboldt Waterkeeper
Humboldt; County of
Inland Empire Waterkeeper
Karmic Action Retribution Management Agency
Los Angeles Waterkeeper
Mendocino Producers Guild
Mid Klamath Watershed Council
Monterey Coastkeeper
Mount Shasta Bioregional Ecology Center
National Parks Conservation Association
Native Fish Society
Northern California Tribal Chairperson's Association

Orange County Coastkeeper
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Planning and Conservation League
Resource Renewal Institute
San Diego Coastkeeper
Santa Barbara Channelkeeper
Save California Salmon
Shasta Waterkeeper
Sierra Club California
Sierra Nevada Alliance
South Yuba River Citizens League
The Fire Restoration Group
The Nature Conservancy
Trout Unlimited
Union of Concerned Scientists
Water Climate Trust
Watershed Research & Training Center
Wholly H2O
Yuba River Waterkeeper

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

Association of California Water Agencies
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Municipal Utilities Association
Milk Producers Council
Regional Water Authority
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Scott Valley Agriculture Water Alliance
Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors
Siskiyou County Farm Bureau
Siskiyou Economic Development
Valley Ag Water Coalition
Western Growers Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:
According to the author, "I'm proud to stand with the fisherfolk and Tribes of the North Coast to protect California's fisheries. We have made tremendous strides to restore the salmon runs in the Klamath River but more must be done further upstream to ensure salmon populations can grow and flourish. This bill simply maintains the current status quo for the next 5 years, or until long term regulations

are finalized, whichever occurs sooner. This legislation will protect some of the most critical salmon habitat in California and will complement the restoration efforts associated with Klamath dam removal. This a matter of survival for salmon, tribal residents, and the historic fishing industry that is a centerpiece of the North Coast's unique culture."

According to the Karuk Tribe, one of the cosponsors of the bill, if the emergency drought declaration is lifted and the emergency drought regulations expire, there will be "no flow protections while the [State] Water Board promulgates permanent regulations which could take years. While flows naturally are at their lowest during a drought, we note that flows in both the Scott and Shasta consistently dip below levels deemed to be the minimum necessary for fish survival even in average water years due to excessive diversions and groundwater pumping. Given the real risk of extinction, we cannot afford to not have flow regulations in place. AB 263 addresses this by ensuring the emergency regulations will stay in place until long-term regulations can be established."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:
Writing in opposition, California Farm Bureau, California Municipal Utilities Association, and Western Growers Association, among others, express concern that AB 263 "would establish in statute the continuation of the January 7, 2025, emergency order for the Scott and Shasta rivers regardless of regional hydrologic conditions, would undermine efforts at the State Water Board to establish permanent regulations for these watersheds, would circumvent public process protections in the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), would set a troubling precedent, and would undermine the current local collaborative process." The coalition expresses concern that the bill "may unnecessarily prolong [the effort to move away from the emergency regulation process and toward adoption of permanent regulations for the Scott and Shasta watersheds] by removing the incentive for the State Water Board to act quickly.

The County of Siskiyou expressed similar concerns, arguing that AB 263 would "circumvent public participation, which would undermine current local collaborative processes that are intended to incorporate all stakeholders." The County points out that "Governor Newsom's proclamation currently remains in place for Siskiyou County and the Klamath Basin" even though "the entirety of Siskiyou County is categorized as 'None' on the drought intensity scale" according to the U.S. Drought Monitor. Also according to the letter, "the California Nevada River Forecast Center indicated that the Scott and Shasta watersheds have received well over 100% of average annual precipitation during the 2025 water year so far."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-17, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Aguiar-Curry, Bains, Ellis, Flora, Blanca Rubio, Solache

Prepared by: Genevieve Wong / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/24/25 16:32:48

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 293
Author: Bennett (D)
Introduced: 1/22/25
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Allen, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Grove

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-5, 4/1/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Groundwater sustainability agency: transparency

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs), by January 1, 2026, to publish information regarding their board membership and their board members' and executives' economic interests on its internet website or its local agency's internet website.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA),

   a) Requires high- or medium-priority basins that are subject to critical conditions of overdraft to be managed by a groundwater sustainability plan (GSP) or coordinated GSPs by January 31, 2020, and requires all other high- or medium-priority basins to be managed under a GSP or coordinated GSPs by January 31, 2022. (Water Code (WAT.) §10720.7(a)).

   b) Authorizes a local agency or combination of local agencies overlying a groundwater basin to become a GSA for that basin. (WAT. §10723)

2) Under the Political Reform Act (PRA),

   a) Creates the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), and makes it responsible for the impartial, effective administration and implementation of the PRA. (Government Code (GOV.) §§81000 et seq.).

   b) Prohibits a public official at any level of state or local government from making, participating in making, or in any way attempting to use the public official's official position to influence a governmental decision in which the official knows or has reason to know that the official has a financial interest. (GOV. §§87100 et seq.).

   c) Requires candidates for, and current holders of, specified elected or appointed state and local officers and designated employees of state and local agencies to file statements of economic interest (SEI) disclosing their financial interest, including investments, real property interests, and income. (GOV. §§81009 et seq.).

This bill:

1) Requires each GSA, by January 1, 2026, to do both of the following:

   a) Publish on its internet website or its local agency's internet website the membership of its board of directors.

   b) Publish on its internet website or its local agency's internet website an electronic link to the location on the FPPC's website where the SEIs, filed by members of the GSA's board of directors and executives, can be viewed.

Background

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Under SGMA, a local agency or combination of local agencies overlying a groundwater basin may become a GSA for that basin. A GSA has broad management authority of the groundwater basin or basins under their jurisdiction including defining the basin's or basins' sustainable yield, limiting groundwater extraction, and imposing fees. GSAs are required to consider the interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater, including, but not limited to, holders of overlying groundwater rights, municipal well operators, public water systems, local land use planning agencies, environmental users of groundwater, surface water uses, the federal government, California Native American tribes, and disadvantaged communities.

GSAs are authorized to perform any act necessary to carry out the purposes of SGMA, including adopting rules, regulations, and ordinances and developing the GSP.

There are currently more than 260 GSAs formed in 140 basins.

Department of Water Resources (DWR's) SGMA Portal. The SGMA Portal is a tool that gives the public the ability to view and download information related to GSAs, GSPs and alternatives to GSPs, adjudicated areas, and basin boundary modifications. A GSP may include the governance structure of its GSA, including the composition of its Executive Committee.

Political Reform Act of 1974 (PRA). The PRA was a voter-approved initiative that, among other provisions, imposed strict conflict of interest laws and required state and local agencies to establish conflict of interest codes, requiring agency officials who routinely participate in decisions to publicly disclose personal financial information, imposed restrictions on lobbyists, and established the FPPC to enforce the PRA (GOV §§81000 – 91014).

[See Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee analysis for more detailed background.]

Comments

Is information already available? AB 293 requires a GSA to post two things on its website: (1) board of directors membership and (2) a link to the location on the FPPC's website where the SEIs of GSA board members and executives can be found.

Board of directors membership. A random sample of GSPs posted to DWR's SGMA Portal shows that while a GSP will contain a point of contact person, it does not necessarily contain board of directors membership. It is unclear if board membership might be available elsewhere in either the SGMA Portal or DWR's website.

The author's office has provided examples of GSAs that do not post board membership information on their website: Aliso Water District GSA, County of Fresno GSA for the Westside Subbasin, and Grassland GSA. While it is possible to determine Aliso Water District GSA board membership by looking at past board meeting minutes, it would be unclear to the public whether the minutes of a past board meeting will reflect current membership. For County of Fresno, it does not appear that board membership is posted on its website, nor board meeting minutes.

However, SGMA Working Group meeting minutes are posted, with the most recent being from March 2018. The Grassland GSA also does not appear to publish board membership.

However, a random sample of GSA websites, whose information was found through the SGMA Portal, also shows that many GSAs do post board membership information on their website (i.e. Omochumne Hartnell Water District, Santa Clarita Valley GSA, Arvin GSA, Pioneer GSA, and Mid Kaweah GSA).

Thus, posting of board membership across GSAs is inconsistent.

Link to FPPC website. Opponents to the bill argue that with the enactment of SB 1156 (Hurtado, Chapter 458, Statutes of 2024), each board member's SEI is already available on the FPPC website and that AB 293 would single out GSAs by requiring GSAs to post links on its websites to its board members' SEIs. It is also argued that some GSAs have limited staffing and resources and this bill would only add to the extensive list of responsibilities, in addition to trying to achieving groundwater sustainability. However, supporters of this bill argue that providing the link will make it easier for the public to access that information.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

Community Alliance with Family Farmers
Community Water Center
Environmental Defense Fund
Sierra Club

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

Association of California Water Agencies
Valley Ag Water Coalition

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "AB 293 is a simple step to build public trust, strengthen accountability, and protect one of California's most vital resources for future generations. California's groundwater is a critical resource, supplying anywhere from 30% to 46% of the state's water needs in an average year. Millions of residents, businesses, and farms rely on sustainable groundwater management to ensure long-term water security. Given the growing pressures of climate change and competing demands for water, it is vital that groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) operate with the highest level of

transparency and accountability. This bill simply requires GSAs to publish the membership of their Board of Directors on their website as well as a link to the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) for access to their statements of economic interest, ensuring that the public can easily access information about the individuals responsible for managing our groundwater."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to the Association of California Water Agencies, "it is unclear why AB 293 is needed" as "existing law already compels special districts to maintain a website, post contact information, and to file statements of economic interest with the FPPC, which houses on its website an easy-to-use transparency portal." Further, "ACWA is not aware of any other special district or public entity subject to the Political Reform Act that has been specifically required to post their board membership online or a link to the FPPC website." ACWA further argues that "existing transparency laws, with which all special districts already comply, adequately provide for the goals of this bill without the need for new legislation."

Additionally, Valley Ag Water Coalition expresses concern that "AB 293 will expose the personal financial affairs of GSA governing board members to greater public scrutiny that will only serve as yet another disincentive to service on GSA governing boards."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-5, 4/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, DeMaio, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Macedo, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Calderon, Castillo, Chen, Davies, Essayli, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Pacheco, Soria, Ta, Wicks

Prepared by: Genevieve Wong / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/11/25 15:55:35

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 321
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 321
Author: Schultz (D), et al.
Amended: 5/29/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/10/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 52-6, 3/13/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Misdemeanors

SOURCE: San Francisco Public Defender's Office

DIGEST: This bill allows a court to reduce wobbler violations any time prior to trial, either on its own motion or the motion of a party.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Law:

1) Recognizes that certain crimes may be punished as either a felony or a misdemeanor. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 17, subd. (b).)

2) States when a crime is punishable, in the discretion of the court, either as a felony or a misdemeanor, it is a misdemeanor for all purposes under the following circumstances:

   a) After a judgment imposing a punishment other than imprisonment in the state prison or imprisonment in a county jail;

   b) When the court, upon committing the defendant to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), designates the offense to be a misdemeanor;

c) When the court grants probation to a defendant without imposition of sentence and at the time of granting probation, or on application of the defendant or probation officer thereafter, the court declares the offense to be a misdemeanor;

d) When the prosecuting attorney files in a court having jurisdiction over misdemeanor offenses a complaint specifying that the offense is a misdemeanor, unless the defendant at the time of his or her arraignment or plea objects to the offense being made a misdemeanor, in which event the complaint shall be amended to charge the felony and the case shall proceed on the felony complaint;

e) When, at or before the preliminary examination or prior to filing an order holding defendant to answer, the magistrate determines that the offense is a misdemeanor, in which event the case shall proceed as if the defendant had been arraigned on a misdemeanor complaint. (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (b).)

3) Provides that when a defendant is committed to the DJJ for a crime punishable, in the discretion of the court, either as a felony or a misdemeanor, the offense shall, upon the discharge of the defendant from DJJ, thereafter be deemed a misdemeanor for all purposes. (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (c).)

4) States that a reduction of a wobbler to a misdemeanor does not authorizes a judge to relieve a defendant of the duty to register as a sex offender if the defendant is charged with an offense for which registration as a sex offender is required, and for which the trier of fact has found the defendant guilty. (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (e).)

This bill:

1) Allows a court to reduce wobbler violations any time prior to trial, either on its own motion or the motion of a party.

2) Allows a subsequent motion to reduce a felony to a misdemeanor only upon a showing of changed circumstances.

3) Replaces references to the former DJJ, which is now closed, with references to now-existing secure youth treatment facilities.

Background

"Offenses punishable as felonies or misdemeanors are traditionally called ‘wobblers.’" (*People v. Stevens* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 982, 987, fn. 12.) For

those offenses, whether the crime is a felony depends upon the punishment imposed. (*Id.* at p. 987.) Unless and until a misdemeanor sentence is imposed, the conviction for a wobbler remains a felony for all purposes. (*People v. Bozigian* (1969), 270 Cal.App.2d 373, 379; see also *U.S. v. Robinson* (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 287, 283.) Only offenses that are statutorily authorized by the Legislature as wobblers may be reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor. (*People v. Mauch* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 669, 674.)

Reduction of a felony to a misdemeanor enables a defendant to avoid many, but not all, of the consequences of a felony conviction. For example, reduction of a wobbler to a misdemeanor means conviction will be treated as a misdemeanor for licensing and employment purposes or for immigration purposes, unless another statute specifies an exception. However, reduction of a felony to a misdemeanor does not relieve a defendant of the duty to register as a sex offender if the offense requires registration. (See Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (e).)

Penal Code section 17, subdivision (b) is the mechanism by which defendants can get a wobbler offenses reduced to a misdemeanor. Under the statute, there are only certain times in the proceedings when the can be reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor. The judge has the discretion to reduce a felony charge to a misdemeanor at the preliminary hearing. (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (b)(5).) Other opportunities for reduction to a misdemeanor are in the sentencing context, namely: when the sentence imposed does not include imprisonment in state prison or county jail under realignment (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (b)(1); or when the judge designates the offense to be a misdemeanor on commitment to the (former) Division of Juvenile Justice (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (b)(2)); and when the court grants felony probation without the imposition of sentence, but later declared the offense to be a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 17, subd. (b)(3)).

This bill expands the pre-sentencing opportunities for a judge to reduce a wobbler. Specifically, this bill allows a court to reduce a wobbler to a misdemeanor at any time before trial, rather than at the preliminary hearing, either on the court's own motion or upon a defendant's motion. This bill provides that if the pre-trial motion to reduce a wobbler is denied, a subsequent motion can only be made if there is a showing of a change in circumstances.

In the juvenile context, this bill deletes the reference to the now-closed DJJ, and instead states that the court can reduce a wobbler offense upon commitment to a secure youth treatment facility.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

San Francisco Public Defender (source)
ACLU California Action
Alliance San Diego
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Public Defenders Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Drug Policy Alliance
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Immigrant Legal Resource Center
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union
New Light Wellness
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Orange County Equality Coalition
Secure Justice
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Vera Institute of Justice

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

Riverside County District Attorney
California District Attorneys Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the San Francisco Public Defender, a co-sponsor of this bill:

The offense for which an accused individual faces trial, also known as the criminal charge against them, should match the accused individual's alleged conduct. This ensures that the individual faces consequences that are proportionate to their actions. However, as explained below, current law places strict restrictions on when judges can review wobbler charges to make sure they are fair. Currently, for offenses called "wobblers"—which can be classified as misdemeanors or felonies—judges must make a final decision on whether a case will move forward as a misdemeanor or felony at or before the preliminary hearing (the very beginning of a case) or after a guilty plea (at the end of a case). At the preliminary hearing stage of a case, very little information has been gathered about the accused person and their alleged conduct. The BID Act is a simple amendment that removes the time restriction that only permits judges to classify wobblers as felonies or misdemeanors at the very beginning of the case. Under the BID Act, judges can make this decision when they have gathered sufficient information about the accused person and their conduct, before trial commences.

The BID Act will improve court efficiency and save public funds because it will ensure that the amount of public resources spent is proportionate to the severity and complexity of each case. Lastly, allowing judges to review wobbler charges to determine whether they are supported by the evidence at a later stage in the criminal case can guard against overcharging and mischarging, and thereby reduce unjust outcomes.

ARGUMENTSIN OPPOSITION:

According to the California District Attorneys Association:

The May 29, 2025 amendments to AB 321 do not address CDAA's concerns, either. As amended, the bill would still allow a motion to be brought at any point in time during the lifespan of the felony criminal proceeding. However, once denied, a motion could then only be brought again upon a showing of changed circumstances. But that "changed circumstances" requirement does not address issues with forum shopping and permit judges to make important dispositional decisions without a full hearing on the facts and circumstances of the case. As such, CDAA remains opposed to these and other amendments in subdivision (b)(5).

Our adversarial justice system is designed to give the judge both sides – all the information – so they may make the most informed, just, and appropriate

decisions. For these reasons we oppose AB 321 unless amended to only address the chaptering issues related to the former DJJ and current SYTF.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 52-6, 3/13/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, DeMaio, Macedo, Sanchez, Tangipa, Wallis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Chen, Dixon, Ellis, Essayli, Gallagher, Garcia, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Lackey, Lee, Ortega, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Soria, Ta, Valencia, Ward

Prepared by: Sandy Uribe / PUB. S. /
6/11/25 15:55:36

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 344
Author: Valencia (D)
Amended: 5/12/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 14-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Alcoholic beverages: beer price posting and marketing regulations: definitions

SOURCE: California Family Beer Distributors

DIGEST: This bill modifies the definition of "successor beer manufacturer" in the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to specify that a successor beer manufacturer is a beer manufacturer or any person, whether licensed or unlicensed, who acquires the rights to manufacture, import, or distribute a product.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

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

2) Separates the alcoholic beverage industry into three component parts, or tiers, of the manufacturer (including breweries, wineries, and distilleries), wholesaler, and retailer (both on-sale and off-sale). This is referred to as the "tied-house" law or "three-tier" system. Generally, other than exceptions granted by the Legislature, the holder of one type of license is not permitted to do business as another type of licensee within the "three-tier" system.

3) Generally, makes it unlawful for any person other than a license to sell, manufacture, or import alcoholic beverages in this state.

4) Establishes the beer and wine wholesaler license, which allows the licensee to acquire beer and wine from suppliers and sell to other wholesalers and to retailers.

5) Provides that if a successor beer manufacturer, as defined, acquires the rights to manufacture, import, or distribute a brand or brands of beer, and then cancels the distribution rights of an existing beer wholesaler, as defined, the successor beer manufacturer shall notify the existing beer wholesaler of his or her intent to cancel those rights (Business and Professions Code § 25000.2)

6) Provides that the successor beer manufacturer's designee, as defined, and the existing beer wholesaler shall negotiate in good faith to determine the fair market value, as defined, of the distribution rights and require the designee to compensate the existing beer wholesaler in the agreed amount of the fair market value, or if they are unable to agree on the fair market value, shall engage in arbitration subject to specified conditions, as provided.

7) Defines "successor beer manufacturer" to mean a beer manufacturer that acquires the rights to manufacture, import, or distribute a product.

This bill modifies the definition of "successor beer manufacturer" in the ABC Act to specify that a successor beer manufacturer is a beer manufacturer or any person, whether licensed or unlicensed, who acquires the rights to manufacture, import, or distribute a product.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "AB 344 will protect previously negotiated and agreed upon distributor rights and fair market value, in the future event that a brewery is sold to an entity who does not value the

relationship between the wholesaler and their original brewery partner. Fair market value compensation has long been protected legally in the event of a brewery sale and protections like this are common across nearly every state. There is no reason why a company who plans to manufacture beer should be viewed differently simply because they had not done so prior to purchasing a brewery. AB 344 will provide financial stability and once again protect wholesalers' long-term investments with their brewery partners."

Harbor Distributing LLC v. Mainsheet Capital Inc. Under existing law, a "successor beer manufacturer" is required to pay fair market value when a beer brand changes ownership and then proceeds to move that brand from one wholesaler to another, as specified. Specifically, BPC § 25000.2 has long been interpreted by beer distributors to guarantee beer wholesalers in California retain "fair market value" in the event that a brewery they partnered with, sells the brewery to another entity. The law requires the successor beer manufacturer's designee to negotiate with the existing beer wholesaler to determine the fair market value of the affected distribution rights. In the event that the existing beer wholesaler and the successor beer manufacturer's designee agree to the fair market value of the affected distribution rights, the existing wholesaler would be compensated for the outgoing distribution rights in the agreed amount. If the parties are unable to agree, then arbitration shall be used to determine the fair market value of the distribution rights to be transferred.

Harbor Distributing LLC, operating as Golden Brands and owned by Reyes Holdings—the largest beer wholesaler in the United States—had been distributing products for Anderson Valley Brewing Company. In 2019, Mainsheet Capital Inc. acquired Anderson Valley Brewing and decided to transfer its distribution rights to other wholesalers within California. After the acquisition, the brewery notified the distributor of its intention to transfer its distribution rights to a different wholesaler, without compensation for the existing contract or its current market value.

In response, Harbor Distributing LLC, filed a lawsuit in the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County contending that under California Law, Anderson Valley was required to compensate them with the fair market value of the distribution rights they were relinquishing. The central legal issue revolved around whether Anderson Valley's new ownership qualified as a "successor beer manufacturer" under California law. Current law requires that when a beer brand changes ownership, the new owner must pay fair market value to the existing distributor if the brand is moved to a different wholesaler.

The new owners of the brewery presented their argument in court, contending that they were not legally obligated to provide fair market value, as they had never engaged in the production of beer and, as a result, should not be categorized as "successor beer manufacturer" under the applicable legal definition. This distinction, they argued, exempted them from the requirements typically imposed on such entities.

The case, which had been progressing through the legal system for approximately five years, concluded in favor of Anderson Valley Brewing. The presiding judge sided with the new owners, ruling that the statute in question did not apply to their situation. The judge's decision was based on the fact that the new owners did not possess a beer manufacturer's license at the time of that transition, which is a necessary criterion for the enforcement of the current legal provisions in this context.

According to the sponsor, AB 344 will reinforce California's long-standing protection of beer wholesalers, when manufacturers sell their business to another entity.

Tied-House Laws. State and federal law prohibit certain relations between those engaged in the production, distribution, and retail sale of alcoholic beverages. The term "tied-house" is derived from a common practice in England whereby a bar or public house was "tied" - by ownership, contractual obligations, or other influences - to a specific manufacturer. In some instances, that model encouraged intemperance in alcohol consumption, as retailers would offer to manufacturers generous favors, such as expensive business meals and gifts, which added costs that needed to be recouped through aggressive product promotion. Tied houses were also subject to undue influence from manufacturers, who sometimes used their influence to force tied houses to sell their products and exclude other manufacturers' products.

As a result, after the repeal of prohibition in 1933, California's current "three-tier" system was introduced. The original policy rationale for this body of law was to: a) promote the state's interest in an orderly market; b) prohibit the vertical integration and dominance by a single producer in the market place; c) prohibit commercial bribery and to protect the public from predatory marketing practices; and, d) discourage and/or prevent the intemperate use of alcoholic beverages.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 410 (Archuleta, 2019) would have removed the beer and wine importer license, the beer and wine importer's general license, and the beer and wine wholesaler license and replace them with a separate beer or wine license, as specified. (Never Heard in the Assembly Governmental Organization)

SB 574 (McLeod, Chapter 350, Statutes of 2007) established, within the ABC Act, a framework to determine fair market value to be paid to an existing beer wholesaler by a successor beer wholesaler when distribution rights to a brand are canceled and that right is granted to a successor beer wholesaler.

SB 1957 (Burton, Chapter 1083, Statutes of 2000) prohibits a beer manufacturer from terminating a wholesaler solely because of the beer wholesaler's failure to meet and unreasonable sales goal or quota, as specified, and requires a beer manufacturer to pay compensation to a beer wholesaler for unreasonable denial of sale or transfer of brands.

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

California Family Beer Distributors (Source)
California Beer and Beverage Distributors

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the California Family Beer Distributors, "AB 344 provides a necessary solution by reaffirming the historical interpretation of B&P Code Section 25000.2. It ensures that beer wholesalers are protected in the event of a brewery sale, preventing unfair business practices that could undermine competition and investment in the industry. Similar protections exist in most other states, and it crucial that California maintains its commitment to fostering a fair and balanced marketplace."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 5/19/25
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, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Dixon, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Papan

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
6/24/25 16:32:49

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 348
Author: Krell (D)
Amended: 4/24/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Menjivar, Valladares, Durazo, Grove, Limón, Padilla, Richardson, Rubio, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Full-service partnerships

SOURCE: Big City Mayors
California Behavioral Health Association
Steinberg Institute

DIGEST: This bill deems an individual with a serious mental illness presumptively eligible for a full-service partnership program, if certain criteria are met.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes a 1% tax on incomes over one-million dollars for the provision of behavioral health services to be deposited into the Behavioral Health Services Fund/Act (BHSF/BHSA, previously the Mental Health Services Fund/Act). [Revenue and Taxation Code (RTC) §17043 and §19602.5]

2) Distributes BHSF moneys generally as follows (inoperative on July 1, 2026):

   a) 20% to county mental health programs (CMHPs/counties) for prevention and early intervention programs;

b) 80% to CMHPs to fund the adult/older adult and the children's systems of care (with the majority to fund full-service partnerships [FSPs] and priority given to those who are not receiving mental health services);
c) 5% to CMHPs for Innovative programs;
d) Up to 5% to CMHPs for specified planning costs; and,
e) Up to 5% to various state departments and entities to implement all duties for programs funded by the BHSF. [Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) §5892, 9 California Code of Regulations (CCR) §3200.310 and §3620(c)]

3) Requires counties to allocate BHSF moneys generally as follows, with some flexibility to shift funds among categories with the Department of Health Care Services' (DHCS's) approval (operative on July 1, 2026, pursuant to Prop. 1 as approved by voters on March 5, 2024):

a) 30% for housing interventions with half spent on those experiencing chronic homelessness and an emphasis on those in encampments;
b) 35% for FSPs; and,
c) 35% for Behavioral Health Services and Supports with 51% spent on early intervention, and 51% of that focused on youth 25 and younger. [WIC §5892]

4) Requires each county, to the extent funds are provided from the BHSF for these purposes, to establish and administer a FSP program that includes various treatment, evidence-based, and ancillary services, including housing interventions, provided through a whole-person approach that is trauma informed, age appropriate, and in partnership with families or an individual's natural supports. Requires the programs to prioritize services for various populations, including eligible adults and older adults, who are any one of the following:

a) Chronically homeless or experiencing homelessness or are at risk of homelessness;
b) In, or are at risk of being in, the justice system;
c) Reentering the community from prison or jail;
d) At risk of conservatorship through the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act for meeting criteria as being a danger to self or others, or gravely disabled; or,
e) At risk of institutionalization. [WIC §5887 and §5892(c)]

This bill:

1) Deems an individual with a serious mental illness as presumptively eligible for an FSP if they are one or more of the following:

    a) Experiencing unsheltered homelessness as described in specified federal regulations;
    b) Transitioning to the community after six months or more in a secured treatment or residential setting, including, but not limited to, a mental health rehabilitation center, institution for mental disease, or secured skilled nursing facility;
    c) Involuntarily detained five or more times under the LPS Act over the last five years; or,
    d) Transitioning to the community after six months or more in a state prison or county jail.

2) Specifies that counties are not required to enroll an individual who meets the presumptive eligibility criteria if doing so would conflict with contractual Medi-Cal obligations or court orders, or exceed FSP capacity or funding.

3) Requires enrollment of a presumptively eligible individual to be contingent upon the individual meeting established criteria, and the individual receiving a recommendation by a licensed behavioral health clinician who, after assessing the individual's mental health needs, finds enrollment appropriate and documents it in the individual's clinical record.

4) Prohibits an individual with a serious mental illness from being deemed ineligible for enrollment in an FSP solely because their primary diagnosis is a substance use disorder.

Comments

Author's statement. According to the author, California is continuing to invest in mental health assistance for those most in need, yet we continue to run into red tape. This bill ensures Californians with the highest need can access the fast, effective, and consistent care that will change their lives. FSPs are shown to be extremely beneficial for those suffering from severe mental illness who have interacted with the criminal justice system and have a history of housing instability. Streamlining access to FSPs for this population will lead to better health outcomes.

FSPs. Regulations currently require CMHPs to direct the majority of Community Services and Supports funds (about 76% of county BHSF moneys) to FSP services, which generally are thought of as "whatever it takes" services, including:

- Mental health treatment, including alternative and culturally specific treatments, peer support, supportive services to assist the client and the client's family, wellness centers, needs assessments, and crisis intervention and stabilization services;
- Non-mental health services and supports like food, clothing, housing, and cost of health care treatment; and,
- Wrap-around services to children through the development of expanded family-based services programs.

Under the BHSA, 35% of county BHSF moneys must be dedicated to FSPs. The BHSA codified standardized, evidence-based practices for models of treatment for FSPs, including Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) and Forensic ACT (FACT), Individual Placement and Support model of Supported Employment, high fidelity wraparound, or other evidence-based services and treatment models, as specified by DHCS. FSP programs are also required to have an established standard of care with levels based on an individual's acuity and criteria for step-down into the least intensive level of care, as specified by DHCS, in consultation with the Behavioral Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (also known as the Commission for Behavioral Health [CBH]), counties, providers, and other stakeholders.

In an October 2024 listening session regarding FSPs, DHCS noted that the BHSA does not prohibit counties from establishing FSP programs for individuals with primary SUD diagnoses (i.e., without co-occurring significant mental health needs). However, counties are not required to develop new, dedicated Levels of Care specific to SUD or FSPs that are exclusively for SUD (apart from implementing new, field-based initiation of SUD care requirements). DHCS stated that the Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System is intended to cover a comprehensive continuum of care for SUD.

FSP report. SB 465 (Eggman, Chapter 544, Statutes of 2021) requires the CBH to report to the Legislature biennially on FSP enrollees, outcomes, and recommendations for strengthening FSPs to reduce incarceration, hospitalization, and homelessness. The first report was released in January 2023 and identified three primary concerns: data quality challenges for assessing effectiveness of FSPs; counties appearing not to meet minimum spending requirements; and, insufficient technical assistance and support to ensure effectiveness. CBH shared

the draft 2025 report at its February 2025 meeting and recommended, among other things, “clear and specific eligibility requirements for FSP clients to reduce wait times and ensure individuals are connected to the correct resources from day one.”

CBH states it has done extensive work to better understand what needs to be done to improve FSPs, including conducting targeted outreach, community forums, and a statewide survey reaching participants from 45 counties. In addition, CBH states on its website that it conducted deep dives with Nevada, San Francisco, and Orange counties to review current FSP contract practices; conducted case studies in two counties to better understand data collection, reporting practices, and the use of outcome and performance metrics; and, is conducting performance management technical assistance and capacity building pilots in Sacramento and Nevada counties. CBH says its next report will cover trends in the characteristics of FSP clients, including race and ethnic composition, diagnoses, service utilization, and housing status, as well as examine how clients have fared prior to and immediately after joining an FSP. The report will also examine FSPs as systems of care and illuminate how system-level issues, such as state-mandated data collection and reporting policies and practices, impact quality of care and client outcomes.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/12/25)

Big City Mayors (co-source)
California Behavioral Health Association (co-source)
Steinberg Institute (co-source)
California Association of Alcohol and Drug Program Executives
California District Attorneys Association
California Hospital Association
California Medical Association
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
California Peer Watch
California State Association of Psychiatrists
Californians for Safety and Justice
City of Sunnyvale
Commission for Behavioral Health
Corporation for Supportive Housing
Courage California
Drug Policy Alliance
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Greater Sacramento Urban League

Housing California
League of California Cities
Mental Health America of California
National Alliance on Mental Illness - California
National Alliance to End Homelessness
Occupational Therapy Association of California
Psychiatric Physicians Alliance of California
Sacramento County Probation Association
Smart Justice California
Vera Institute of Justice

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/12/25)

County Behavioral Health Directors Association
County of Los Angeles

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Behavioral Health Association and the Steinberg Institute, cosponsors of this bill, and other supporters comprised of stakeholders in the behavioral health space argue for too long individuals with serious mental illness have found themselves in a traumatizing cycle of homelessness, hospitalization, and incarceration, unable to access the intensive services they need to escape the cycle. Though FSP funding has existed for more than two decades, the individuals most at risk of continued system involvement are not being prioritized for enrollment due to a lack of clarity in eligibility criteria. The CBH 2024 FSP report found that the "complexity of the eligibility requirements and vast recent changes to the billing systems are creating significant administrative burdens that FSP providers feel are preventing them from maximizing the use of their staff time and funding to provide care to clients." Supporters further argue that inconsistent, county-by-county eligibility processes delay access, create confusion, and leave the most vulnerable people without care. This bill standardizes eligibility for these high-need populations and removes the delays and barriers that have historically blocked the sickest individuals from care. By establishing presumptive eligibility, the bill ensures that those with a serious mental illness and experiencing chronic homelessness, hospitalization, and justice system involvement can access FSP services right away, which are the most effective tool for stabilizing individuals with serious mental illness and complex social needs. Supporters state that decades of research confirm when implemented correctly, FSPs prevent costly and inhumane cycles of crisis, law enforcement intervention, and institutionalization. CBH's 2024 FSP report further found that "FSP clients experienced a 41% reduction in psychiatric hospitalizations, and

another study identified that FSP clients spent less days on the streets, with an average reduction of 129 days per year."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Los Angeles County (LAC) opposes based on the concern that by putting FSP eligibility criteria into statute, this bill would limit both LAC's and the state's flexibility, and thereby the ability to deliver services in the best interest of clients. FSP eligibility criteria are currently established at a county's discretion, which allows LAC to maximize the value and optimize allocation of counties' limited resources. LAC further argues that what's important and a priority in LAC may not be a priority or important in San Francisco, Modoc, or any of the other counties in the state. Although this bill proposes a process for counties to appeal for not having sufficient capacity or funding to provide FSP services to all clients who would meet the bill's proposed presumptive eligibility requirements, LAC argues this would create a new administrative burden that would detract from, not improve, client care. Complicating matters, this bill could place a substantial financial strain on LAC due to the anticipated rise in automatic referrals, thus imposing even more restrictions on how counties allocate BHSA FSP funds.

Oppose unless amended. The County Behavioral Health Directors Association (CBHDA) states that it remains concerned as this bill now opens up FSP eligibility to any individual with a serious mental illness that has been involuntarily detained five or more times for up to 72 hours ["5150" in the LPS Act] over the last five years. CBHDA says this additional criteria would significantly hinder county operations relating to implementing FSPs in accordance with current law and as proposed by this bill. CBHDA would like to see this provision removed from the bill.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/12/25
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, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, 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, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Garcia, Harabedian, Stefani

Prepared by: Reyes Diaz / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
6/13/25 15:46:15

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 361
Author: Schultz (D)
Amended: 5/28/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 5-2, 6/25/25
AYES: Pérez, Cabaldon, Cortese, Gonzalez, Laird
NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Choi

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-3, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Best value procurement: school districts

SOURCE: Los Angeles Unified School District

DIGEST: This bill permanently authorizes the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to use the best value procurement method and establishes a pilot program authorizing all other school districts and county offices of education (COEs) to use best value procurement for construction projects over $1 million until December 31, 2030.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires school districts to competitively bid public works contracts over $15,000 and award to the lowest responsible bidder. (Public Contract Code (PCC) § 20111)

2) Authorizes LAUSD, until January 1, 2026, to use the best value procurement method for projects over $1 million. (PCC § 20119.2)

3) Requires LAUSD to submit a third-party report on its use of best value procurement by January 1, 2025. (PCC § 20119.5)

4) Requires prequalification of certain contractors on large state bond-funded projects. (PCC § 20111.6)

5) Allows school districts to use design-build for certain projects. (Education Code §§ 17250.10–17250.50)

6) Allows the University of California to use best value procurement. (PCC § 10506.4)

This bill:

1) Establishes a pilot program allowing use of best value procurement for public works projects over $1 million through December 31, 2030.

2) Requires governing boards using this method to adopt and publish fair and impartial procedures and guidelines for evaluating bidder qualifications.

3) Requires contracts to be awarded to the bidder representing the best value, or else all bids must be rejected.

4) Allows awards to be made to the next highest scoring bidder if the selected bidder fails to execute the contract.

5) Limits retention proceeds withheld by school districts to 5% if a performance and payment bond is required.

6) Requires consistent retention terms between contractors and subcontractors, with limited exceptions if bonds are not furnished.

7) Requires all subcontractors bidding on such contracts to be protected under the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act.

8) Requires:

   a) Bid solicitations with public notice.

   b) A prequalification process with confidentiality protections under the Public Records Act.

   c) Use of a skilled and trained workforce, unless subject to certain project labor agreement (PLA) exceptions.

   d) Solicitation documents to include evaluation criteria, methodology, and weighting system.

e) Final evaluation processes that conceal bidder identities and costs until qualification scoring is complete.

9) Requires participating districts and COEs to submit a third-party report on their use of best value procurement to the Legislature by January 1, 2030.

10) Repeals the pilot authorization on January 1, 2031.

11) Removes the January 1, 2026, sunset and makes LAUSD's authorization to use best value procurement permanent.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill.* According to the author, "For the past 10 years, the LAUSD has been the only school district authorized to use the Best Value Procurement method for school construction projects. A recent independent report to the Legislature concluded that the LAUSD achieved expected benefits from the best value method including fewer change orders, less schedule delays, and fewer claims, resulting in contracting and administrative savings.

   "Following the passage of Proposition 2 and numerous other local school construction bonds approved by voters in November 2024, billions of dollars in state and local funds will be spent on school construction projects in the coming years in school districts across the state. It is imperative that districts have the necessary tools to reduce risk and maximize efficiencies that will result in the selection of a quality contractor with a good history at a competitive price.

   "AB 361 simply removes the sunset on the LAUSD's Best Value Procurement pilot program and expands the option statewide to any school district for public works projects over $1 million that meet specified labor requirements."

2) *Responding to rising capital needs.* This bill is being introduced at a moment of substantial school construction investment across California. With the passage of Proposition 2 and multiple local bond measures in 2024, billions of dollars in public funds are being invested into school facility modernization and expansion. The traditional "lowest responsible bidder" procurement model—while long-standing—does not necessarily ensure the selection of contractors with the strongest track records or capacity for timely, cost-effective project delivery. This bill seeks to equip school districts with an alternative procurement tool that allows for broader evaluation of contractor quality.

3) *Shifting the definition of "value."* Best value procurement challenges the historical assumption that lowest price equates to the best deal. It introduces a

formula that blends price with qualitative factors such as prior performance, safety history, financial condition, and labor compliance. LAUSD's own use of this method suggests that incorporating these non-cost criteria can reduce costly disruptions such as change orders and claims—costs that ultimately dilute the savings gained through low bids. The broader question this bill raises is whether California should shift toward a procurement model that explicitly values long-term performance over short-term price.

4) *LAUSD's experience as proof of concept.* Since being granted best value authority in 2015, LAUSD has used the method on over 100 projects and subjected its practices to third-party review. The most recent 2024 report found LAUSD compliant, consistent, and successful in reducing cost overruns and delays. These findings build confidence in expanding best value procurement, but also highlight the importance of having internal capacity to manage a more complex bid evaluation process. For smaller or less-resourced districts, technical assistance may be critical to realizing the same benefits.

5) *Guardrails and structured accountability.* This bill preserves labor protections by requiring contractors to use a skilled and trained workforce unless covered by a qualifying PLA, aligning the pilot with California's broader workforce development and public works goals. This ensures that efforts to reduce construction costs do not come at the expense of job quality, apprenticeship opportunities, or worker safety. Simultaneously, the bill builds in accountability: participating school districts and COEs must submit an independently prepared report by January 1, 2030, evaluating their experience with best value procurement. These reports will inform future legislative decisions about whether the pilot should be extended, revised, or made permanent—grounding statewide policy in empirical outcomes.

6) *Scaling complexity: a cautious expansion.* While the bill offers districts a promising alternative to the low-bid process, best value procurement is procedurally demanding. It requires upfront planning, clear bid criteria, and the administrative capacity to conduct fair and technically sound evaluations. Districts with limited procurement experience may find these expectations challenging and risk exposure to disputes or inconsistent application. By limiting the pilot to five years and requiring interim reporting, the bill creates space for thoughtful implementation, oversight, and potential course correction. If accompanied by technical assistance or model guidance, the pilot could support more equitable and effective use of this tool across diverse districts.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Los Angeles Unified School District (source)
Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials
San Diego Unified School District
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-3, 6/2/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, 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, Ta, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Sanchez, Tangipa

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/26/25 16:11:38

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 391
Author: Michelle Rodriguez (D)
Amended: 6/19/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 6/17/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/15/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Mobilehome parks: notices to homeowners and residents

SOURCE: Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association

DIGEST: This bill permits mobilehome park management to provide all notices required to be delivered prior to February 1 of every year to a mobilehome owner and resident by electronic mail with the resident or owner's affirmative, written consent, as specified, and requires mobilehome park management that receives affirmative, written consent for such electronic notices to deliver to the mobilehome owner or resident a specified notice within five days, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Creates the Mobilehome Residency Law (MRL) to regulate the relationship between mobilehome park management and park residents, and establishes various rights, responsibilities, and limits of both groups. (Civil (Civ.) Code §§ 798 *et seq.*).

2) Requires all notices required by the MRL, unless otherwise provided, to be either delivered personally to the homeowner, or deposited in the United States

mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the homeowner at their site within the Mobilehome Park. Specifies that all notices required under the MRL to be delivered prior to February 1st of each year may be combined in one notice that contains all the information required by those notices. (Civ. Code § 798.14.)

3) Requires mobilehome site rental agreements to be in writing and contain specified provisions, including a copy of the rules and regulations of the park, a copy of the text of the MRL, and specified notices regarding mobilehome residents' rights. Requires that mobilehome park management must provide a copy of the MRL, or a notice that a change has been made to the MRL and that residents may obtain a copy of the MRL from management at no charge, and a specified notice regarding mobilehome park residents' rights, to each mobilehome owner prior to February 1st of each year whenever there has been a significant change to the MRL. (Civ. Code § 798.15.)

4) Specifies that a mobilehome park may only evict a resident for: failing to comply with a local or state law or regulation on mobilehomes within a reasonable time after the homeowner receives notice of noncompliance; conduct of the resident that amounts to a substantial annoyance of other homeowners or residents; conviction for certain crimes; failure to comply with a reasonable rule of the park; condemnation of the park; a change of use of the park or any portion of it, as specified; or for nonpayment of rent, utilities, or other reasonable incidental services charged by the park. (Civ. Code § 798.56.)

5) Prohibits management from terminating or refusing to renew a tenancy, except for a reason specified in (4) and upon giving written notice to the homeowner to sell or remove the mobilehome from the park, at the homeowner's election, within a period of not less than 60 days. Requires a copy of this notice to be sent to the legal owner of the mobilehome, each junior lienholder, and the registered owner of the mobilehome, if other than the homeowner, by United States mail within 10 days after notice to the homeowner. (Civ. Code § 798.55(b)(1).)

6) Requires that, when mobilehome park management plans to amend the park's rules and regulations, it must meet and consult with mobilehome residents in the park, after providing written notice to all mobilehome residents 10 days or more before the meeting. Requires that mobilehome residents who did not consent to the proposed amendment of a rule or regulation receive written

notice not less than 6 months before the amendment may be implemented after the meeting. (Civ. Code § 798.25.)

7) Requires mobilehome park management to provide written notice to all mobilehome owners and prospective owners regarding the zoning and use permit under which the mobilehome park is permitted to operate, including any expiration or renewal dates, and requires mobilehome park management to provide written notice within 30 days of any change of the park's zoning or use permit. (Civ. Code § 798.27.)

8) Requires mobilehome park management to provide mobilehome owners in the park written notice at least 90 days before any increase in their rent. (Civ. Code § 798.30.)

9) Requires management to provide all affected homeowners and residents at least 72 hours' written advance notice of an interruption in utility service of more than two hours for the maintenance, repair, or replacement of facilities of utility systems over which the management has control within the park, provided that the interruption is not due to an emergency. Allows mobilehome park management to, upon voluntary, written consent of a homeowner or resident, provide this notice by electronic communication in a form of electronic communication to which the homeowner or resident consents. (Civ. Code § 798.42.)

10) Requires mobilehome park management of a park that provides utilities to residents through a master-meter system give notice to mobilehome owners and residents on or before February 1st of each year in their utility billing statements regarding assistance with utility costs that are available for low-income individuals through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) program, as specified. (Civ. Code § 798.43.1.)

11) Provides that, if mobilehome park management determines that a mobilehome within the park has been abandoned, as defined, that management must post a notice of abandonment on the mobilehome and mail such notice to the mobilehome owner and any other holder of interest in the mobilehome, and provides a process by which the mobilehome park may sell or dispose of the abandoned mobilehome after obtaining a judgment of abandonment in a limited civil action. (Civ. Code § 798.61.)

12) Prohibits mobilehome park management from requiring the removal of a mobilehome from the mobilehome park in the event of the sale of the mobilehome to a third party during the term of the mobilehome owner's rental agreement or for 60 days after management provided notice of eviction of the previous mobilehome owner, except in limited circumstances to upgrade the quality of the park. Requires mobilehome park management to provide particular notice of the condition of the mobilehome permitting it to require the mobilehome's removal under this exception. (Civ. Code § 798.73.)

This bill:

1) Specifies that, unless otherwise provided, all notices required by the MRL must be provided to the mobilehome owner and resident either by personal delivery or by United States mail, postage prepaid.

2) Specifies that all notices required to be delivered prior to February 1 of each year that may be combined in one notice may be delivered to the mobilehome owner and resident by electronic mail if the mobilehome owner or resident has provided affirmative, written consent that clearly and conspicuously states that the mobilehome owner or resident agrees to receive notices by electronic mail and includes the address to which the notices may be sent.

3) Specifies that a mobilehome owner or resident's affirmative, written consent to receive notices by electronic mail may be revoked by the mobilehome owner or resident at any time, without any fee, charge, or penalty, and without any impact on the terms of the homeowner or resident's tenancy. Specifies that a mobilehome owner or resident's revocation must be honored so long as it is in writing and indicates the intention of the mobilehome owner or resident to no longer receive notices by electronic mail.

4) Requires a mobilehome park management that obtains the affirmative, written consent of a mobilehome owner or resident to receive notices by electronic mail to deliver personally or by mail to each mobilehome owner or resident who gives consent a specified notice in English and any language of five languages specified by law if used as the primary language during the negotiation of the rental agreement, in a clear and conspicuous manner, in at least 10-point Arial equivalent type, within five days.

5) Specifies the contents of the notice required by (4), above. The required specified notice advises the mobilehome owner or resident of their election to

receive notices by electronic mail, that they will not receive the notices in person or by mail, and that they may revoke their consent without penalty at any time through a written notice stating as such.

6) Requires that the specified notice required by (4), above, must include the name and address of the entity to whom the mobilehome owner or resident may deliver their revocation of their consent to receive notices by electronic mail.

7) Defines, for the purposes of its previsions, "affirmative, written consent" as express written consent obtained separately from, and not contained in, any lease or rental agreement and that is not a condition of the tenancy.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/20/25)

Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association (Source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/20/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association, which is the sponsor of AB 391:

> As more Californians each year choose to go "paperless" and receive correspondence via electronic means instead of traditional materials delivered by mail, state law should adapt to the changing reality.
>
> Current law requires each tenant of a mobilehome park to receive a physical hard copy of the Mobilehome Residency Law (MRL) in their rental agreement and then annually thereafter. AB 391 would allow tenants to voluntarily choose to receive these documents electronically instead of a printed copy, allowing them, to do their part to help the environment. If a tenant elects to continue receiving paper delivery, park management will accommodate that request. This is a purely voluntary option to save paper and reduce costs. This practice is similar to how other businesses and utilities provide voluntary notices to their customers.

WMA alone prints and ships approximately 200,000 copies of the MRL to parks around the state for distribution to tenants who live in parks that are members of WMA. The MRL has grown substantially over the years and is now 28 pages. According to HCD, there are approximately 363,000 mobilehome spaces in California, which multiplied by 28 pages equals 10,164,000 pieces of paper annually. This comes with a significant cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars for printing and shipping the MRL. Nearly three million pieces of paper are shipped to WMA members every year. While we cannot say for certain how parks that are not members ofWMA receive their copies of the MRL, we know at least another seven million pages are printed annually to comply with the law. In addition, if you are a new renter, you will get two MRLs within the first 12 months, which is also duplicative.

California has long been a leader in conservation and waste reduction. AB 391 aligns with our state's sustainability goals, including AB 341 (2011), which established California's mandatory commercial recycling program and set a statewide goal of 75% waste diversion. By embracing modern, environmentally responsible practices without compromising access to information AB 391 will streamline processes, cut costs, and advance our collective efforts to reduce unnecessary paper waste.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/15/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Castillo, Jeff Gonzalez, Hart, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Stefani

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/27/25 11:12:57

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 414
Author: Pellerin (D)
Amended: 6/11/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 3/20/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Residential tenancies: return of security

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill (1) requires a landlord to return any remaining security deposit at the end of a residential tenancy to the tenant electronically if the tenant paid rent or the deposit electronically, and (2) amends the process by which the remaining deposit and required itemized statement of deductions is delivered to the tenant or tenants, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines "security" for the rental of residential property as a payment, fee, deposit, or charge, that is imposed at the beginning of the tenancy to be used for any purpose by the landlord, including but not limited to:

    a) Processing a new tenant;
    b) Ensuring advance payment of rent;
    c) Compensating for nonpayment of rent;
    d) Repairing damages to the property, other than ordinary wear and tear, caused by the tenant or the tenant's guest or licensee;

e) For tenancies beginning on or after January 1, 2003, cleaning the property upon termination of the tenancy in order to restore the same level of cleanliness the property had at the beginning of the tenancy; or
f) Cover any obligation, as established by the rental agreement, to restore, replace, or return personal property or accessories, other than due to ordinary wear and tear. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1950.5 (b).)

2) Excludes from the definition of "security" any permissible application screening fee that a landlord charges a prospective tenant. (Civ. Code § 1950.6.)

3) Limits the amount of a security deposit a landlord can collect for a residential tenancy to no more than one month's rent, regardless of whether the property is furnished or unfurnished. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (c)(1).)

4) Establishes that, notwithstanding (3), above, small landlords who meet the following requirements may demand or receive a security deposit of up to two months' rent:

a) The landlord is a natural person or a limited liability company in which all members are natural persons; and
b) The landlord owns no more than two residential rental properties that collectively include no more than four dwelling units offered for rent. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (c)(5)(A).)

5) Clarifies that notwithstanding 4), above, service members, as defined, may not be required to pay more than one month's rent in security deposit. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (c)(5)(B).)

6) Permits a landlord to claim only that portion of the security deposit reasonably necessary for the purposes set forth in 1) above. Prohibits a landlord from asserting a claim against the tenant or the security for damages or defective conditions that preexisted the tenancy, ordinary wear and tear, or the cumulative effects of wear and tear. Limits any claims against the tenant or the deposit for materials or supplies for work on the property to a reasonable amount necessary to restore the premises back to the condition it was in at the inception of the tenancy, exclusive of ordinary wear and tear. Prohibits a landlord from requiring a tenant to pay for, or from asserting against the tenant or the deposit, professional carpet cleaning or other professional cleaning services, unless they are reasonably necessary to return the premises to the

condition it was at the start of the tenancy, less ordinary wear and tear. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (e).)

7) Provides that, within a reasonable time after notification of either party's intention to terminate the tenancy, or before the end of the lease term, the landlord must notify the tenant in writing, as specified, of the tenant's option to request an initial inspection where the tenant may be present, so that the tenant can have the opportunity to remedy any deficiencies to avoid deductions from their deposit. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (f)(1).)

8) Establishes that a landlord must provide the tenant with an itemized statement, based on the inspection, specifying repairs or cleanings that are proposed to be the basis of any deductions from the security the landlord intends to make, as permitted. Provides that the landlord must give the statement to the tenant at the inspection, if the tenant is present, or must be left inside the unit, and that the statement must include the text of Civil Code Section 1950.5(b)(1)-(4). (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (f)(2).)

9) Provides that, during the period following the initial inspection until termination of the tenancy, the tenant has the opportunity to remedy identified deficiencies in order to avoid deductions from their security deposit, and permits a landlord to use the security deposit for itemized deductions that were not cured by the tenant, as provided. Also permits a landlord to use the security deposit for any permitted purposes, as provided, that occurs between completion of the initial inspection and termination of the tenancy, or that was not identified during the initial inspection due to the presence of a tenant's possessions on the premises. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (f)(3)-(5).)

10) Establishes that, no later than 21 calendar days after the tenant has vacated the premises, but not earlier than the time that either the landlord or the tenant provides a notice to terminate the tenancy or not earlier than 60 calendar days prior to the expiration of a fixed-term lease, the landlord must furnish the tenant, by personal delivery or by pre-paid first-class mail, a copy of an itemized statement, along with specified supporting documents, indicating the basis for, and the amount of, any security received and the disposition of the security, and must return any remaining portion of the security to the tenant. After either the tenant or the landlord provides the other notice of their intent to terminate the tenancy, they may mutually agree to have the remainder of the deposit returned electronically to a bank account or other financial institution

designated by the tenant, and the landlord and tenant may agree to have the itemized statement and all required documents emailed to the tenant instead. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (h)(1).)

a) If the tenant requests specified documentation within 14 calendar days of receiving the itemized statement, the landlord must provide the required documentation within 14 calendar days of the request from the tenant. (Civ. Code § 1950.5(h)(5).)

11) Requires the landlord to provide to the tenant, along with the itemized statement, copies of documents showing charges incurred and deducted by the landlord to repair or clean the premises, as follows:

a) If the landlord or landlord's employee did the work, the itemized statement must reasonably describe the work performed. The itemized statement must include the time spent and the reasonable hourly rate charged;
b) If the landlord or landlord's employee did not do the work, the landlord must provide the tenant a copy of the bill, invoice, or receipt supplied by the person or entity performing the work. The itemized statement must provide the tenant with the name, address, and telephone number of the person or entity, if the bill, invoice, or receipt does not include that information;
c) If a deduction is made for materials or supplies, the landlord shall provide a copy of the bill, invoice, or receipt. If a particular material or supply item is purchased by the landlord on an ongoing basis, the landlord may document the cost of the item by providing a copy of a bill, invoice, receipt, vendor price list, or other vendor document that reasonably documents the cost of the item used in the repair or cleaning of the unit; and
d) If the deduction is made for repairs or cleanings permitted by these provisions, the landlord must provide photographs taken as provided, along with a written explanation of the cost of the allowable repairs or cleanings. (Civ. Code § 1950.5 (h)(2).)

12) Permits, if a repair cannot reasonably be completed within 21 days after the tenant vacates the premises, or if the required documents from a person or entity providing services, materials, or supplies are not given to the landlord within the 21-day period, the landlord to deduct from the tenant's deposit the amount of a good faith estimate of the charges that will be incurred, and

provide that estimate to the tenant with the itemized statement, as specified. (Civ. Code § 1950.5(h)(3).)

13) Requires a landlord or their agent, within a reasonable time upon the termination of the landlord's interest in the premises, to either transfer the portion of the security remaining after any lawful deductions to the landlord's successor in interest and notify the tenant, or return the portion of the security deposit remaining after any lawful deductions to the tenant, with the required accounting of those deductions. (Civ. Code § 1950.5(i).)

14) Requires the landlord to deliver to the landlord's successor in interest, prior to any voluntary transfer of the landlord's interest a written statement indicating: the security remaining after any lawful deductions; an itemization of those lawful deductions; and whether the landlord intends to return the remaining deposit to the tenant or transfer it to the landlord's successor in interest. (Civ. Code § 1950.5(j).)

15) Specifies that a tenant may receive statutory damages of up to twice the amount of the security deposit, in addition to actual damages, if the landlord retains or claims the tenant's deposit or any portion thereof in bad faith violation of the above provisions, and specifies that a landlord is not entitled to any deductions from a tenant's deposit if they violate the above provisions in bad faith. Provides that, in any action under Section 1950.5, the landlord has the burden of proof as to the reasonableness or lawfulness of the amounts claimed. (Civ. Code §§ 1950.5(h)(7), (m).

16) Specifies that an action under Civil Code Section 1950.5 may be brought in small claims court, if the damages claimed are within the jurisdictional amount allowed for small claims court cases. (Civ. Code § 1950.5(n).)

This bill:

1) Requires a landlord that received a tenant's security deposit or rental payments electronically to return the remainder of the tenant's deposit electronically to a bank account or other financial institution designated by the tenant in writing, or by any electronic or virtual method available to the landlord if agreed to in writing by the tenant. Permits the landlord and tenant agree in writing that the remainder of the deposit be returned by another method, including but not limited to, by personal delivery or by a check mailed by first-class mail.

2) Specifies that, upon the termination of the landlord's interest in the rental property and the transfer of the security to the landlord's successor in interest, as permitted by law, the landlord's successor in interest must return the remainder of the security electronically only if the landlord's successor in interest received rental payments from the tenant electronically.

3) Requires, if the landlord or the landlord's successor in interest received the security deposit or any rental payments from the tenant electronically, the landlord must, within a reasonable time after notification of either party's intent to terminate the tenancy, or before the end of the lease term, notify the tenant in writing of their right to receive the security deposit back electronically. Specifies that this notice requirement does not apply if the landlord and tenant previously entered into an agreement designating another method of delivery.

4) Requires the landlord, except as provided in (5), below, to provide the itemized statement to the tenant by personal delivery or first-class mail with prepaid postage.

5) Permits the itemized statement to be provided to the tenant by email to an account provided by the tenant, or by mail to an address provided by the tenant, through a mutual agreement between the landlord and the tenant entered into at the beginning of the tenancy, or at any time during or after the tenancy.

6) Requires that, if there are multiple adult tenants residing in the unit, the landlord return the remainder of the security deposit by check payable to all adult tenants listed on the rental or lease agreement at the time that the tenancy is terminated, and requires the landlord to provide the itemized statement by personal delivery or by first-class mail with prepaid postage to any adult tenant the landlord chooses.

7) Permits the landlord and all adult tenants to enter into a mutual written agreement at the commencement of the tenancy or any time during or after the tenancy, to specify:

    a) How the remaining deposit will be returned, including whether it will be returned to a specific tenant or divided among multiple tenants, with allocation percentages, and that the deposit is either returned by check by

first-class mail with prepaid postage, or by an electronic deposit to a bank or other financial institute designated by each adult tenant; and

b) For each adult tenant, whether the landlord will provide the itemized statement by email or first-class mail, with prepaid postage, along with a forwarding address or email account for doing so.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/25)

California Apartment Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/25)

Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles
Apartment Association of Orange County
Apartment Association, California Southern Cities
Berkeley Property Owner's Association
California Rental Housing Association
East Bay Rental Housing Association
NorCal Rental Property Association
North Valley Property Owners Association
Santa Barbara Apartment Association, INC. Dba Santa Barbara Rental Property Association
Southern California Rental Housing Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the California Apartment Association, which supports AB 414:

> [AB 414] provides important clarity regarding the return of security deposits in residential tenancies.
>
> We appreciate [the author's] collaboration with CAA in developing provisions that offer flexibility for returning security deposits in a manner agreed upon by both the owner and tenant, including the option of electronically transferring any remaining funds. The bill's added guidance on how to handle the return of a security deposit when multiple tenants are vacating a unit is particularly beneficial. We believe AB 414 thoughtfully balances the interests of both property owners and tenants.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to the California Rental Housing Association, which opposes AB 414:

> AB 414's requirement that security deposit refunds be processed electronically if originally received by a landlord electronically, unless otherwise mutually agreed, is overly prescriptive. This provision disregards the operational realities and sophistication of many of today's landlords, particularly small, independent housing providers, who might accept a singular electronic payment but lack the consistent infrastructure or preference for processing electronic refunds, and thereby forcing them to utilize unfamiliar processes.
>
> By imposing a requirement on housing providers to refund security deposits electronically may expose unsuspecting property owners to a variety of online fraud schemes. Payment fraud is a growing fraud type that involves the use of false or stolen payment information to obtain money and can occur in a variety of ways, but it often includes fraudulent actors stealing bank account information to make unauthorized transactions. Inexperienced housing providers can easily fall prey to phishing attacks that may appear to be requested by renters, or money could mistakenly be directed to the wrong person or account other than the tenant who is eligible for a refund.
>
> Also, the ambiguity surrounding what constitutes "received electronically" further opens the door to disputes and legal interpretation. Further, AB 414's proposed new mandate requiring written notification to tenants about their right to an electronic refund, when applicable, adds another layer of administrative burden to an already regulated process.
>
> The most significant concern lies with the stipulation that if multiple adult tenants reside in a unit, the security deposit must be returned via a single check made payable to all adult tenants. While seemingly equitable on the surface, this can lead to considerable logistical complications for tenants. It creates the potential for delays in accessing funds due to the practical challenges of securing multiple endorsements, especially if tenants have moved to different locations or have strained relationships. Banks may require all named payees to be present, presenting a significant logistical nightmare for tenants to simply cash that check and obtain the portion of the security deposit they are entitled to. This provision also inadvertently inserts

landlords into potential disputes between co-tenants regarding the division of funds, which is outside the scope of their typical responsibilities.

Lastly, current law already allows for mutual agreement on electronic deposits and email statements, providing sufficient flexibility without the need for these new, potentially burdensome, and often impractical requirements. Clearly, AB 414 appears to attempt to create solutions for problems that simply do not exist while adding unnecessary red tape, exposing tenants and landlords to fraud, causing disputes among multiple tenants on a lease, and creating potential for increased litigation, thereby impacting both landlord operating costs and the efficiency of processing security deposit refunds.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Castillo, Davies, Essayli, Gallagher, Hadwick, Krell, Macedo, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/26/25 16:11:39

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 417
Author: Carrillo (D)
Amended: 3/27/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Durazo, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-0, 4/1/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Local finance: enhanced infrastructure financing districts: community revitalization and investment authorities

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes various changes to the laws for local agencies to create enhanced infrastructure financing districts (EIFDs) and community revitalization and investment authorities (CRIAs).

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes local governments to create EIFDs and to use tax increment financing (TIF) to finance public capital facilities or other specified projects.

2) Provides that EIFDs can finance public capital facilities or other specified projects of communitywide significance that provide significant benefits to the district or the surrounding community with an estimated useful life of 15 years or more. This includes the acquisition, construction, or repair of commercial structures by the small business occupant of such structures, if it is for the purposes of fostering economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and ensuring the long-term economic sustainability of small businesses.

3) Authorizes a local government to establish a CRIA to use property tax increment revenues to finance a community revitalization plan within an community revitalization area.

4) Provides that local officials may only establish a CRIA in an area where at least 80% of the area has an annual median household income that is less than 80% of the city, county, or statewide annual median income, and includes at least three of the specified blight conditions.

This bill:

1) Makes various changes to EIFD laws:

   a) Requires that annual reports be adopted within seven months of the end of the fiscal year, to enable these reports to include audited data.

   b) Clarifies the process for amending a plan to add a participating local agency, which will facilitate exploration of local partnerships.

   c) Removes an obsolete reference to COVID-19 pandemic, to ensure that EIFDs continue to have the option of assisting the economic recovery of small businesses.

2) Makes various changes to CRIA laws:

   a) Revises the formation timeline to match the process approved for EIFDs with SB 1140 (Caballero, Chapter 599, Statutes of 2024).

   b) Reduces complexity associated with formation by requiring 60% of included territory to be comprised of census tracts with lower (below 80% of AMI) median incomes, or meet existing thresholds for deteriorated infrastructure and structures, or elevated crime and unemployment.

Background

SB 1140 made a number of changes to this formation process, including reducing the number of public meetings necessary to consider EIFD formation from four to three. The public financing authority (PFA) must mail a written notice of the meeting to each landowner, resident, and taxing entity in the proposed EIFD at least 10 days before the meeting.

To reduce mailing costs, SB 780 (Cortese, Chapter 391, Statutes of 2021) allowed the PFA to consolidate some of the mailing and meeting notice requirements.

Under this alternative process, the official responsible mails each landowner, resident, and affected taxing entity a notice at least 40 days prior to the first meeting. SB 1140 revised the alternative mailing and noticing process to include all EIFD formation meetings, annual reports, and potential amendments, and required specified information to be included in the notice, as applicable. The PFA must also review the IFP annually and adopt an annual report by June 30 each year, make any amendments to the IFP that are necessary, and prepare an annual independent financial audit.

Over a dozen local agencies have created EIFDs. Only the City of Victorville has created a CRIA.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "In order to respond to the needs of our communities, local governments have come up with creative ways to fund critical infrastructure. Tax increment financing tools, such as EIFDs and CRIAs have become increasingly important in funding local infrastructure projects. AB 417 improves the functionality and usefulness of EIFDs and CRIAs by streamlining administrative processes, and providing other crucial clarification to existing law, while maintaining public participation and transparency. These reforms will significantly improve the ability for local governments to support economic development and build critical infrastructure in communities across the state."

2) *Tinkering around the edges.* Post redevelopment TIF tools have existed for over a decade. While there are over a dozen EIFDs, there is only one CRIA in Victorville in northern San Bernardino County. SB 961 (Allen, Chapter 559, Statutes of 2018) required the Office of Planning and Research, now known as the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI), to study the effectiveness of tax increment financing tools. LCI found that post-redevelopment TIF tools have limited revenue potential to make district formation worthwhile, especially when considering the lengthy formation process. AB 417 makes a series of changes intended to make these districts more functional, but does relatively little to address the limited revenue potential needed to make these districts worthwhile. Should the Legislature continue to tinker with these tools rather than address the core reasons for their sluggish development?

3) *Careful what you wish for.* AB 417 makes changes to both EIFD and CRIA law. While there are several differences between these two tools, one significant difference is that CRIAs can exercise eminent domain while EIFDs

cannot. Eminent domain allows public agencies to take private property for "public use," including economic development, and as long as the agency provides "just compensation" to the property owner for their property. Cities and counties have eminent domain authority that is broadly applicable to their activities, while many other local governments only have authorization to use eminent domain for specific purposes, if at all. CRIAs inherited eminent domain from RDAs. RDAs use of eminent domain remains hotly contested. For example, in 2005 the San Mateo County Grand Jury issued a report on how Redwood City used eminent domain to aid a private developer's construction of a retail and cinema complex. The Grand Jury found that the Redwood City Redevelopment Agency did not provide fair and equitable treatment and forced property owners to settle at the lowest possible price, imposing an emotional and financial hardship on affected property owners. AB 417 does not change CRIAs eminent domain authority, but it does make it easier to form CRIAs by relaxing the criteria required for their formation. An unintended consequence of making it easier to form CRIAs is expanding opportunities for local agencies to use eminent domain, relegating these important decisions regarding the taking of private property for public use to a distinct financing authority few members of the public likely recognize. However, if eminent domain were a primary motivation for forming CRIAs, it is likely that more than one local agency would have created a CRIA.

Related legislation

SB 5 (Cabaldon,2025), prohibits enhanced infrastructure financing districts (EIFDs) and community revitalization and investment authorities (CRIAs) from including taxes levied upon parcels enrolled in a Williamson Act or farmland security zone contract. The measure is currently pending in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

SB 516 (Ashby, 2025) enacts the California Capital City Downtown Revitalization Act, which creates a new type of enhanced infrastructure financing district specific to Downtown Sacramento. The measure is currently pending in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

SB 549 (Allen, 2025) removes the authority for a subset of enhanced infrastructure financing districts to receive sales and use tax revenue, and no longer requires them to be contiguous. The measure is currently pending in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

SB 782 (Pérez, 2025) creates disaster recovery financing districts, which have similar powers to a climate resilience district. The measure is currently pending in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/18/25)

California Association for Local Economic Development (Source)
American Planning Association, California Chapter
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
California Central Valley Flood Control Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Chapters of the American Public Works Association
City of Carson
City of Lakewood CA
City of Redwood City
City of Vista
City of West Sacramento
County of Humboldt
Institute of Real Estate Management
League of California Cities
Naiop of California
Rural County Representatives of California
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Southern California Leadership Council

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/18/25)

Fieldstead and Company, INC.
R Street Institute

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Ellis, 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, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Essayli, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wicks

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
6/19/25 16:25:43

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 437
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 437
Author: Lackey (R)
Amended: 3/19/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Laird, Limón

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-0, 3/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Interscholastic athletics: California Interscholastic Federation: sports-related injuries

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) to include in its septennial report to the Legislature and the Governor, information specific to sports-related head injuries and other sports-related injuries and medical problems.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides that the CIF is a voluntary organization comprising of school and school-related personnel responsible for administering interscholastic athletic activities in secondary schools. (Education Code (EC) § 33353 (a))

2) Specifies the CIF shall report to the appropriate policy committees of the Legislature and the Governor on its evaluation and accountability activities undertaken on or before January 1, 2023, and on or before January 1 every seven years thereafter. This report shall include, but not be limited to, the goals and objectives of the CIF and the status of all of the following:

a) The governing structure of the CIF and the effectiveness of that governance structure in providing leadership for interscholastic athletics in secondary schools.

b) Methods to facilitate communication with agencies, organizations, and public entities whose functions and interests interface with the CIF.

c) The quality of coaching and officiating, including, but not limited to, professional development for coaches and athletic administrators and parent education programs.

d) Gender equity in interscholastic athletics, including, but not limited to, the number of male and female pupils participating in interscholastic athletics in secondary schools and action taken by the CIF to ensure compliance with Title IX of the federal Education Amendments of 1972. (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1681 et seq.)

e) Health and safety of pupils, coaches, officials, spectators, including but not limited to, racial discrimination, harassment, or hazing.

f) The economic viability of interscholastic athletics in secondary schools, including, but not limited to, the promotion and marketing of interscholastic athletics.

g) New and continuing programs available to pupil athletes.

h) Awareness and understanding of emerging issues related to interscholastic athletics in secondary schools. (EC § 33353 (b))

3) States, subject to funds being appropriated for this purpose in the annual Budget Act, the CIF is encouraged to establish a statewide panel that includes, at a minimum, the following members: school administrators, school board members, coaches of secondary school athletics, teachers, parents, athletic directors, representatives of higher education, pupils participating in athletics at the secondary school level, and a representative of the State Department of Education (CDE). (EC § 35179.2)

4) Requires a school district, charter school, or private school that elects to offer an athletic program to comply with all of the following:

a) Immediately remove from the athletic activity for the remainder of the day an athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or head injury.

b) Prohibits the athlete from returning to the athletic activity until he or she is evaluated and provided written clearance by a licensed health care provider.

c) Requires the athlete, if the health care provider determines a concussion or head injury was sustained, to complete a graduated return-to-play protocol of at least seven days in duration.

d) Requires a concussion and head injury information sheet to be signed and returned by the athlete and the parent annually before the athlete initiates practice or competition. (EC § 49475(a)(1))

5) Requires a school district, charter school, or private school that elects to offer an athletics program to issue an annual concussion and head injury information sheet to be signed and returned by the athlete and the athlete's parent or guardian before the athlete initiates in practice or competition. (EC § 49475(a)(2))

6) Requires the CDE to make available specified guidelines and materials on sudden cardiac arrest; requires pupils and parents to sign informational materials before athletic participation; requires training of coaches; and sets requirements for action in the event a pupil experiences specified symptoms. (EC § 33479 et al.)

This bill requires the CIF to include in its septennial report to the Legislature on the health and safety of pupils, coaches, officials, and spectators, information about sports-related head injuries, including concussions, and other sports-related injuries and medical problems, requiring medical clearance to resume full athletic participation, including injuries sustained during competitions, practices, and training camps.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill.* According to the author, "AB 437 simply adds sports-related head injuries and other sports-related injuries and medical problems as reportable information for the California Interscholastic Federation."

2) *The California Interscholastic Federation.* The CIF, founded in 1914, is a voluntary organization comprised of 1,615 public, public charter, and private high schools that are organized into ten geographical sections for the purpose of governing education-based athletics in grades 9 through 12.

While each CIF section has autonomy from the state and has its own governance structure, section control and oversight are led by school representatives from that geographical region. These representatives include school board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, coaches, and athletic directors from each high school who come together to carry out the CIF's mission that is outlined in the CIF Constitution and Bylaws. The CIF Constitution and Bylaws are the product of the CIF elected representatives who serve on the CIF Federated Council and Executive Committee.

The elected membership of the Federated Council consists of school and district representatives elected from the 10 CIF Sections. State council membership voting is weighted to reflect the number of schools and students served by the respective CIF sections. Additionally, voting members of the Federate Council include representatives from the CDE; California School Boards Association; Association of California School Administrators; California Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; California Coaches Association; California Athletic Directors Association; California Association of Private School Organizations; California Association of Directors of Activities; and school superintendents from across the state.

The CIF receives no state or federal funding as part of its annual budget and is supported by state championship game receipts (36%), corporate support and sponsorships (35%), and limited membership dues (18%). Local school programs are supported by their school district general fund, game receipts, and fundraising by coaches, student-athletes and booster clubs.

Current law requires CIF to submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor every seven years on its evaluation and accountability activities. This report includes information on CIF's governance structure; the quality of coaching and officiating; gender equity in interscholastic sports; the health and safety of its students; and the health and safety of students, coaches, officials, spectators (including information about racial discrimination, harassment, or hazing).

This bill adds to this report a requirement to include information about sports-related head injuries, including concussions and other sports-related injuries and

medical problems that require medical clearance to resume full athletic participation.

3) *CIF Bylaws on Sports Injuries.* As part of its adopted bylaws and state law, CIF currently has established injury protocols for concussions, sudden cardiac arrest, and heat illness. In each of these protocols, if a student athlete exhibits the respective injury while participating in, or immediately following, an athletic activity or is known to have exhibited the respective injury while participating in, or immediately following an athletic activity, they must be removed immediately from participating in a practice or game for the remainder of the day. A student athlete who has been removed from play after displaying signs and symptoms associated with the respective injury may not return to play until they have been evaluated by a licensed health care provider and have received written clearance to return to play from that health care provider.

   Consistent with state law, CIF bylaws also require that information sheets on concussions, sudden cardiac arrest, and heat illness be issued annually to student athletes and their parents or guardians. These information sheets must be signed and returned by all student athletes and their parents or guardians before the student athlete's initial practice or competition.

Prior legislation

AB 245 (McKinnor, Chapter 422, Statutes of 2023), revises requirements established by the California High School Coaching Education and Training Program to include training in cardiopulmonary resuscitation and first aid. This includes additional training to recognize and respond to the signs and symptoms of concussions, heat illness, and cardiac arrest, certification in the use of an automated external defibrillator, and rehearsal of emergency action plan procedures to be followed during medical emergencies at athletic program activities or events.

AB 1327 (Weber, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2023) requires the CDE to develop a standardized incident form to track racial discrimination, harassment, or hazing that occurs at high school sporting games or sporting events, and requires each local educational agency that participates in the CIF to post on their internet website the standardized incident form developed by the CDE.

AB 1653 (Sanchez, Chapter 589, Statutes of 2023) requires a school district or charter school that elects to offer any interscholastic athletic program to include

as part of their emergency action plan, a procedure in the event a student athlete suffers from a heat stroke.

AB 1660 (Cooper, Chapter 122, Statutes of 2016) eliminated the sunset on provisions related to CIF, and instead requires legislative hearings every seven years to correspond with the release of specific reporting by the CIF.

AB 1639 (Maienschein, Chapter 792, Statutes of 2016) establishes a return-to-play protocol for students who pass out or faint during an athletic activity, requires coaches to complete a sudden cardiac arrest training course, and requires schools to retain a copy of a sudden cardiac arrest information sheet before a student participates in an athletic activity.

AB 25 (Hayashi, Chapter 456, Statutes of 2011) requires a school district that elects to offer athletic programs to immediately remove from a school-sponsored athletic activity for the remainder of the day an athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or head injury during that activity. The bill also prohibits the return of the athlete to that activity until they are evaluated by, and receives written clearance from, a licensed health care provider.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/18/25)

California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/18/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-0, 3/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bennett, Boerner, Chen, Essayli, Flora, Gabriel, Lee, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Rogers, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Ward, Zbur

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/27/25 11:08:42

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 438
Author: Hadwick (R)
Amended: 5/29/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Umberg, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta, Gonzalez

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/15/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Authorized emergency vehicles

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill authorizes the commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to issue an emergency vehicle permit to any vehicle owned by a county, city or city and county office of emergency services only while that vehicle is being used by an employee of that office in responding to any disaster.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines an authorized emergency vehicle (AEV) as:

   a) Any publicly owned and operated ambulance, lifeguard, or lifesaving equipment or any privately owned or operated ambulance licensed by the Commissioner of the CHP to operate in response to emergency calls;

b) Any publicly owned vehicle operated by federal, state, or local agency, department, or district employing peace officers; forestry or fire department of any public agency or fire department;

c) Any vehicle owned by the state, or any bridge and highway district, and equipped and used either for fighting fires, or towing or servicing other vehicles, caring for injured persons, or repairing damaged lighting or electrical equipment;

d) Any state-owned vehicle used in responding to emergency fire, rescue, or communications calls and operated either by the Office of Emergency Services or by any public agency or industrial fire department to which the Office of Emergency Services has assigned the vehicle;

e) Any vehicle owned or operated by any department or agency of the United States government when the vehicle is used in responding to emergency fire, ambulance, or lifesaving calls or is actively engaged in law enforcement work; and,

f) Any vehicle for which an authorized emergency vehicle permit has been issued by the Commissioner of the CHP. (Vehicle Code (VEH) § 165)

2) Authorizes the Commissioner of the CHP to issue authorized emergency vehicle permits to the following operators in each case that the vehicle is used in responding to emergency calls for fire or law enforcement, the immediate preservation of life or property, or the apprehension of law violators: police, public utilities, fire, air pollution control district, privately owned ambulances, and city or county hazardous materials hazardous response team.

This bill allows CHP to authorize an emergency vehicle permit for a vehicle owned by a county, city, or city and county office of emergency services only while that vehicle is being used by a public employee of the office in responding to a disaster.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "Local offices of emergency services serve as the first line of defense for communities during disasters. They respond immediately by setting up emergency operation centers, coordinating mutual aid, and directing evacuation operations. However, many rural areas face unique challenges due to limited resources, longer response times, and a

lack of infrastructure. Assembly Bill 438 recognizes the critical role of local OES in emergency response by allowing responders to drive code 3, just as state OES does. By allowing local OES to drive code 3, emergency responders will be able to arrive faster, coordinate more effectively, and save more lives. This bill will improve emergency response and increase public safety."

2) *Emergency vehicles*. AEV permits are only issued by CHP to qualifying vehicles which are used in the response to emergency calls for fire or law enforcement, the immediate preservation of life or property, or the apprehension of law violators. AEVs may use red, white, and amber flashing lights during an emergency. SB 909 (Dodd, Chapter 262, Statutes of 2020) authorized these vehicles to use a "Hi-Lo" audible system solely for the purpose of notifying the public of an immediate evacuation in case of an emergency. CHP regulation requires users to receive training against the indiscriminate use of the sound, so as to prevent the reduction of the effectiveness of the uniquely identifiable sound when used to warn the public.

   When using lights and sirens, an emergency vehicle is considered to be in "Code 3"—which refers to a mode of response for an emergency unit responding to a call. According to CHP, "[r]unning Code 3 (lights and sirens) through high-traffic areas such as highway, city streets and intersections significantly increase the risk to public. These situations must be evaluated carefully to weigh the urgency of the response against potential hazards." As such, CHP conducts a thorough risk assessment during the AEV permitting process to ensure that AEVs are deployed only when absolutely necessary. CHP states that "activation should be reserved for situations involving the 'immediate' preservation of life, property or the enforcement of law."

   Examples of AEVs authorized by CHP include fire department vehicles, city police vehicles, county sheriff vehicles, ambulances, air pollution enforcement district vehicles, armed forces vehicles, and hazardous materials response team vehicles.

3) *CHP's authorization process.* CHP has established criteria they use to evaluate Authorized Emergency Vehicle applications. An eligible applicant must submit their application and paperwork, then the evaluation and an inspection are completed by the local CHP Area Regulated Special Purpose Vehicle Officer. CHP conducts a risk assessment to evaluate whether the deployment of the vehicle as an AEV is absolutely necessary and whether they meet the legal criteria to qualify. CHP also weighs the urgency of the response provided by the

vehicle against potential hazards of the vehicle driving "Code 3." One factor CHP considers is whether the vehicle would be mitigating an incident as a first response, as opposed to simply reacting to an event after it has occurred. CHP provided an example of a vehicle that would not meet this purpose: "while blood or organ transport vehicles perform vital roles, they typically operate under controlled, pre-planned conditions. These operations, though critical, do not qualify under the 'immediate' preservation criteria and therefore do not necessitate Code 3."

As part of the assessment CHP also inspects the vehicle to determine whether it meets Safety and Roadworthiness standards. CHP states that, "mechanical reliability is vital when operating under high stress conditions." Lastly, CHP evaluates operator training and competence. The driver of the AEV must possess specialized training, experience, and a demonstrated ability to operate under pressure. Specifically, CHP requires a driver to complete an Emergency Vehicle Operator Course to ensure the driver can navigate complex traffic scenarios without endangering the public or themselves.

Under this bill, city and county office of emergency services vehicles would be eligible to apply for this permitting process through CHP. The vehicles would only be eligible for the authorization only while being used by a public employee who is employed by the office in responding to a disaster.

4) *County Office of Emergency Services.* County Offices of Emergency Services typically coordinate countywide preparedness and response services for large-scale incidents and disasters. These offices often are responsible for alerting, notifying, and coordinating with appropriate agencies within the county when disaster strikes. They also ensure resources are available and mobilized in times of disaster, develops plans and procedures in response to and recovery from disasters, and develop preparedness materials.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 349 (Archuleta of 2025) – Would have authorized parole officers to display a blue warning light from their emergency vehicles if the officer completes a certified training course on the operation of emergency vehicles. This bill died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 902 (Rodriguez, Chapter 124, Statutes of 2023) – Clarifies that both public and private local emergency service providers can request the owner or operator of a

toll facility to enter into an agreement to establish mutually agreed upon terms for use of the toll facility, including, but not limited to, being exempt from toll payment.

AB 2270 (Seyarto, Chapter 497, Statutes of 2022) – Requires the owner or operator of a toll facility, upon the request of a local emergency service provider, to enter into an agreement to establish mutually agreed upon terms for use of the toll facility.

AB 798 (Ramos, Chapter 282, Statutes of 2021) – Authorizes federally recognized tribes to operate, inspect, maintain, and drive emergency vehicles used in responding to emergency calls for fire or law enforcement.

SB 909 (Dodd, Chapter 262, Statutes of 2020) – Authorized an emergency vehicle to use a "Hi-Lo" audible system solely for the purpose of notifying the public of an immediate evacuation in case of an emergency.

AB 3472 (Committee on Local Government, Chapter 872, Statutes of 1997) – Authorized CHP to issue authorized emergency vehicle permits to the following operators: police, public utilities, fire, air pollution control district, privately owned ambulances, city or county hazardous materials hazardous response team, among many other provisions.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

Rural County Representatives of California
Sacramento; County of
Sutter County Fire Department
Sutter County Office of Emergency Services

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/15/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen,

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Castillo, Jeff Gonzalez, Hart, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Stefani

Prepared by: Isabelle LaSalle / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
6/24/25 16:32:49

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 439
Author: Rogers (D)
Introduced: 2/6/25
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 6-1, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 54-13, 4/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Coastal Act of 1976: local planning and reporting

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill eliminates the delay in "de minimis" local coastal program (LCP) or port master plan (PMP) amendments going into effect as part of a certified LCP or PMP, and revises and revamps California Coastal Commission administrative penalty reporting requirements, as provided.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act) (Public Resources Code (PRC) §§30000 *et seq*.) establishes the California Coastal Commission (commission) in the California Natural Resources Agency.

    a) Includes legislative findings and declarations that:

        i) The coastal zone is a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people, the permanent protection of the state's natural and scenic resources is a paramount concern to present and future residents, and existing uses and future developments that are carefully

planned and developed consistent with the Coastal Act are essential to the economic and social well-being of the people of the state (PRC §30001).

b) Provides for the planning and regulation of development within the coastal zone, as defined.

   i) A person planning to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone is required to obtain a coastal development permit (CDP) from the commission or local government enforcing a certified LCP (PRC §30600).

      (1) Development means, among other things, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure on land or in water. Structure means any building, road, pipe, flume, conduit, and electrical power transmission and distribution line, among other things (PRC §30106).

      (2) The coastal zone means the coastal land and waters of California, and includes the lands that extend inland generally 1,000 yards from the mean high tide line, as specified, with various exceptions, including the San Francisco Bay (PRC §30103).

c) Requires a local government in the coastal zone to prepare a LCP. Requires the precise content of the LCP to be determined by the local government in full consultation with the commission and with full public participation (PRC §30500). Provides for LCPs to be amended by the local government, but the amendment does not take effect until certified by the commission (PRC §30514).

d) Authorizes certain ports to develop PMPs to govern development within their jurisdictions that conforms with and carries out the policies of Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act (PRC §§30700 *et seq*.). Provides a public process for the approval and certification of the PMP by the commission.

e) Authorizes the executive director of the commission to designate certain amendments to a LCP or PMP to be "de minimis" if they have no impact, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources and meet certain additional criteria. Requires proposed "de minimis" amendments to be noticed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled commission meeting. Provides that the "de minimis" amendment becomes part of the certified LCP or PMP 10 days after the noticed meeting, if three or more

commissioners do not object with the "de minimis" determination, as provided (PRC §§30514, 30714).

f) Provides that any person who violates any provision of the Coastal Act may be found civilly liable for that violation. Penalties of up to $30,000 and not less than $500 may be assessed by a superior court for CDP violations, and other Coastal Act violations may be assessed a penalty by a superior court of up to $30,000. Intentional and knowing Coastal Act violations are subject to additional daily penalties of between $1,000 to $15,000 per day, as provided (PRC §30820).

g) Provides that a person who violates provisions in the Coastal Act may have an administrative penalty of up to 75% of the maximum penalty assessed by the commission by majority vote, as provided. Limits daily penalties to 5 years. Prohibits the same violation from being both assessed a penalty by the superior court and an administrative penalty by the commission. Provides an opportunity for a violation to be cured without an assessed administrative penalty (PRC §§30821, 30821.3).

h) Requires a single report, due in 2019, on public access violations addressed by the commission with administrative penalties. Requires annual reporting on non-public access violations addressed by the commission with administrative penalties that includes the following information for the previous year:

   i) The number and type of violations identified and reported.

   ii) The number of violations resolved, including those without administrative penalty.

   iii) The number of administrative penalties issued, the dollar amount of the penalties and a description of the violations.

   iv) The number of days from initial notice to resolution of the violation (PRC §§30821, 30821.3).

This bill:

1) Requires that a "de minimis" amendment to a LCP or PMP goes into effect and becomes part of the certified LCP or PMP immediately upon adjournment of the commission hearing where it is noticed on the agenda on the condition that three or more commissioners do not object to the executive director's "de minimis" determination, as provided.

2) Requires the commission to prepare a written report on all administrative penalties assessed by the commission for violations of the Coastal Act every five years:

   a) Requires the report to include information for the previous five years.

   b) Expands and revises the list of information required to be reported to include the number of violations referred to the Attorney General, the number of pending violations at the end of the reporting period, and summaries of select resolved violations that meet specified criteria, as provided.

3) Deletes obsolete reporting requirement for administrative penalties, as specified.

Background

Development activities in the coastal zone generally require a CDP issued by the commission or by a local government with a LCP certified by the commission. Coastal Act policies are the standards the commission uses to determine the permissibility of proposed developments subject to its jurisdiction. The governing authorities of certain ports are also authorized to develop PMPs to guide development within their jurisdictions through a process similar to that for LCPs. PMPs must also be certified by the commission to go into effect. Both LCPs and PMPs may be amended through a public process, and the commission has to approve any amendments in order for them to become part of the certified LCP or PMP. The commission's executive director is authorized to designate certain LCP or PMP amendments as "de minimis" when they do not impact coastal resources and meet certain additional criteria. "De minimis" amendments have a simplified approval process, and go into effect 10 days after the commission meeting where they were noticed if three commissioners do not object to their designation as "de minimis."

Certain penalties can be assessed for violations of the Coastal Act. Due to the extended process required to identify, investigate, and have a court assess penalties for confirmed violations, a backlog of thousands of unresolved violations developed over time. The commission was then authorized by statute to seek administrative penalties for public access to the coast violations (2014) and subsequently for all other violations (2021) of the Coastal Act. A one-time report was required in 2019 for public access violations resolved by the administrative penalty process, and annual reporting is required for all other violations resolved by the administrative penalty process.

[NOTE: For additional information regarding this bill, please see the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee's bill analysis.]

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/24/25)

California Coastal Commission
Sierra Club California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "Public access to the coast is a cornerstone of California's government and culture. In the 2nd Assembly District, we are proud of our storied history of protecting coastal access from intense residential and industrial development. We are one of the cradles of the Coastal Commission. We've repeatedly resisted efforts to charge for parking and otherwise limit access to the beach. This is especially critical for low-income residents who are trying to escape hot inland temperatures and may be travelling long distances to reach the coast. This bill helps the Coastal Commission operate more efficiently and maintain that critical public access."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 54-13, 4/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bains, Bennett, Chen, Flora, Hadwick, Krell, Quirk-Silva, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Soria, Wilson

Prepared by: Katharine Moore / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/24/25 16:32:50

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 483
Author: Irwin (D)
Amended: 6/12/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 47-12, 4/7/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Fixed term installment contracts: early termination fees

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits early termination fees unless the relevant fixed term installment contract includes a clear explanation of the total cost of the termination fee or the formula used to calculate the fee, except as provided. This bill caps the termination fee at 20% of the total cost of the installment contract.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides that every contract for health studio services shall contain a clause providing that if the person agreeing to receive health studio services moves further than 25 miles from the health studio and is unable to transfer the contract to a comparable facility, such person shall be relieved from the obligation of making payment for services other than those received prior to the move. A contract for health studio services may contain a clause providing that if such a condition occurs, such person may be charged a predetermined fee not exceeding $100, or, if more than half the life of the contract has expired, such

person may be charged a predetermined fee not exceeding $50. (Civil Code (Civ. Code) § 1812.89.)

This bill:

1) Prohibits a seller that uses a fixed term installment contract entered into or modified on or after July 1, 2026, from charging a fee to a consumer who terminates the fixed term installment contract unless, at the time of entering the initial contract, the contract includes either of the following, which shall be viewable by the consumer without reliance upon a tooltip, additional hyperlink, or any other feature that requires additional user interaction:

    a) A clear and conspicuous explanation of the total cost of the early termination fee in writing.
    b) The formula used to calculate the early termination fee, including a sample calculation demonstrating the highest possible early termination fee under the contract.

2) Provides that a provider of broadband internet access service on its own, or as part of a bundle, that complies with federal broadband consumer requirements, including the broadband consumer label, codified in 47 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R). § 8.2(a), shall be deemed compliant herewith.

3) Prohibits a fixed term installment contract entered into or modified on or after July 1, 2026, from charging an early termination fee or any similar fee in an amount greater than 20% of the total cost of the fixed term installment contract.

4) Clarifies that it shall not be interpreted to prohibit a contract from requiring the return of a good if the fixed term installment contract is terminated.

5) Exempts a fixed term installment contract that is regulated by state or federal law providing greater protections to consumers than those provided hereby, including, but not limited to, a prohibition on early termination fees or a lower limit on early termination fee amounts.

6) Defines the relevant terms, including:

    a) "Early termination fee" means an additional fee charged to a consumer as a result of a consumer's election to apply a term or clause included in the contract that authorizes a consumer to suspend making installment payments

and to end access to the good or receipt of the service before the end of the period of time during which installment payments are required to be made by the consumer.

b) "Fixed term installment contract" means any contract for the sale of goods or the furnishing of services by a seller to a consumer for a deferred payment price payable in installments required to be made by the consumer during a fixed period of time until the price is paid in full.
c) "Terminate" means that the consumer has elected to apply a term or clause included in the contract that authorizes a consumer to suspend making installment payments and to end access to the good or receipt of the service. "Terminate" does not include a general failure of a consumer to perform an obligation of the contract, including a failure to make installment payments.

Background

The issue of "junk" fees and other pricing schemes gained more prominence nationally when President Joe Biden took aim at them in his State of the Union address in February 2023. There are various types of pricing schemes generally deemed unfair or unlawful business practices and California has a host of laws aimed at rooting them out. This includes recent statutes that require pricing transparency and reasonable methods for cancellation of automatic renewal and continuous service offers.

One practice that has drawn attention across the country is the charging of "early termination fees" that penalize consumers for cancelling a contract for a good or service early. The concern is focused on the transparency of such fees and their onerous amounts, that may imprison consumers in contracts they no longer need or can no longer afford.

Following the lead of regulatory action taken at the federal level, this bill prohibits such fees unless the contract includes a clear and conspicuous explanation of the total cost of the fee or a formula used to calculate the fee, as specified. The total early termination fee is capped at 20% of the total contract. This bill is author-sponsored. It is supported by the Consumer Attorneys of California. It is opposed by a coalition of industry groups, including the California Grocers Association.

Comment

Consumer protection and early termination fees. Drip pricing and hidden junk fees have been an increased focus of government regulators both at the federal level and here in California.

SB 478 (Dodd, Chapter 400, Statutes 2023) made it an unlawful business practice under the Consumer Legal Remedies Act to advertise, display, or offer a price for a good or service that does not include all mandatory fees or charges, except as provided or exempted. Last year, AB 2863 (Schiavo, Chapter 515, Statutes 2024) bolstered the consumer protections within the law governing automatic renewal and continuous services offers, including prohibitions on failing to obtain affirmative consent to the offer separate from the other terms of the contract. It required more notice to consumers and a method for cancellation in the same medium as used in the initial transaction.

One particularly troubling practice is the charging of "early termination fees" on consumers who wish to cancel a subscription or other ongoing contract. Concerns have been raised about the transparency and excessive level of these fees, and the attendant impacts on consumers.

In 2021, President Biden issued an executive order "in order to promote the interests of American workers, businesses, and consumers." Relevant here, the EO included the following edict:

> To promote competition, lower prices, and a vibrant and innovative telecommunications ecosystem, the Chair of the Federal Communications Commission is encouraged to work with the rest of the Commission, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, to consider . . . prohibiting unjust or unreasonable early termination fees for end-user communications contracts, enabling consumers to more easily switch providers.[1]

The FCC responded and took action against these very practices in the video service sector:

[1] *Executive Order 14036 – Promoting Competition in the American Economy* (July 9, 2021) President Joseph Biden, **https://www.govinfo.gov/link/cpd/executiveorder/14036** (emphasis added). All internet citations are current as of June 10, 2025.

> The Federal Communications Commission today adopted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that proposes to eliminate video service junk fees from cable operators and direct broadcast satellite (DBS) providers and to study the impact of these practices on consumer choices.
>
> TV video service subscribers may terminate service for any number of reasons, including moving, financial hardship, or poor service. Early termination fees require subscribers to pay a fee for terminating a video service contract prior to its expiration date, making it costly for consumers to switch services. Because these fees may have the effect of limiting consumer choice, they may reduce competition for video service. Additionally, billing cycle fees require TV video service subscribers to pay for a complete billing cycle even if the subscriber terminates service prior to the end of that billing cycle. These fees penalize consumers for terminating service by requiring them to pay for services they choose not to receive.[2]

Just last year, the Federal Trade Commission filed suit against Adobe for its subscription practices, alleging that a reasonable consumer would be misled by Adobe's disclosure of its early termination fee, including what it is, when it applies, how much it is, and how that amount is calculated.[3] A federal court recently denied Adobe's motion to dismiss the case.[4]

Tackling issues with early termination fees. This bill seeks to address these issues by ensuring transparency and limiting the egregiousness of such fees.

First, this bill prohibits a seller that uses a fixed term installment contract entered into or modified on or after July 1, 2026, from charging a fee to a consumer who terminates the fixed term installment contract unless, at the time of entering the initial contract, the contract includes either of the following:

- A clear and conspicuous explanation of the total cost of the early termination fee in writing.

---

[2] *FCC Takes Action Against Video Service Junk Fees to Protect Consumers and Promote Competition* (December 13, 2023) FCC, **https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-proposes-rules-eliminate-video-service-junk-fees**.
[3] *United States v. Adobe, Inc.* (2025) 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87777, *28.
[4] *Ibid*.

- The formula used to calculate the early termination fee, including a sample calculation demonstrating the highest possible early termination fee under the contract.

To ensure such information is not hidden behind links or other mechanisms, this bill requires the explanation or formula to be viewable by the consumer without reliance upon a tooltip, additional hyperlink, or any other feature that requires additional user interaction.

Second, to prevent usurious rates, this bill caps early termination fees to 20% of the total cost of the fixed term installment contract.

According to the author:

> Despite the successes of recent consumer protection legislation regarding drip pricing and automated subscriptions, early termination fees for installment contracts continue to be rampant. These are fees that stand between a consumer and the decision to stop using a service early to save money. Businesses often argue that early termination fees act as a mechanism to balance out the discount a consumer may have received in exchange for their long-term commitment. While this justification has merit, it too frequently exists to the detriment of consumers, and it is not clear when fees go beyond recoupment of discounts. Without clear communication to a consumer on what potential early termination fees they may face, consumers may be enticed into a long-term commitment they cannot afford. Additionally, cancellation fees frequently make it more financially painful to cancel a service someone can no longer afford, preventing them from being able to respond to rising cost of living expenses.
>
> AB 483 will protect consumers from these predatory cancellation fees on their fixed term installment contracts by requiring distinct transparency for cancellation fee terms when the consumer first agrees to the contract. This bill also caps any potential cancellation fee to 20% of the total contract cost. This will ensure the fee is proportional to what the consumer expects to pay and avoids consumers feeling financially trapped.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Consumer Attorneys of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

Calbroadband
California Chamber of Commerce
California Grocers Association
California Retailers Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Consumer Attorneys of California state:

> Despite the successes of recent consumer protection legislation regarding drip pricing and automated subscriptions, early termination fees continue to be rampant. Businesses often argue that early termination fees act as a mechanism to balance out the discount a consumer may have received in exchange for their long-term commitment. However, it is not clear when fees go beyond recoupment of discounts. Businesses who do not clearly disclose and explain how cancellation fees are calculated prioritize their own profits over the understanding of the consumer and general notions of fairness.

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

> In a variety of industries, consumers benefit from arrangements that allow them to receive a significant portion of the benefit of that installment contract initially – or a discount for a longer commitment. For example: in the case of an ongoing service, a consumer may be given a lower total price due to the length of their commitment. However, AB 483 would disincentivize such a discount, because any such discount implicitly limits the recoverable amount if the consumer breached the agreement to 20% of the total value of the contract. That limitation creates an implicit risk for any contract where the cost of the good or service provided is greater than 20% of the contract value for the vendor.

Notably, we have been in ongoing discussions with the author related to these concerns, and appreciate the repeated discussions in good faith. We also appreciate the recent amendments adding a July 1, 2026 implementation date for covered contracts.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 47-12, 4/7/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Kalra, Krell, Lowenthal, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Stefani, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Alanis, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Castillo, Flora, Gabriel, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Jackson, Lee, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ramos, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Solache, Soria, Ta, Valencia, Wallis

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/26/25 16:11:40

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 503
Author: Mark González (D)
Amended: 2/25/25 in Assembly
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Laird
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: School facilities: Civic Center Act: direct costs

SOURCE: Coalition for Adequate School Housing

DIGEST: This bill, an urgency measure, permanently restores provisions of the Civic Center Act that expired on January 1, 2025, allowing school districts to continue recovering direct costs—including proportional maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment costs—for the use of nonclassroom school facilities and grounds by eligible organizations.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Civic Center Act, creating a "civic center" at each public school facility in California, enabling community access for supervised recreational activities, public meetings, and civic engagements. (Education Code (EC) §§ 38130, 38131)

2) Requires school districts to authorize use of their facilities by nonprofit organizations or groups promoting youth and school activities, such as the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, parent-teacher associations, and recreational youth sports leagues. (EC § 38134(a))

3) Permits districts to charge such organizations fees covering direct costs associated with their use of facilities, provided districts first adopt a clear policy specifying applicable activities and costs. (EC § 38134(b))

4) Defines "direct costs" to include proportional shares of expenses related to supplies, utilities, janitorial services, employee salaries, and costs directly tied to operating and maintaining facilities. This also temporarily includes proportional shares of maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment. However, this provision sunsets on January 1, 2025. (EC § 38134(g))

This bill:

1) Permanently reinstates the Civic Center Act provisions that sunset on January 1, 2025, allowing school districts to charge a proportional share of maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment costs when community organizations use nonclassroom facilities and grounds.

2) Clarifies the definition of "direct costs"—consistent with how the term was defined in statute prior to the sunset—by specifying that allowable charges include:

   a) The proportional share of costs for supplies, utilities, janitorial services, and district employee salaries directly tied to administering and maintaining the facility use.

   b) The proportional share of maintenance, repair, restoration, and refurbishment costs, but only for nonclassroom spaces and grounds such as athletic fields, tennis courts, track venues, and outdoor basketball courts.

3) Exempts classroom-based after-school programs, tutoring, childcare, and in-school instructional providers from any charges related to maintenance and repair.

4) Requires that funds collected under these provisions be placed in a dedicated special fund, used exclusively for purposes of the Civic Center Act.

5) Declares an urgency statute, making the bill effective immediately to minimize the gap in authority and maintain safe, accessible public facilities.

Comments

1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, "School districts struggle with adequate resources to maintain and preserve their facilities. The Civic Center Act, up until January 1, 2025, allowed school districts to charge for both the operating and maintenance costs relating to the use of school facilities by outside entities. Without the authorization to charge outside organizations for a prorated share of maintenance costs, school districts are being forced to take on the entire burden for all wear and tear to their facilities. School districts want to continue to be able to offer their facilities for community use, but they must be able to recoup some of the costs to ensure the facilities are safe and accessible to all for years to come."

2) *Rationale and historical context.* The Civic Center Act was established to guarantee community access to publicly funded school facilities for civic, recreational, and youth-oriented activities. In response to mounting facility maintenance pressures during budget downturns, the Legislature temporarily authorized districts to recover a proportional share of maintenance and repair costs tied to community use. That authority remained in effect through December 31, 2024. This bill does not introduce a new policy but rather makes that previously sunsetted authority permanent, recognizing that ongoing cost recovery has become a necessary component of district budgeting. This bill maintains the original spirit of the Civic Center Act while aligning it with the long-term fiscal realities districts now face.

3) *Facility maintenance and community access.* Public school facilities often function as vital community gathering spaces, hosting youth leagues, local events, and civic programming. These uses, while valuable, also contribute to wear and tear—especially on fields and outdoor infrastructure. Without the ability to recover costs proportionately, districts must either reduce public access or divert limited instructional resources to cover upkeep. By reinstating cost-recovery authority that was in place for over a decade, this bill helps districts continue to make facilities available while keeping them safe and functional for students and community users alike.

4) *Financial stewardship and transparency.* The bill's requirement to place collected fees into a dedicated special fund provides critical transparency. This measure enhances fiscal accountability, enabling clear auditing and assurance that funds collected from community groups are used solely to offset the actual maintenance and operational costs directly associated with community use.

This approach reassures stakeholders, fostering trust and continued support for community facility usage.

5) *Urgency justification.* The statutory authority for school districts to recover proportional maintenance and repair costs under the Civic Center Act expired on January 1, 2025. As a result, districts currently lack authority to charge these fees, potentially disrupting budget planning and limiting their ability to maintain facilities used by community groups. The urgency clause allows the bill to take effect immediately upon enactment, minimizing the gap in authority and helping districts avoid shifting these costs onto educational programs or restricting community access.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/11/25)

Coalition for Adequate School Housing (source)
Alameda County Office of Education
Association of California School Administrators
Beaumont Unified School District
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Suburban School Districts
California School Boards Association
California School Employees Association
Castro Valley Unified School District
County School Facilities Consortium
Fontana Unified School District
Grossmont Union High School District
Jurupa Unified School District
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles Unified School District
Modesto City Schools
Natomas Unified School District
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Petaluma City Schools
Pittsburg Unified School District
Riverside County Public K-12 School District Superintendents
San Benito High School District
San Diego Unified School District
San Francisco Unified School District

Santa Monica – Malibu Unified School District
Sierra Sands Unified School District
Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/11/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, 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, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Chen, Gallagher, Harabedian, Lackey

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/12/25 16:02:25

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 516
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Amended: 6/16/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 8-0, 6/9/25
AYES: Ashby, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Niello, Strickland, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas, Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Registered veterinary technicians and veterinary assistants: scope of practice

SOURCE: San Francisco SPCA
California Veterinary Medical Association
San Diego Humane Society

DIGEST: This bill authorizes a registered veterinary technician (RVT) to perform specified dental care procedures under the supervision of a veterinarian and clarifies that RVTs and veterinary assistants can perform animal health services that are not otherwise prohibited by law under the supervision of a veterinarian, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB), under the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer Affairs, to license and regulate veterinarians, veterinary assistants, RVTs, issue both premises permits and veterinary assistant controlled substance permits (VACSP). (Business and Professions

Code (BPC) § 4800 *et. seq.*)

2) Prohibits any a person from practicing veterinary medicine in this state, unless at the time of so doing, the person holds a valid, unexpired, and unrevoked license provided under the veterinary practice act (act). (BPC § 4825)

3) Requires the VMB to adopt regulations establishing animal health care tasks and an appropriate degree of supervision required for tasks that may be performed only by a RVT or a licensed veterinarian. (BPC § 4836(a))

4) Authorizes a RVT or veterinary assistant to administer a drug, including, but not limited to, a drug that is a controlled substance, under the direct or indirect supervision of a licensed veterinarian when done pursuant to the order, control, and full professional responsibility of a licensed veterinarian. However, no person, other than a licensed veterinarian, may induce anesthesia unless authorized by regulation of the VMB. (BPC § 4836.1(a))

5) Authorizes RVTs and veterinary assistants to perform those animal health care services prescribed by law under the supervision of a veterinarian licensed or authorized to practice. (BPC § 4840(a))

6) Specifies that an RVT may perform animal health care services on impounded animals by a state, county, city, or city and county agency pursuant to the direct order, written order, or telephonic order of a veterinarian licensed or authorized to practice in California. (BPC § 4840(b)

7) Permits an RVT to apply for registration from the federal Drug Enforcement Administration to allow the direct purchase of sodium pentobarbital for the performance of euthanasia, without the supervision or authorization of a licensed veterinarian. (BPC § 4840(c))

8) Prohibits RVTs and veterinary assistants from performing surgery, diagnosis and prognosis of animal diseases, and prescribing of drugs, medicine and appliances. (BPC § 4840.2)

9) Permits a veterinarian to authorize an RVT to act as an agent of the veterinarian for the purpose of establishing the veterinarian-client-patient relationship to administer preventive or prophylactic vaccines or medications for the control or eradication of apparent or anticipated internal or external parasites, subject to certain conditions, including:

a) Vaccines must be administered in a registered veterinary premise at which the veterinarian is physically present.

b) If working at a location other than a registered veterinary premises, the veterinarian is in the general vicinity or available by telephone and is quickly and easily available. The RVT shall have necessary equipment and drugs to provide immediate emergency care.

c) The RVT examines the animal patient and administers vaccines in accordance with written protocols and procedures established by the veterinarian.

d) The veterinarian and RVT sign and date a statement containing an assumption of risk by the veterinarian for all acts of the RVT related to patient examination and administration of vaccines, short of willful acts of animal cruelty, gross negligence, or gross unprofessional conduct on behalf of the RVT.

e) The veterinarian and RVT sign and date a statement containing authorization for the RVT to act as an agent of the veterinarian until such date as the veterinarian terminates authorization.

f) Before the RVT examines or administers vaccines to the animal patient, the RVT informs the client orally or in writing that they are acting as an agent of the veterinarian.

g) Signed statements between the veterinarian and RVT must be retained by the veterinarian for the duration of the RVT's work as an authorized agent and until three years from the date of termination of their relationship with the veterinarian. (BPC § 4826.7(b))

This bill:

1) Authorizes veterinary assistants in addition to RVTs to perform specified animal healthcare services, not otherwise prohibited in law, in public or private animal shelters, humane societies, or societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, as specified.

2) Deletes a reference to impounded under the provisions related to an order from a veterinarian.

3) Permits RVTs to perform dental care procedures, including tooth extractions, under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian authorized to practice in California.

4) Makes a clarifying reference change.

Background

Veterinarians, RVTs and Veterinary Assistants. Current law prohibits a person from practicing veterinary medicine in this state without a current and valid license issued by the VMB. RVTs are an essential part of the veterinary workforce, performing critical support tasks for animal health care and welfare, typically under the supervision and direction of a licensed veterinarian. An RVT must register with the VMB in order to provide the designated animal health care tasks.

There are multiple pathways to become an RVT in California. All applicants must take and pass the National Veterinary Technician National Exam offered by the American Association of Veterinary State Boards and graduate from a VMB-approved program, or obtain education equivalency certified by the American Association of Veterinary State Boards Program for the Assessment of Veterinary Education Equivalency for veterinary technicians.

Veterinary Assistants are not required to register with the VMB and there are no state-specific requirements for a veterinary assistant to practice. As noted by the VMB, all unlicensed staff in a veterinary facility are considered veterinary assistants and may assist with supporting tasks under the direct or indirect supervision of a veterinarian or under the direct supervision of an RVT, but are not allowed to perform tasks restricted to veterinarians or RVTs. Unlicensed staff may not treat animals outside a registered premises setting.

Identified in Title 16, California Code of Regulations § 2036, are the specified health care tasks that a RVT may perform under the direct supervision of a licensed veterinarian. These tasks include treatments such as: induce anesthesia, perform dental extractions, suture cutaneous and subcutaneous tissues, create a relief hole in the skin to facilitate placement of an intravascular catheter, and drug compounding from bulk substances. Additionally, RVTs may perform the following procedures under the indirect supervision of a licensed veterinarian: administer controlled substances, apply casts and sprints, and drug compounding from non-bulk substances.

Direct supervision occurs when the supervising veterinarian is physically present at the location where animal health care professionals provide care and tasks that are expected to be conducted quickly and are easily available. Indirect supervision occurs when the supervisor is not physically present at the location where animal health care tasks, treatments, procedures, etc. are performed, but the supervising veterinarian has given either written or oral instructions ("direct orders") for treatment of the animal and the animal has been examined by a veterinarian and the animal is not anesthetized, as defined.

As noted by the author and the sponsor, the existing regulations are not clear as to what tasks an RVT is authorized to perform. According to information from the author, "Unfortunately, existing regulations are not written in a way that supports this outcome. They make ample use of short, exhaustive lists of tasks, creating the misconception that these are the only responsibilities that RVTs and veterinary assistants may perform. This, in turn, makes supervising veterinarians hesitant to assign any duty that is not explicitly named in regulation, effectively preventing them from fully utilizing their staff." The aim of this legislation is to more clearly identify those health care tasks that a RVT or veterinary assistant can perform. In addition, this bill clarifies the animal health care tasks that a RVT or veterinary assistant may provide in shelter environment pursuant to the order of a veterinarian.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/24/25)

California Veterinary Medical Association (co-source)
San Diego Humane Society (co-source)
San Francisco SPCA (co-source)
Act 2 Rescue
American Kennel Club
Best Friends Animal Society
California Animal Welfare Association
Carmel Police Department
City of Sacramento
County of San Diego Animal Services
Friends of the Alameda Animal Shelter
Forgotten Felines of Sonoma County
Humane Society of Imperial County
Humane World for Animals
Inland Valley Humane Society & SPCA

Joybound People & Pets
Marin Humane
Napa County Animal Shelter
Nine Lives
NorCal Boxer Rescue
NorCal German Shorthaired Pointer Rescue
Palo Alto Humane
Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA
Pets In Need
San Gabriel Valley Humane Society
Santa Barbara Humane
Santa Cruz County Animal Shelter
Social Compassion in Legislation
Stray Cat Alliance
The Dancing Cat
Town of Apple Valley Animal Services
Valley Humane Society, Inc.
Woody Cat Rescue

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Supporters note generally that this bill helps clarify the tasks that RVTs are authorized to perform to help increase access to animal health care.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, 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, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Chen, McKinnor, Papan

Prepared by: Elissa Silva / B., P. & E.D. /
6/24/25 16:32:51

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 523
Author: Irwin (D)
Amended: 5/5/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 6-1, 6/18/25
AYES: Durazo, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Seyarto, Wiener
NOES: Choi

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-4, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Metropolitan water districts: proxy vote authorizations

SOURCE: Eastern Municipal Water District

DIGEST: This bill allows, until January 1, 2030, certain members of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) board to assign a proxy to cast their vote under specified conditions.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires, pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act (Brown Act), meetings of the legislative body of a local agency to be open and public.

2) Establishes provisions for teleconferencing of local agency meetings under specified circumstances.

3) Authorizes the formation of metropolitan water districts for the purpose of developing, storing, and distributing water for municipal and domestic purposes. The MWD is the only district organized under this act.

4) Establishes procedures for appointing members of the MWD board by participating member agencies, and for the allocation of votes among board members.

This bill:

1) Allows a representative from a MWD member agency with one seat on the MWD board to assign a proxy vote authorization to a representative of another member public agency if the assigning representative cannot attend a board meeting.

2) Requires the assigning representative to designate the meetings for which the proxy is valid. The proxy vote authorization must be in writing and filed with MWD's board secretary one business day in advance of the meeting.

3) Limits the proxy authorization to being used for up to six board meetings in any calendar year.

4) Provides that:

   a) A proxy vote authorization does not allow the proxy to assume the assigning representative's officer position, and it only applies to designated board meetings, not committee meetings.

   b) All provisions of the MWD Act apply to the representative assigned the proxy vote authorization.

   c) All conflict of interest laws that apply to the assigning representative also apply to the proxy when exercising a proxy vote authorization. If either the assigning representative or the proxy has a conflict of interest on a specific item, that conflict equally applies to the assigned representative regarding the proxy vote for that item.

5) Repeals this bill's provisions on January 1, 2030.

Background

Brown Act. The Brown Act provides guidelines for how local agencies must hold public meetings. Among other provisions, the Brown Act requires meetings of the legislative body of a local agency be open and public.

The Brown Act generally requires local agencies to notice meetings in advance, including the posting of an agenda, and requires these meetings to be open and accessible to the public. The Brown Act only allows legislative bodies to take actions, meaning a majority vote of the legislative body unless otherwise specified, on items that appear on a posted agenda.

AB 3191 (Frazee, 1988) responded to these concerns by authorizing the legislative body of a local agency to use teleconferencing, meaning both members of the legislative body and the public have the opportunity to participate remotely.

More recently, AB 2449 (Blanca Rubio, Chapter 285, Statutes of 2022) gave members of legislative bodies more teleconferencing flexibility in certain cases. It allowed members of legislative bodies to participate remotely for "just cause" and "emergency circumstances" without noticing their teleconference location or making that location public.

MWD. MWD is a regional wholesale water district in Southern California that delivers water to 26 member public agencies. These member agencies in turn provide water to 19 million people in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura counties, making MWD the largest distributor of treated drinking water in the United States.

The MWD Act sets out the district's governance structure, powers and duties, annexation processes, and taxation and bonding authorities. MWD is governed by a 38-member board, representing each of the district's 26 member agencies. The board establishes and administers MWD's policies and oversees the operations of the district.

Each member agency appoints one director on the board, plus an additional director for each full five percent of assessed property valuation within the member agency's territory, as a share of the total assessed valuation within MWD's service area. For example, the City of Los Angeles appoints five directors: one for belonging to MWD and four more for its 20.63% share of assessed valuation. Accordingly, assessed valuation drives the current and future representation for all member agencies on the board.

MWD's principal act also establishes a weighed voting system that is distinct from the number of seats that each agency gets. The voting power on the MWD's board of directors reflects each member agency's share of the MWD's total assessed valuation, but rather than a fixed number of seats on the board, members get one vote for every $10 million of assessed valuation within the member agency.

Each year, MWD reviews the assessed property valuation of all 26 member agencies and adjusts its voting power and board makeup annually based on changes in the member agencies' assessed valuations. MWD's service area has more than tripled in its assessed valuation over the last twenty years, from $863 billion to $4 trillion in 2024. However, this increase in assessed valuation is not consistent across MWD's service area. For example, in the last fiscal year, the

City of Los Angeles's assessed valuation grew by 4.6%, while Eastern Municipal Water District's grew by 11.8%. These changes create shifts in the makeup of MWD's board and voting power over time.

While membership is based on assessed valuation and votes are allocated in proportion to assessed valuation, votes are not split equally among directors. The casting of votes is vested as a block in the agency, and not distributed among the number of board members. For example, the City of Los Angeles has five board members, but only one of them needs to be present to cast all 83,835 votes. Consequently, if a member agency with just one board member misses a meeting, its votes are not cast. As a result, the majority of member agencies with just one member cannot afford to miss a meeting, while board members from larger member agencies can miss meetings with no voting repercussions.

Eastern Municipal Water District wants the Legislature to ensure that MWD member agencies that only have one seat on the board can have their votes counted when their representative cannot attend a meeting.

Comments

Purpose of this bill. According to the author, "Of the 26 member agencies that constitute the Board of Directors of Metropolitan, 21 agencies are represented by a single board member. If a board member, acting as their member agency's sole representative, is unable to attend a board meeting, that member agency would lose the opportunity to cast a vote. This means their voice would go unheard regarding billion-dollar infrastructure projects and investments that impact nearly half the state's population. AB 523 will allow member agencies represented by a single board member to authorize a proxy vote authorization to another Metropolitan board member to vote on their agency's behalf if they are unable to attend a board meeting. This will ensure more fair and flexible representation for smaller member agencies on the Metropolitan board."

Checking attendance. Under current law, MWD board members have at least two options at their disposal if they can't travel to attend meetings. First, they can use the long-standing teleconferencing provisions under the Brown Act that allow them to participate in a meeting remotely so long as their location is publicly accessible and the public is notified ahead of time. Second, they can use the authority under AB 2449, which grants just cause exemptions for board members to participate via teleconferencing without public access or noticing their location. Together, these existing authorities provide flexibility for board members to attend meetings (and vote) remotely, ensuring they can still participate when they can't attend in person and that the voice of their constituents does not go unheard.

MWD reports that these authorities are frequently used by its board members. Despite this existing flexibility, AB 523 authorizes the casting of proxy votes when members with only one representative on the MWD board can't attend. Allowing proxy votes in this manner may increase the likelihood that board members will miss meetings because the consequences of doing so—that a member's vote won't be recorded—are lessened. When board members don't attend meetings, their constituents are deprived of the opportunity to directly confront their representative about decisions they may disagree with. Given the existing flexibility in the Brown Act for teleconferencing to enable board members to attend remotely, it is unclear whether AB 523 strikes the right balance between ensuring member agencies can cast votes and the public's right to address their representatives.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/19/25)

Eastern Municipal Water District (Source)
Adan Ortega Jr. Representative of the City of San Fernando
Association of California Water Agencies
Central Basin Municipal Water District
City of Beverly Hills
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
Inland Empire Utilities Agency
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
Western Municipal Water District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-4, 5/12/25
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, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, 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, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio, Gallagher, Hoover, Patterson

NO VOTE RECORDED: Hadwick, Jackson, Lackey, Macedo, Stefani

Prepared by: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
6/19/25 16:25:43

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 581
Author: Bennett (D)
Amended: 3/19/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-0, 3/28/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: State shrub

SOURCE: California Chaparral Institute
Los Padres ForestWatch

DIGEST: This bill establishes the bigberry manzanita (Arctostaphylos glauca) as the official state shrub.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law establishes various official state emblems, including, but not limited to: the golden poppy as the official State Flower; the California redwood as the official state tree; lace lichen as the official state lichen; the California Grizzly Bear as the state animal; Purple needlegrass, or Nassella pulchra, as the official state grass; and the California Golden Chanterelle as the official state mushroom.

This bill establishes the bigberry manzanita (Arctostaphylos glauca) as the official state shrub and makes related findings and declarations, as specified.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "AB 581 will designate the bigberry manzanita as the official shrub of California. With invasive plant species

contributing to the intensity and rapid spread of recent wildfires, it is critical for us to highlight the key benefits of native California plants. Due to millions of years of adaptation to the California climate and landscape, the bigberry manzanita possess unique abilities to efficiently utilize water, help with soil erosion and regenerate at higher rates after fire exposure. This species does not natively grow in any state outside of California, aside from a region in Baja California, making it uniquely representative of California."

Shrubbery and the Chaparral. A shrub is a woody plant that is smaller than a tree and typically has multiple stems arising near the ground rather than a single trunk. Shrubs vary widely in size, shape, and function, but are often uniquely identified by their height – generally under 20 feet tall – and their dense branching structure. Unlike herbaceous plants, shrubs are perennial and retain their woody structure year-round. They play a vital role in ecosystems by providing habitat, stabilizing soil, and supporting pollinators and wildlife. While appearing to be a humble background flora, shrubs sprang to unlikely pop culture fame due to *Monty Python and the Holy Grail*, when Roger the Shrubber and the shrub-obsessed Knights Who Say "Ni!" turned the unassuming landscaping staple into high comedy.

Chaparral is one of California's most distinctive and widespread ecosystems. Found primarily in coastal and inland foothill regions with hot, dry summers and mild, wet winters, chaparral is dominated by drought-tolerant shrubs such as manzanita, chamise, and ceanothus. Many chaparral plants, such as the bigberry manzanita, have developed traits like fire-triggered seed germination or thick bark to survive and regenerate after periodic wildfires.

Bigberry Manzanita (Arctostaphylos glauca) – a Shrubbery that looks Nice. And Not Too Expensive. Supporters of the bigberry manzanita point out that it is a quintessential symbol of California's diverse and resilient natural heritage. This evergreen shrub, native to the chaparral and coastal sage scrub habitats of California and Baja California, is characterized by its dense, branching growth habit. The bigberry's branches further stand out in the chaparral with a smooth roan-like coat of red bark as if dusted with ash or burnished by the wind. The bigberry flaunts oval-shaped leaves with a distinctive blue-grey hue, giving it its species epithet "glauca" from the Latin for "bluish-gray" or "gray-green," and is often associated with a waxy coating on leaves or other surfaces.

Bigberry manzanitas produce small, urn-shaped flowers ranging in color from white to pale pink, followed by edible berries that are a food source for birds and mammals. The plant's extensive root system aids in soil stabilization, making it

valuable for rehabilitating disturbed watersheds and wildfire burn scars. Adapted to California's Mediterranean climate, it thrives in dry, nutrient-poor soils and has a unique relationship with fire: while it does not resprout after burning, its seeds require the heat and chemicals from fire to germinate, ensuring its regeneration in fire-prone ecosystems. However, because it takes at least 30 years between fires before there are enough seeds in the soil bank to secure the bigberry's survival post-fire, increasing frequency of wildfire and the drying climate threaten the long term health of the species.

Beyond its ecological significance, bigberry manzanita holds cultural and historical importance. Its berries were traditionally used by Indigenous communities to make a refreshing, cider-like drink, and young branches of the shrub served in crafting tools and other structures. The plant's name reflects California's multicultural heritage: "manzanita" means "little apple" in Spanish, while "Arctostaphylos" dervies from Greek, translating to "bear" and "bunch of grapes," a nod to the now-extinct California grizzly bear that once roamed its habitats.

California's Official State Emblem Landscape. California is renowned for its iconic geography, rich history, global influence, and its industrious and vibrant people. Boasting a unique array of official symbols, the state represents its natural beauty, historical significance, and cultural identity through emblems. These symbols serve as reminders for residents and visitors alike, emphasizing the state's distinct identity and the importance of preserving its heritage for future generations. As California continues to evolve and grow, its state emblems are intended to remain steadfast symbols of the state's past, present, and future.

For example, the golden poppy is codified as the official state flower, representing the state's vibrant landscapes and wildflower fields. Many people believe that emblem law prohibits cutting or damaging the California poppy because of its official designation. In fact, there is no law specifically protecting the California poppy, but the designation endears a special appreciation of the flower and has perpetuated the myth that no one may pick them. Designated in 1903, the golden poppy symbolizes the beauty of California's natural environment.

A number of the state's official emblems lean heavily on California's Gold Rush history. The official state motto – "Eureka" – is a Greek word that translates to "I have found it." In the context of California, the motto is closely tied to the California Gold Rush of 1848-1855. Gold discovered at Sutter's Mill in 1848 sparked a massive influx of fortune-seekers who flocked to California to seek wealth and prosperity. Native gold is designated as the official state mineral and

mineralogic emblem, while "The Golden State" serves as the official state nickname, and Bodie is established as the official state gold rush ghost town.

Recent additions to the list of official state emblems include the California Golden Chanterelle (state mushroom), the pallid bat (state bat), the banana slug (state slug), the shell of the black abalone (state sea shell), and the Dungeness crab (state crustacean) – all having been added during the 2023-24 Legislative Session. California is now represented by nearly 50 state symbols, 43 of which are codified by statute in Government Code including: state amphibian, animal, bat, bird, colors, dance, dinosaur, fabric, flower, flag, folk dance, fossil, gemstone, gold rush ghost town, grass, historical society, insect, LGBTQ veterans memorial, lichen, marine fish, marine mammal, marine reptile, military museum, mineral, motto, mushroom, nickname, nut, prehistoric artifact, reptile, rock, seal, silver rush ghost town, soil, song, sport, tall ship, tartan, tree, and Vietnam veterans memorial.

Pruned Before Passage. Not every emblem takes root. While some proposals enjoy basking in bipartisan sunshine, others have failed to survive the shade of a disapproving Legislature. Examples of would-be-emblems left wandering in the wilderness include AB 666 (Rogers, 2025) which would name Bigfoot as the official state cryptid. That bill failed to receive a motion in the Assembly Arts, Entertainment, Sports, & Tourism Committee earlier this year. AB 868 (E. Garcia, 2021) proposed to establish the date shake as the official state milkshake. That bill was approved by the Assembly but never heard in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee. AB 1769 (Voepel, 2018) would have established the California Vaquero Horse as the official state horse. That bill was never heard in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee.

In 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger terminated the possibility of naming Zinfandel "California's historic wine" contemplated by AB 1253 (Migden, 2006). As introduced, the bill sought to designate that particular varietal as an official state emblem. However, the bill was watered down after much attention and controversy – and instead proposed Zinfandel as historic. Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed the legislation writing, in part, "California wines have inspired authors, artists and Oscar-winning motion pictures. Singling one out for special recognition would be inappropriate." That bill is yet to be back.

The importance of state emblems in California, as well as in any other state, is their ability to convey the unique identity, values, and history of the region. As such, when proposing new official state emblems, it is crucial to give careful consideration to the emblem's significance to the state and its resonance with both

current and future residents. Emblems serve as reminders of the state's heritage and represent the collective consciousness of its people. By recognizing emblems that hold deep meaning and relevance, California can effectively celebrate its past, present, and future, while inspiring residents to appreciate and preserve the state's legacy. It may be important to consider whether, after a certain point, the state's emblem collection turns from distinctive to distractingly decorative.

Branching Out Too Far? Designating a new state symbol can briefly stir a media response, but does not always materially accomplish any particular policy goal such as supporting habitat, research, or protections for the identified symbol. Each time a new symbol sparks a burst of attention, it may lead to a sort of "emblem fatigue" as successive designations produce progressively smaller spikes in public interest and can foster a growing frustration from the general public. Exceptions to the emblematic law of diminishing returns include the bald eagle (USA), giant panda (China), and Bengal tiger (India) that have seen natural populations rebound after intense, well-funded recovery campaigns and attention. Alternatively, the California Grizzly Bear – California's official state animal – went extinct in 1922 when the last known bear was reportedly shot in Tulare County.

Further, a February 1, 2024, article in *CalMatters* titled "A bill for every problem? Why California lawmakers introduce longshots," cites a 2002 Legislative Analyst's Office estimate that "each bill cost at least $18,000 to go from introduction to passage: Each bill is given a title and number, goes through analysis by committee staff and is printed out. An updated dollar figure from the legislative analyst was not available, but adjusting for inflation, each bill costs in the neighborhood of $30,000."

The article goes on to note that, "[e]ven Jerry Brown, who famously vetoed a bill with the message, 'Not every human problem deserves a law,' signed a majority of those sent to his desk while he was governor."

California's Proposition 140 approved by the voters in 1990, among other things, limited the total amount of expenditures allowed by the Legislature. The Committee may wish to consider at what point establishing additional state symbols reaches a breaking point in a larger cost-benefit analysis. Alternative avenues currently exist that allow for the Legislature to recognize the myriad iconic animals, places, and things that make California a globally recognized cultural driver it is – without the need for creating new statute. Options include resolutions and certificates which are commonly adopted and/or distributed and

allow the Legislature to highlight particularly notable animals, plants, places, or items within the state.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 765 (Niello, 2025) establishes the giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas) as the official state snake. (Pending in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee)

AB 666 (Rogers, 2025) would have established Bigfoot as the official state cryptid. (Held without recommendation in the Assembly Arts, Entertainment, Sports, and Tourism Committee)

AB 1334 (Wallis, 2025) establishes solar energy as the official state energy. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

California Chaparral Institute (Source)
Los Padres ForestWatch (Source)
California Institute for Biodiversity
California Native Plant Society
Sea of Clouds
The Nature Conservancy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: In support of the bill, the California Chaparral Institute writes that, "[l]ike the California Grizzly Bear that thrived in the chaparral, Bigberry manzanita is big and bold. When undisturbed for a century or more, its smooth, burgundy trunk can become waist-sized, its graceful branches can reach more than 20 feet into the sky, and its fallen, white flowers can blanket the ground with a soft, botanical snow. Unlike the grizzly, Bigberry manzanita remains with us today as both a living symbol of the state's natural wonders, and as a living reminder to take care of what remains of wild California."
Further, "Bigberry manzanita has a delicate relationship to fire. When burned under the chaparral's naturally infrequent, high-intensity fire regime, the shrub responds by seed germination. Although the adults expire, their offspring emerge

from the soil by the dozens, rising like a Phoenix, repopulating the chaparral with energetic, resilient seedlings."

Additionally, the Los Padres ForestWatch writes that, "[b]ig berry manzanita is found exclusively in the California Floristic Province, growing across chaparral-covered foothills and mountains from California's southern border to the Bay Area. While many Californians are familiar with manzanitas generally thanks to their iconic appearance, most are likely unfamiliar with big berry manzanita specifically despite the fact that it is one of the largest and most striking manzanita species in existence. Its smooth red bark, lightly colored leaves, and large fruits make it a recognizable species, and designating it as California's official state shrub would bring heightened awareness to big berry manzanita as well as manzanitas and chaparral in general. It is crucial we take appropriate steps to ensure we recognize this plant's symbolism in California's most extensive shrubland ecosystem."

Further, "big berry manzanita can also serve as a bellwether for consequential changes to natural fire patterns in chaparral-dominated portions of the state. The increasing frequency of fire in many areas and the subsequent spread of invasive species can threaten big berry manzanita. It is important now more than ever to educate the public about the importance of chaparral and the species found in this ecosystem, including the big berry manzanita, to increase awareness about the dangers of climate change and increased fire activity from human activities."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-0, 3/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patterson, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schultz, Solache, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Boerner, Carrillo, Chen, DeMaio, Essayli, Gabriel, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Papan, Patel, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Rogers, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Ward, Zbur

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
6/11/25 15:57:08

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 596
Author: McKinnor (D)
Amended: 6/12/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Cortese, Durazo, Laird

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-10, 4/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Occupational safety: face coverings

SOURCE: California Federation of Labor Unions
Orange County Employees Association

DIGEST: This bill prohibits an employer from preventing any employee from wearing a face covering, including a respirator, unless it would create a safety hazard.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) The California Occupational Safety and Health Act, assures safe and healthful working conditions for all California workers by authorizing the enforcement of effective standards, assisting and encouraging employers to maintain safe and healthful working conditions, and by providing for research, information, education, training, and enforcement in the field of occupational safety and health. (Labor Code §6300-6413.5)

2) Establishes the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (known as Cal/OSHA) within the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) to, among

other things, propose, administer, and enforce occupational safety and health standards. (Labor Code §6300 et seq.)

3) Establishes the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, within DIR, to promote, adopt, and maintain reasonable and enforceable standards that will ensure a safe and healthful workplace for workers. (Labor Code §140-147.6)

4) Requires employers to establish, implement and maintain an effective Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) that must include, among other things, a system for identifying and evaluating workplace hazards, including scheduled periodic inspections to identify unsafe conditions and work practices and the employer's methods and procedures for correcting those unsafe or unhealthy conditions and work practices in a timely manner. The IIPP must also include the employer's system for communicating with employees on occupational health and safety matters. (Labor Code §6401.7)

5) Until February 3, 2025, established a Temporary Emergency Standard for COVID-19 Prevention in the workplace, which, among other things, included requirements for the use of face coverings consistent with recommendations from the California Department of Public Health. (California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 8, §3205)

This bill:

1) For purposes of these provisions, defines the following terms:

   a) "Face covering" means a surgical mask, a medical procedure mask, a respirator worn voluntarily, or a tightly woven fabric or nonwoven material of at least two layers that completely covers the nose and mouth and is secured to the head with ties, ear loops, or elastic bands that go behind the head. If gaiters are worn, they shall have two layers of fabric or be folded to make two layers. A face covering is a solid piece of material without slits, visible holes, or punctures that fits snugly over the nose, mouth, and chin with no large gaps on the outside of the face:

      i. "Face covering" includes clear face coverings or cloth face coverings with a clear plastic panel that otherwise meet this definition and which may be used to facilitate communication with people who are deaf or hard of hearing or others who need to see a speaker's mouth or facial expressions to understand speech or sign language respectively.

ii. "Face covering" does not include a scarf, ski mask, balaclava, bandana, turtleneck, collar, or single layer of fabric.

b) "Respirator" means a respiratory protection device approved by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to protect the wearer from particulate matter, including, but not limited to, an N95 filtering facepiece respirator.

2) Prohibits an employer from preventing any employee from wearing a face covering, including a respirator, unless it would create a safety hazard.

3) Provides that this prohibition does not limit more protective or stringent local health department orders or guidance.

Background

COVID-119 Prevention Temporary Standards. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, California adopted a COVID-19 prevention standard (CCR Title 8, Section 3205) that applied to all employers, employees, and places of employment, with some exceptions. The standard directed employers on measures to prevent COVID-19 transmission and to identify and correct hazards, including by testing employees and providing notices on cases found. Among other elements, the standard included employer requirements to provide face coverings and ensure they are worn by employees when required by a California Department of Public Health regulation or order. Additionally, the standard included a prohibition on employers preventing employees from wearing face coverings, including a respirator, when not required by the standard, unless it would create a safety hazard.[1]

Regarding face coverings requirements, the standard provided the following exceptions:

- When an employee is alone in a room or vehicle.
- While eating or drinking at the workplace, as specified.
- While employees are wearing respirators required by the employer, as specified.
- Employees who cannot wear face coverings due to a medical or mental health condition or disability, or who are hearing-impaired or communicating with a hearing-impaired person, as specified.

[1] CCR Title 8, Section 3205 (f). https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/3205.html

- During specific tasks which cannot feasibly be performed with a face covering. This exception is limited to the time period in which such tasks are actually being performed.

With the exception of certain COVID-19 reporting and recordkeeping requirements, the emergency standard and related provisions sunsetted on February 3, 2025. This bill proposes to codify the element of the standard that prohibits employers from preventing any employee from wearing a face covering, including a respirator, unless it would create a safety hazard. Staff notes, however, that this bill does not include the exceptions for mask usage found in the standard.

Benefits of Using Face Coverings. Even though the COVID-19 virus is more under control and the standard has sunsetted, the virus is not exactly behind us. A new COVID variant is currently spreading across California with experts warning of a summer surge. The benefits of mask wearing to help prevent the spread of this and other viruses is well documented. The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and the Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) continue to promote mask wearing as an effective strategy in the prevention of respiratory viruses. Mask wearing can help prevent the transmission of common respiratory viruses such as COVID-19, influenza, and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV).[2] CDPH additionally promotes the use of masks for the protection against harmful environmental exposures including from wildfire smoke and infection with Valley Fever.[3]

According to the CDC, "wearing a mask can help lower the risk of respiratory virus transmission. When worn by a person with an infection, masks reduce the spread of the virus to others. Masks can also protect wearers from breathing in infectious particles from people around them. Different masks offer different levels of protection. Wearing the most protective one you can comfortably wear for extended periods of time that fits well (completely covering the nose and the mouth) is the most effective option."[4]

Need for this bill? According to the author: "The COVID-19 Prevention Safety Standard, implemented by Cal/OSHA in November 2020, included critical protections for workers, including the right to wear face coverings at work, even when not required, unless doing so creates a safety hazard…This worker safety standard expired on February 3, 2025. Without action, employers could begin

[2] See https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/Respiratory-Viruses/When-and-Why-to-Wear-a-Mask.aspx
[3] See https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/Respiratory-Viruses/When-and-Why-to-Wear-a-Mask.aspx, and https://www.cdc.gov/respiratory-viruses/prevention/masks.html
[4] https://www.cdc.gov/respiratory-viruses/prevention/masks.html

restricting mask use, as has been observed in other states and local jurisdictions. Such restrictions could leave workers vulnerable to health risks and undermine their autonomy in making personal health decisions.

AB 596 will codify the protections in Title 8, Section 3205(f)(4), ensuring that no employer may prevent an employee from wearing a face covering, including a respirator, unless it creates a safety hazard…This measure will ensure that California remains a leader in worker safety and public health, particularly in the face of ongoing and future infectious disease risks."

Related/Prior Legislation:

AB 2693 (Reyes, Chapter 799, Statutes of 2022) 1) extended the sunset date on COVID-19 related workplace reporting requirements and for Cal/OSHA's authority to disable an operation or process at a place of employment when the risk of COVID-19 infection creates an imminent hazard; 2) revised and recast COVID-19 exposure reporting provisions to require employers to display a notice with information on confirmed COVID-19 cases at the worksite; 3) authorized employers to post this information on an employer portal or continue to provide it in writing; and 4) struck requirements in existing law pertaining to the reporting by employers of COVID-19 outbreaks to local public health agencies and the public posting of this information by the State Department of Public Health.

AB 685 (Reyes, Chapter 84, Statutes of 2020) required employers to provide specified notices to employees and others if an employee is exposed to COVID-19, and also provided explicit authority for Cal/OSHA to close work areas and locations and issue citations due to COVID-19 risk in the workplace.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/24/25)

California Federation of Labor Unions (co-source)
Orange County Employees Association (co-source)
California Medical Association
California Nurses Association
California School Employees Association
California Federation of Teachers - a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals
Church State Council
Consumer Attorneys of California

Courage California
Oakland Privacy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/24/25)

California Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to one of the sponsors, the California Federation of Labor Unions:

"As a direct and immediate response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Cal/OSHA approved emergency temporary regulations to help stop the spread of the disease at worksites throughout the state. One of the most critical protections included in those emergency regulations stated that 'No employer shall prevent any employee from wearing a face covering, including a respirator… unless it would create a safety hazard.' This necessary set of regulations helped protect workers who were not already protected by existing regulations that apply only to workplaces at high risk for infectious diseases, such as hospitals, health clinics, and laboratories. So for most workers, these protections were the only ones they had.

The COVID-19 temporary protection safety standard sunset on February 3, 2025, meaning that those workers who had the right to protect themselves at work by wearing a mask to prevent exposure no longer have that right. Since then, some employers have enacted politically motivated rules in their workplaces to prohibit workers from wearing masks on the job to protect themselves. This is especially dangerous for workers who are immunocompromised, or who live with people who are, and must take extra precautions to protect themselves and their family.

Additionally, the fires in Los Angeles have reignited conversations about smoke and air quality, especially for workers who must continue to work in areas in and around the fires."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

The California Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the measure arguing:

"Cal/OSHA included face coverings in its COVID-19 protection regulation, and obligated them to be used in certain circumstances. Notably, even Cal/OSHA included a list of exemptions from these obligations, including: (1) exempting employees who are already required to wear non-compatible headgear; (2) employees who could not wear such a covering due to a mental health or disability issue; and (3) where such masks are not 'feasible' due to the job tasks.

AB 596 would prohibit an employer from preventing an employee from wearing a mask; or, in other words: it ensures that an employee can wear a 'face covering' and that an employer cannot prohibit them from doing so. Notably, AB 596 does not include the "feasibility" exemption, or the disability-based exemption that Cal/OSHA had placed in its regulation.

While we certainly do not oppose any Californians' desire to wear additional respiratory protection where appropriate, we are concerned that certain professions and job tasks are not compatible with such 'face coverings.'"

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-10, 4/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, DeMaio, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ellis, Flora, Patterson, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Solache

Prepared by: Alma Perez-Schwab / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556
6/24/25 16:32:51

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 628
Author: McKinnor (D)
Amended: 6/12/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 54-10, 4/7/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Hiring of real property: dwellings: untenantability

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes a dwelling that substantially lacks a stove or refrigerator that are maintained in good working order and capable of safely generating heat for cooking or safely storing food untenantable, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires a lessor of a building intended for human occupation to put the building in a condition fit for occupation, and to repair all dilapidations that render it untenantable, except as specified. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1941.)

2) Specifies that a dwelling shall be deemed untenantable for these purposes if it substantially lacks any of the following characteristics:

   a) Effective waterproofing and weather protection of roof and exterior walls, including unbroken windows and doors;

b) Plumbing or gas facilities that conform to applicable law in effect at the time of installation, maintained in good working order;
c) A water supply approved under applicable law that is under the control of the tenant, capable of producing hot and cold running water, or a system that is under the control of the landlord, that produces hot and cold running water, furnished to appropriate fixtures, and connected to a sewage disposal system approved under applicable law;
d) Heating facilities that conform to applicable law at the time of installation, maintained in good working order;
e) Electrical lighting, with wiring and electrical equipment that conform to applicable law at the time of installation, maintained in good working order;
f) Building, grounds, and appurtenances at the time of the commencement of the lease or rental agreement, and all areas under control of the landlord, kept in every part clean, sanitary, and free from all accumulations of debris, filth, rubbish, garbage, rodents, and vermin;
g) An adequate number of appropriate receptacles for garbage and rubbish, in clean condition and good repair at the time of the commencement of the lease or rental agreement, with the landlord providing appropriate serviceable receptacles thereafter and being responsible for the clean condition and good repair of the receptacles under their control;
h) Floors, stairways, and railings maintained in good repair; and
i) A locking mail receptacle for each residential unit in a residential hotel, as specified. (Civ. Code § 1941.1.)

3) Specifies that, notwithstanding the above, a landlord who leases a dwelling unit has no duty to repair a dilapidation if the tenant is in substantial violation of specified affirmative obligations, provided the tenant's violation contributes substantially to the existence of the dilapidation or interferes substantially with the landlord's obligation to keep the property tenantable. The affirmative obligations include:

a) To keep the tenant's premises clean and sanitary, as the condition of the premises permits;
b) To dispose of all rubbish, garbage, and other waste in a clean and sanitary manner;
c) To properly use and operate all electrical, gas, and plumbing fixtures, and to keep them as clean and sanitary as their condition permits;
d) Not to permit any person on their premises to willfully or wantonly destroy, deface, damage, or impair or remove any part of the structure or dwelling

unit or the facilities, equipment, or appurtenances, or to do any of those things themselves; and

e) To occupy the premises as their abode, utilizing the premises only for purposes for which it was designed or intended to be used. (Civ. Code § 1941.2.)

4) Requires a landlord who leases a dwelling unit to do all of the following:

   a) Install and maintain an operable dead bolt lock on each main swinging entry door of a dwelling unit. The dead bolt lock shall be installed in conformance with the manufacturer's specifications and shall comply with applicable state and local codes, as specified;
   b) Install and maintain operable window security or locking devices for windows that are designed to be opened, as specified;
   c) Install locking mechanisms that comply with applicable fire and safety codes on the exterior doors that provide ingress or egress to common areas with access to dwelling units in multifamily developments. (Civ. Code § 1941.3(a).)

5) Requires a landlord who leases a dwelling unit to install at least one usable telephone jack and to maintain inside telephone wiring in good working order, as specified, and to make any required repairs. (Civ. Code § 1941.4.)

6) Provides that, if the landlord fails to repair dilapidation that renders the premises untenantable within a reasonable time of receiving notice of the dilapidation, the tenant may repair the dilapidation if the cost of such repairs does not require an expenditure more than one month's rent of the premises, and may deduct the expenses of such repairs from the rent, or the tenant may vacate the premises and be discharged from further payment of rent or the performance of other conditions. Limits the availability of this remedy to a tenant to no more than twice in any 12-month period. (Civ. Code § 1942.)

7) Prohibits a landlord of a residential property from collecting rent from the tenant, increasing the tenant's rent, or initiating an eviction proceeding against the tenant if the property is untenantable or violates the Building Code or is deemed substandard, when a building code enforcement officer notifies the landlord of their duty to repair the dilapidation, 35 days have elapsed since that notice, and the dilapidations were not caused by the tenant. Specifies that a landlord who violates these provisions is liable to the tenant or lessee for actual damages and special damages between $100 and $5,000. (Civ. Code § 1942.4.)

8) Specifies that, in any unlawful detainer action, a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence that the landlord has breached specified habitability requirements is created when: the property is untenantable, violates the Building Code, or is deemed substandard; an enforcement officer notifies the landlord of their obligation to repair the deficient conditions; the deficient conditions have existed without being abated for 60 days since the issuance of the notice; and the conditions were not caused by the tenant or lessee. (Civ. Code § 1942.3.)

9) Provides that, in an unlawful detainer action, it is an affirmative defense against eviction for nonpayment of rent that a landlord failed to provide or maintain the premises to tenantable or habitable condition. (*Green v. Superior Court of San Francisco* (1974), 10 Cal. 3d 616, 637.)

This bill:

1) Includes in the list of conditions that deem a dwelling that substantially lacks such conditions untenantable a stove that is maintained in good working order and capable of safely generating heat for cooking purposes. Specifies that a stove that is subject to a recall by the manufacturer or a public entity is not capable of safely generating heat for cooking purposes.

2) Includes in the list of conditions that deem a dwelling that substantially lacks such conditions untenantable a refrigerator that is maintained in good working order and capable of safely storing food. Specifies that a refrigerator that is subject to a recall by the manufacturer or a public entity is not capable of safely storing food. Specifies that a tenant and a landlord may mutually agree when the lease is signed that the tenant will provide their own refrigerator, if the tenant chooses to provide and maintain their own refrigerator, and specifies that in such a scenario, the landlord is not responsible for the maintenance of the refrigerator.

3) Specifies that the requirements of (1) and (2), above, only apply to a lease entered into, amended, or extended on or after January 1, 2026.

4) Exempts from the requirements of (1) and (2), above: permanent supportive housing, as defined; a single-room occupancy unit that provides living and sleeping space for the exclusive use of the occupant; a unit in a residential hotel, as defined; and a dwelling unit within a housing facility that offers shared or

communal kitchen spaces to its residents, including a dwelling unit within an assisted living facility.

5) Specifies that a landlord must repair or replace a stove or refrigerator subject to a recall by the manufacturer or a public entity within 30 days of receiving notice that the stove or refrigerator is subject to a recall. Clarifies that this should not be construed to prohibit a tenant from exercising the existing remedies of repairing the dilapidation and deducting the costs from rent or vacating the premises.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/2025)

Aids Healthcare Foundation
All Home, a Project of Tides Center
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc.
Housing California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/2025)

California Association of Realtors

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to All Home, which supports AB 628:

> While most Californians assume that appliances like a stove and refrigerator are standard in any rental unit, that is not guaranteed under current state law. In fact, some tenants—especially those in lower-income communities or older housing stock—are forced to furnish and maintain these critical appliances themselves, adding hidden costs to already unaffordable rents and compounding barriers to safe and healthy living conditions. A foundational part of housing stability is ensuring that housing is not only available but livable. AB 628 affirms that the ability to store and prepare food safely is a basic necessity—not a luxury.
>
> This is especially troubling for the people we serve—residents with extremely low incomes who are disproportionately Black, Brown, disabled, or formerly unhoused. In the Bay Area, roughly one million residents with extremely low incomes are severely cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing. Those who receive no

housing assistance are paying an average of 76 percent of their income in rent. Requiring tenants to bear the cost of appliances that are essential to food security, health, and dignity undermines the very concept of habitability.

By explicitly including a functioning stove and refrigerator in the legal definition of "tenantable" housing, AB 628 updates California's housing standards to reflect the realities of modern life and codifies what should already be considered the baseline for safe, humane housing. Just as state law requires adequate plumbing, lighting, and heating, it should also ensure that tenants can cook meals and store food in a way that promotes health and safety.

We appreciate that AB 628 also recognizes the practical limitations of certain housing types by exempting permanent supportive housing, senior living communities, and residential hotels that use communal kitchen arrangements. These thoughtful exemptions ensure the bill's requirements are targeted, enforceable, and aligned with real-world housing models that serve specific populations.

As California continues its work to reduce homelessness, prevent displacement, and increase the supply of affordable housing, we must also ensure that the homes we are preserving, subsidizing, and building meet the basic expectations of habitability. AB 628 helps bring California's rental housing standards in line with those goals.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to the California Association of Realtors, which is opposed to AB 628:

AB 628 would allow disputes over appliance condition to serve as a basis for asserting a habitability violation, effectively creating a new legal defense in unlawful detainer proceedings. This could significantly complicate and delay the unlawful detainer process—even over minor or subjective disagreements about appliance functionality—leading to increased litigation, inconsistent enforcement, and heavier burdens on the courts. Such a change is particularly troubling because habitability violations carry significant legal consequences, including rent withholding, repair-and-deduct claims, and civil penalties. Expanding these provisions should be approached with extreme caution.

California already provides comprehensive habitability protections under Civil Code section 1941.1 and longstanding case law, ensuring that residential units meet essential health and safety standards. Refrigerators and stoves have never been part of that legal framework, and in practice, most landlords already provide these appliances voluntarily. If lack of access were a widespread or systemic issue, we would expect local jurisdictions with rent boards and robust tenant protections to have already adopted similar mandates—but they have not.

The bill also introduces vague and subjective enforcement challenges. In many dense, urban areas—such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, and coastal communities—efficiency units rely on compact appliances, such as mini-fridges or portable cooktops, due to space limitations or building code constraints. AB 628 could generate confusion and legal disputes over what constitutes a "working" or "adequate" appliance, exposing housing providers—especially small housing providers—to new liabilities, unclear regulatory expectations, and costly retrofitting obligations.

Even if a policy rationale exists for encouraging access to appliances, there is no justification for placing such a mandate within California's habitability statute, which carries broad and serious legal implications. As with Civil Code section 1941.4, which mandates telephone wiring through a separate statutory requirement, a standalone provision could be crafted to support tenant access to appliances without disrupting the structure of California's habitability and unlawful detainer laws.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 54-10, 4/7/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Castillo, Chen, Ellis, Flora, Gabriel, Jeff Gonzalez, Lee, Muratsuchi, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Ta, Wallis

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113

6/26/25 16:11:40

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 639
Author: Soria (D)
Amended: 6/11/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Seyarto, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/21/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Dams: exceptions

SOURCE: Kings River Conservation District

DIGEST: This bill exempts specified "weirs," as defined, that have at least three feet of freeboard from Department of Water Resources (DWR) Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) regulation and oversight.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Subjects all dams and reservoirs to regulation and oversight by DSOD within DWR (Water Code (Wat. C.) §6075).

2) Defines "dam" as any artificial barrier, together with additional appurtenant structures (including training walls, spillways, outlets, tunnels, channels, pipelines, or dikes) that may impound or divert water and is either (a) 25 feet or greater in height from the natural stream bed to the top of the barrier/maximum storage elevation, or (b) impounds a capacity of 50 acre-feet of water or more (Wat. C. §6002).

3) Excludes any barrier not in excess of six feet or a barrier with a storage capacity of 15 acre-feet or less, regardless of height, from the definition of dam (Wat. C. §6003).

4) Excludes certain structures from the definition of "dam," including an obstruction in a canal as a barrier across a stream channel, watercourse, or natural drainage area from consideration as a dam if the structure is no greater than 15 feet in height (Wat. C. §6004).

5) Excludes dams owned and operated by the federal government from regulation and oversight by DSOD (Wat. C. §6009).

6) Requires DSOD to inspect dams, reservoirs, and appurtenant structures to verify their safety in accordance with a prescribed schedule depending on the hazard classification, as determined by DSOD, of the facility (Wat. C. §6102.5).

This bill:

1) Provides that any barrier that does not impound water above the top of a levee where the maximum storage behind the barrier has a minimum of three feet of freeboard on the levee and is a weir is not considered a dam.

   a) Only applies this exemption to Peoples Weir, Reynolds Weir, Last Chance Weir, Lemoore Diversion Weir, Island Weir, Crescent Weir, Stinson Weir, Empire Weir No. 1, and Empire Weir No. 2.

2) Defines "weir" as an agricultural water delivery structure with either mechanically or manually removable flashboards or gates that serves to regulate water flow and that functions as part of a federal flood control system.

Background

Division of Safety of Dams. The State has regulated dams since 1929 to prevent failure, safeguard life, and protect property. DSOD provides oversight to the design, construction, and maintenance of over 1,200 jurisdictional sized dams in California. A "dam" is any artificial barrier, together with appurtenant works. If the dam height is more than six feet and it impounds 50 acre-feet or more of water, or if the dam is 25 feet or higher and impounds more than 15 acre-feet of water, it is under the jurisdiction of DSOD ("jurisdictional dams"), unless it is exempted.

DSOD ensures dam safety by:

- Reviewing and approving dam enlargements, repairs, alterations, and removals to ensure that the dam appurtenant structures are designed to meet minimum requirements.
- Performing independent analyses to understand dam and appurtenant structures performance. These analyses can include structural, hydrologic, hydraulic, and geotechnical evaluations.
- Overseeing construction to ensure work is being done in accordance with approved plans and specifications.
- Inspecting each dam on an annual basis to ensure it is safe, performing as intended, and is not developing issues.
- Periodically reviewing the stability of dams and their major appurtenances in light of improved design approaches and requirements.

DSOD's website contains information about jurisdictional dams, including owner name, dam height, reservoir capacity, dam type, certified status, downstream hazard, condition assessment, and reservoir restrictions. The downstream hazard is based solely on potential downstream impacts to life and property should the dam fail when operating with a full reservoir. There are four categories of downstream hazard: low, significant, high, and extremely high, described below.

Downstream Hazard Potential Classifications	Potential Downstream Impacts to Life and Property
Low	No probable loss of human life and low economic and environmental losses. Losses are expected to be principally limited to the owner's property.
Significant	No probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, impacts to critical facilities, or other significant impacts.
High	Expected to cause loss of at least one human life.
Extremely High	Expected to cause considerable loss of human life or would result in an inundation area with a population of 1,000 or more.

King's River Inline Weir Evaluation. In November 2024, Kings River Conservation District used GEI Consultants to evaluate nine inline structures located within the Kings River system, the sites being within Tulare, Fresno, and Kings County. The nine inline structures covered by the report are: Peoples Weir, Reynolds Weir, Last Chance Weir, Lemoore Weir, Island Weir, Crescent Weir, Stinson Weir, Empire Weir No. 1, and Empire Weir No. 2.

According to the report, the purpose of the evaluation was to determine if there would be any upstream or downstream impacts to critical facilities if the inline structure flashboards were to fail during the summer irrigation season. The hydraulic model evaluations assumed full water storage behind each of the inline structures with the flashboards in place. The evaluations also assumed that the inline structures would fail within an hour and the starting water level at the time of failure was set at the top of the flashboard height which provides a minimum of three feet of freeboard below the top of the levee where the water is being impounded.

In an open channel, a freeboard is the distance measured from the maximum water level to the uppermost watertight portion of a surrounding channel. As described by the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee, "one might think of 'freeboard' as a safety buffer that helps prevent water overtopping a channel by compensating for factors that can contribute to water levels higher than anticipated, such as waves, surges, or splashes."

The evaluation concluded that the results for each of the structures shows a failure of the flashboards at full storage would not impact any bridge structures crossing the channel downstream and not have any impact to the levees since the flood is contained in the channel and drops in elevation as it moves downstream. All nine structures have shown the modeled flood wave will have no impacts to the bridge structures and no impacts to any critical facilities, levees or bridge structures within the channel conveyance."

Further, DSOD's *Downstream Hazard Potential Classification* for each of these weirs is "low."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

Kings River Conservation District (source)
Association of California Water Agencies
California Association of Realtors
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Farm Bureau
Kings River Water Association
Rural County Representatives of California
Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District

Valley Ag Water Coalition
Western Growers Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "Water impounding and delivery systems called "weirs" do not typically cross the entirety of rivers or streams, do not impound water above the river levees and are only operated during low-flow periods to pool water for delivery to adjacent farms and ranches. Any spill would be contained entirely within a streambed leading the Department of Water Resources to rate them as very low hazard. Despite this rating, DWR's Division of Safety of Dams includes weirs in their maintenance and inspection schedule and imposes fees of $56,000 on all water impounding structures despite not posing an equivalent safety risk as a dam. This has significantly increased the cost to operate and maintain these weirs with no practical increase in safety for California's residents. AB 639 specifies that these impounding facilities do not count as dams under the Department's inspection program in a very narrow exemption to ensure affordable water deliveries while maintaining California's high safety standards for dams."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/21/25
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, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gallagher, Papan, Ramos, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Valencia

Prepared by: Genevieve Wong / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/24/25 16:32:52

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 677
Author: Bryan (D), et al.
Amended: 6/12/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Laird
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 4/10/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil records: directory information and reporting

SOURCE: Los Angeles Unified School District

DIGEST: This bill authorizes directory information of a student identified as a homeless child or youth to be disclosed to facilitate an eye examination by a nonprofit eye examination provider or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools, unless the parent or student accorded parental rights has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical examination.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Prohibits, pursuant to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), federal funds from being provided to any educational agency or institution which has a policy or practice of permitting the release of a student's educational records to any individual, agency, or organization without the written consent of the student's parents. FERPA exempts from the general

parental consent requirement certain kinds of disclosures, including disclosures to state and local officials for the purposes of conducting truancy proceedings, a criminal investigation, auditing or evaluating an educational program, or in relation to the application for financial aid. (United States Code, Title 20, Section 1232g and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 34, Sections 99.31)

2) Prohibits a school district from permitting access to student records to a person without parental consent or under judicial order, with some exceptions. (Education Code (EC) § 49076)

3) Requires school districts to permit access to records relevant to the legitimate educational interests of specified requesters, including:

   a) School officials and employees of the districts, members of a school attendance review board and any volunteer aide (as specified), provided that the person has a legitimate educational interest to inspect a record.

   b) Officials and employees of other public schools or school systems where the student intends to or is directed to enroll.

   c) Other federal, state and local officials as specified.

   d) Parents of a student 18 years of age or older who is a dependent.

   e) A student 16 years of age or older or having completed the 10th grade who requests access.

   f) A district attorney, judge or probation officer, in relation to truancy proceedings.

   g) A district attorney's office for consideration against a parent for failure to comply with compulsory education laws.

   h) A probation officer, district attorney, or counsel of record for a minor, in relation to a criminal investigation or in regard to declaring a person a ward of the court or involving a violation of a condition of probation.

   i) A county placing agency when acting as an authorized representative of a state or local educational agency.

j) A student 14 years of age or older who meets specified criteria.

k) An individual who completes specified items of the Caregiver's Authorization Affidavit and signs the affidavit for the purpose of enrolling a minor in school.

l) An agency caseworker or other representative of a state or local child welfare agency, or tribal organization, that has legal responsibility, in accordance with state or tribal law, for the care and protection of the student.

m) A foster family agency with jurisdiction over a currently enrolled or former student, a short-term residential treatment program staff responsible for the education or case management of a student, and a caregiver who has direct responsibility for the care of the student, including a certified or licensed foster parent, an approved relative or nonrelated extended family member, or a resource family. (EC § 49076)

4) Authorizes school districts to release information from student records to the following:

a) Appropriate persons in connection with an emergency if the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or other person.

b) Agencies or organizations in connection with the application of a student for, or receipt of, financial aid.

c) The county elections official for the identification of students who are eligible to register to vote.

d) Accrediting associations in order to carry out accrediting functions.

e) Organizations conducting studies on behalf of educational agencies or institutions for the purpose of developing, validating or administering predictive tests, administering student aid programs, and improving instruction.

f) Officials and employees of private schools or school systems where the student is enrolled or intends to enroll.

g) A contractor or consultant with a legitimate educational interest who has a formal written agreement or contract with the school district regarding the provision of outsourced institutional services or functions by the contractor or consultant. (EC § 49076)

5) Requires school districts to adopt a policy identifying categories of directory information that may be released, and authorizes directory information to be released according to the local policy. School districts are required to provide notice at least annually of the categories of information that the school plans to release and of the recipients. The release of directory information is prohibited if the parent has notified the school district that the information is not to be released. Further, the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless is prohibited unless a parent or student with parental rights has provided written consent that directory information may be released. (EC § 49073)

6) Defines "directory information" as one or more of the following: student's name, address, telephone number, date of birth, email address, major field of study, participation in officially recognized activities and sports, weight and height of members of athletics teams, dates of attendance, degrees and awards received, and the most recent previous public or private school attended by the student. (EC § 49061)

This bill:

1) Authorizes directory information of a student identified as a homeless child or youth to be disclosed to facilitate an eye examination by a nonprofit eye examination provider or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools, unless the parent or student accorded parental rights has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical examination.

2) Requires that directory information disclosed pursuant to # 1 only be disclosed for the purpose of facilitating an eye examination by a nonprofit eye examination provider, or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools.

3) Provides that reports made to a parent, legal guardian, or caregiver of a student experiencing homelessness about a student defect identified from an eye examination facilitated by a nonprofit eye examination provider, or a free oral health assessment hosted by schools, should be made by alternative

communication channels rather than mail, when possible.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill*. According to the author, "AB 677 will increase access to on-campus vision and dental screenings for unhoused students by exempting these youth—solely for the purpose of these screenings—from requirements that prohibit the sharing of their directory information. This information is necessary for these screenings to be conducted by providers; however, due to current restrictions in statute, it cannot be released without written parental consent, which is often difficult to obtain in the case of unhoused students. This leads to the underutilization of on-campus vision and dental screenings amongst these vulnerable youth. AB 677 removes a barrier that will allow unhoused students to access the essential vision and dental screenings they need and deserve."

2) *Opt-in vs. opt-out*. Existing law prohibits the release of directory information if a parent has notified the school district that the information is not to be released (opt-out), and also prohibits the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless unless a parent or student with parental rights has provided written consent that directory information may be released (opt-in).

   This bill authorizes the release of directory information regarding a student identified as homeless specifically for the purposes of facilitating an eye exam or oral health assessment unless the parent has provided written notice to the school that they do not consent to the physical exam (opt-out). This bill aligns opt-out policies for both housed and unhoused students regarding the release of directory information for the purposes of conducting vision and dental screenings.

3) *Vision screening and oral health assessment currently required for school enrollment*. Existing law requires a parent or guardian of a first-grade student, within the first 90 days of the school year, to provide a certificate, signed by a medical professional, documenting that the child has received a health check-up within the last 18 months (Health and Safety Code § 124085). The health examination required for school entry includes a vision screening, completed by the child's regular healthcare provider. The parent or guardian may submit a signed waiver stating they are unwilling or unable to obtain a health screening for the child. School districts are required to exclude children from school for up to five days, if the parent has not provided the health documentation or

waiver. In the case of students experiencing homelessness, a school is required to immediately enroll the student even if they do not have required documents such as required health records, pursuant to both federal and state law.

Existing law requires a student to provide proof of having received an oral health assessment by a dental health professional within the 12 months prior to initial enrollment (EC § 49452.8). Parents or guardians may be excused from this requirement if the dental assessment could not be completed due to an undue financial burden, lack of access to a dentist, or if the parent does not consent to such an assessment. Existing law requires that homeless students be immediately enrolled regardless of whether they have required health records.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Los Angeles Unified School District (Source)
Alameda County Office of Education
American Academy of Pediatrics, California
Association of California School Administrators
California Coalition for Youth
California County Superintendents
California Dental Association
California School Boards Association
Health Net and its Affiliated Companies
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Santa Clara County School Boards Association
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 4/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, 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, 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: Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Chen, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Lynn Lorber / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/27/25 15:57:29

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 709
Author: Jeff Gonzalez (R)
Introduced: 2/14/25
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Seyarto, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/8/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Sustainable Groundwater Management Act: groundwater sustainability plans

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill specifies that groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) that have developed multiple groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) for a basin are not prohibited for amending the coordination agreement following the Department of Water Resources' (DWR) assessment of the GSPs.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law, under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA):

1) Requires high- or medium-priority basins that are subject to critical conditions of overdraft to be managed by a GSP or coordinated GSPs by January 31, 2020, and requires all other high- or medium-priority basins to be managed under a GSP or coordinated GSPs by January 31, 2022. (Water Code (Wat. C.) §10720.7(a)).

2) Authorizes a local agency or combination of local agencies overlying a groundwater basin to decide to become a GSA for that basin. (Wat. C. §10723)

3) Requires a GSA of each medium- and high-priority basin to develop and implement a GSP to meet the sustainability goal of implementing one or more

GSPs that achieve sustainable groundwater management, as specified. (Wat. C. §§10721, 10727).

4) Requires a GSA, upon adoption of a GSP, to submit the GSP to DWR for review. (Wat. C. §10733.4(a)).

5) If GSAs develop multiple GSPs for a basin, require the GSPs not be submitted until the entire basin is covered by GSPs. When the entire basin is covered by GSPs, the GSAs are required to jointly submit to DWR (1) the GSPs, (2) an explanation of how the GSPs implemented together satisfy SGMA for the entire basin, and (3) a copy of the coordination agreement between the GSAs to ensure the coordinated implementation of the GSPs. (Wat C. §10733.4(b)).

6) Requires DWR to post the GSP on its internet website upon receipt and provide 60 days for persons to submit comments to DWR about the plan. (Wat. C. §10733.4(c)).

7) Requires DWR to evaluate the GSP within two years of its submission and to issue an assessment of the plan. (Wat. C. §10733.4(d)).

This bill specifies that GSAs that have developed multiple GSPs for a basin are not prohibited for amending the coordination agreement following DWR's assessment of the plans.

Background

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). In contrast to other environmental legislation, California was the last state in the West to adopt a statewide groundwater management system. In 2014, the Legislature passed and then Governor Brown signed SB 1168 (Pavley, Chapter 346, Statutes of 2014), SB 1319 (Pavley, Chapter 348, Statutes of 2014) and AB 1739 (Dickinson, Chapter 347, Statutes of 2014). Those three bills established SGMA, and made other related changes to the California Water Code. Together, those bills provide a framework for sustainable groundwater management, with the goal of managing and using groundwater in a manner that can be maintained during the planning and implementation horizon without causing undesirable results.

Under SGMA, a local agency or combination of local agencies overlying a groundwater basin may become a GSA for that basin. A GSA has broad management authority of the groundwater basin or basins under their jurisdiction including defining the basin's or basins' sustainable yield, limiting groundwater

extraction, and imposing fees. GSAs are required to consider the interests of all beneficial uses and users of groundwater, including, but not limited to, holders of overlying groundwater rights, municipal well operators, public water systems, local land use planning agencies, environmental users of groundwater, surface water uses, the federal government, California Native American tribes, and disadvantaged communities. GSAs are authorized to perform any act necessary to carry out the purposes of SGMA, including adopting rules, regulations, and ordinances and developing the GSP.

SGMA requires GSAs in medium- and high-priority groundwater basins, which includes 21 critically overdrafted basins, to develop and implement GSPs. GSAs may customize their GSPs to their regional economic and environmental circumstances. If there are multiple GSPs within a basin, the GSAs are required to coordinate with each other to ensure that the GSPs utilize the same data and methodologies and to submit a coordination agreement between the GSA to DWR along with the GSPs. Thus, while SGMA provides for the sustainable management of groundwater basins, it does so by empowering local agencies to manage groundwater basins, while minimizing state intervention.

There are currently more than 260 GSAs formed in 140 basins.

DWR's SGMA Portal. The SGMA Portal is a tool that gives the public the ability to view and download information related to GSAs, GSPs and alternatives to GSPs, adjudicated areas, and basin boundary modifications. Coordinated agreements are also posted onto the SGMA Portal.

Comments

It is unclear if GSAs are currently having issues amending their coordinated agreements or have concern about their ability to amend a coordinated agreement. According to the author's office, the intent of this proactive bill is to provide clarity in this area. However, according to the SGMA Portal, seven coordination agreements have been submitted to DWR: (1) Kern County, (2) Madera, (3) Kings, (4) Kaweah, (5) Tule, (6) Delta-Mendota, and (7) Santa Ynez River Valley. Of those, amended coordinated agreements have been submitted for Kaweah and Kern, implying that GSAs are already submitting amended coordinated agreements to DWR.

According to the author's office, the author wants to make sure there is absolutely clarity that GSAs maintain this authority.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "SGMA requires continued cooperation and coordination to advance a more sustainable groundwater system for California's agricultural community, residents, and economy. California's laws must ensure flexibility for those parties that are responsible for groundwater sustainability plans to work together – especially those under coordinated agreements. Providing the legal and statutory authority to amend their coordination agreements will foster adaptive management strategies to address any deficiencies or necessary changes in internal governance. This bill is important to continue advancing collaborative partnership efforts within various regions and groundwater basins to manage a critical resource such as groundwater sustainably."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/8/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, 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, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Boerner, Carrillo, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Wallis

Prepared by: Genevieve Wong / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/11/25 15:57:08

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 711
Author: Chen (R)
Amended: 5/6/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/15/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Civil Actions: shorthand reporters

SOURCE: California Court Reporters Association
Deposition Reporters Association of California

DIGEST: This bill requires a party to include, as part of its meet-and-confer declaration submitted in support of a discovery motion, whether the parties have met and conferred regarding the retention of a certified shorthand reporter for the hearing on the motion.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires, in a civil case, an official reporter or official reporter pro tempore of the superior court to take down in shorthand all testimony, objections made, rulings of the court, exceptions taken, arguments of the attorneys to the jury, and statements and remarks made and oral instructions given by the judge or judicial officer, on the order of the court or at the request of a party. (Code Civil Procedure (Civ. Proc.), § 269.)

2) Establishes the Civil Discovery Act, which governs discovery in civil cases. (Code Civ. Proc., pt. 4, tit. 4, §§ 2016.010 et seq.)

3) Requires a party filing a motion pursuant to the Civil Discovery Act to file a meet-and-confer declaration in support of the motion; the declaration must state facts showing a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue presented by the motion. (Code Civ. Proc., § 2016.040.)

This bill:

1) Requires that the meet-and-confer declaration filed in support of a discovery motion to include whether the moving party has met and conferred with the subject of the motion, including through an electronic communication, regarding the retention of a certified shorthand reporter to report the hearing on the motion.

2) Provides that 1) does not prevent the retention of a certified shorthand reporter.

Comments

Only a licensed court reporter can take a record of a court proceeding. A party wishing to have their proceeding recorded by a court reporter can do so in one of two ways. If the court has an official court reporter available to take down the proceedings, the party can request that the court reporter take the record of their proceeding. If the court does not have an official court reporter available, a party can retain a freelance licensed court reporter to serve as an official pro tempore reporter. According to the author and sponsors of this bill, however, sometimes multiple parties to a case each retain a court reporter, which results in court reporters being unavailable for matters and parties expending unnecessary funds.

This bill is intended to help parties avoid double-booking freelance court reporters by requiring a party, as part of its meet-and-confer declaration in support of a discovery motion, to state whether the moving party has conferred with the opposing party regarding the retention of a certified shorthand reporter to report the hearing on the motion. This bill specifies that the party can accomplish the court reporter meet-and-confer through electronic communication, which will permit parties to more easily meet and confer on this point.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

California Court Reporters Association (co-source)

Deposition Reporters Association of California (co-source)
SEIU California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the California Court Reporters Association:

> As every working court reporter knows, it is common for attorneys to double-book freelance court reporters for the same hearing or trial in court, resulting in court reporters needlessly being unavailable to be retained by other attorneys for other matters for an entire workday.
>
> AB 711 simply requires counsel to meet and confer regarding whether they are retaining duplicate reporters for the same matter prior to any court appearance. This is a common-sense measure that will benefit litigants, lawyers, and the courts with no cost to the state's General Fund.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/15/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, 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, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Arambula, Castillo, Lee, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Solache, Stefani, Valencia

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/27/25 15:57:30

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 870
Author: Hadwick (R)
Amended: 4/21/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Menjivar, Valladares, Durazo, Grove, Limón, Padilla, Richardson, Rubio, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Children's Services Program: county designation

SOURCE: Alpine County Board of Supervisors

DIGEST: This bill allows counties with populations under 2,000 to designate another county to administer its California Children's Services (CCS) program so long as the other county agrees, abides by the CCS program standards, and neither county is a "Whole Child Model" county that provides CCS services through Medi-Cal managed care plans.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes CCS, administered by the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), under which individuals under the age of 21 who have eligible medical conditions established in regulation and meet financial requirements, are eligible to receive medically necessary services and treatments. [Health and Safety Code (HSC) §123800, et seq.]

2) Authorizes DHCS to establish a "Whole Child Model" (WCM) program for children enrolled in a Medi-Cal managed care plan who are also enrolled in CCS in 33 specified counties. [Welfare & Institutions Code §14094.4, et seq.]

3) Requires each county board of supervisors to designate a county agency to administer the CCS program. Permits counties with populations under 200,000 to administer the county program independently or jointly with DHCS. Requires counties with populations over 200,000 to administer the county program independently. [HSC §123850]

4) Requires the DHCS director to establish standards relating to the local administration and minimum services counties must offer in the CCS program. [HSC §123850]

This bill allows counties with populations under 2,000 to designate another county to administer the CCS program so long as: the other county agrees to the designation; the other county meets the required CCS program standards; and, neither county is a WCM county.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

> Alpine County is the smallest county in California with a total population of roughly 1,200 residents. There is a single Public Health Nurse who manages their CCS program; when the nurse is sick or misses work for any reason, the program comes to a halt as no one else in the county carries the credentials to administer the CCS program. This leaves sick and/or physically handicapped children to go without medically-necessary services until the employee is back to work. This bill would allow neighboring El Dorado County to operate Alpine County's CCS program.

Background

CCS. The CCS program provides diagnostic and treatment services, medical case management, and physical and occupational therapy health care services to children under 21 years of age with CCS-eligible conditions (e.g., severe genetic diseases, chronic medical conditions, infectious diseases producing major sequelae, and traumatic injuries) from families unable to afford catastrophic health care costs. A child eligible for CCS must be a resident of California, have a CCS-eligible condition, and generally be income eligible. According to March 2025 data, approximately 185,000 children are in CCS; of those, roughly 93% are also in Medi-Cal and 7% are in the CCS-only program.

CCS "carve out" and WCM. Children who are eligible for both Medi-Cal and the CCS program are enrolled in a Medi-Cal plan and receive CCS-covered services through the CCS program on a fee-for-service basis. SB 586 (Hernandez, Chapter 625, Statutes of 2015) authorized DHCS to establish WCM in 21 counties, in which both Medi-Cal and most CCS services would be covered and paid for by the Medi-Cal plan. SB 586 also required DHCS to create a statewide WCM stakeholder advisory group to inform implementation, as well as, the development of the monitoring and evaluation process. AB 118 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 42, Statutes of 2023) authorized the expansion of WCM to 12 additional counties starting January 1, 2025.

CCS program administration. Current law requires counties with over 200,000 residents to administer their own CCS program, and allows counties with under 200,000 residents to either independently administer their CCS program or do so jointly with DHCS. This bill would allow a county with fewer than 2,000 residents to designate another county to administer the program so long as neither county is not a WCM county. Alpine County is currently the only county in California with fewer than 2,000 residents, and neither it nor neighboring El Dorado County are WCM counties. Additionally, Alpine county does not currently have any children enrolled in the CCS program.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/19/25)

Alpine County Board of Supervisors (source)
California State Association of Counties
County Health Executives Association of California
Health Officers Association of California
Rural County Representatives of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is sponsored by the Alpine County Board of Supervisors who write that Alpine County is the state's smallest county, consisting largely of federal land, no incorporated cities, and 85 county employees. Alpine County's current CCS program has been administered with a single public health nurse. When this employee is not available, there is no one to manage the program in her absence, as nursing credentials are required to process and

coordinate care for recipients. This bill would allow Alpine County to enter into an agreement with a neighboring county to administer its CCS program to facilitate the most timely and effective care for CCS recipients. Current law does not allow this flexibility. As the state's smallest county, Alpine County requires an alternative approach to ensure consistent and quality care for CCS-eligible children.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, 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, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Chen, McKinnor, Papan

Prepared by: Jen Flory / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
6/19/25 12:29:23

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 952
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 952
Author: Elhawary (D)
Introduced: 2/20/25
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Youth Offender Program Camp Pilot Program

SOURCE: Initiate Justice Action

DIGEST: This bill requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to make the Youth Offender Program Camp Pilot Program permanent, and authorizes the Secretary of the department to expand the program to include some or all of California Conservation Camps.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes CDCR and the state's prisons. (Government (Gov.) Code, § 12383, Subdivision (subd.) (a); Pen. Code, §§ 5000, 5003.)

2) Establishes the California Conservation Camp program to provide for the training and use of incarcerated individuals and wards assigned to the camps to perform public conservation projects. (Public (Pub.) Resources Code, § 4951.)

3) Defines "California Conservation Camps" or "camps" as "any camps now or hereafter established, as provided by law, for the purpose of receiving prisoners

committed to the custody of the Director of Corrections and wards committed to the Director of the Youth Authority, and in which the work projects performed by the inmates or wards are supervised by employees of the department." (Pub. Resources Code, § 4952.)

This bill:

1) States that it is the intent of the Legislature to make the Youth Offender Program Camp Pilot Program within the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation permanent.

2) Requires the Secretary of CDCR to make permanent the Youth Offender Program Camp Pilot Program. Authorizes, at the discretion of the secretary, expansion of the program to include some or all of California Conservation Camps.

3) Provides that "California Conservation Camps" has the same meaning as in Section 4952 of the Public Resources Code.

4) Includes legislative findings and declarations.

Background

CDCR, in cooperation with Cal Fire and the Los Angeles County Fire Department, jointly operates 35 conservation camps, commonly referred to as fire camps, in 25 counties across the state. Conservation Camp Program participants support state, local, and federal government agencies as they respond to emergencies such as fires, floods, and other natural or manmade disasters, and complete community service projects when not assigned to an emergency. All fire camps are minimum-security facilities which are overseen by CDCR employees. Participants are supervised by Cal Fire staff when responding to a wildfire or working on a conservation project. (See <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/facility-locator/conservation-camps/faq-conservation-fire-camp-program/ .)

Incarcerated individuals participating in fire camps receive the same entry-level training as Cal Fire's seasonal firefighters as well as ongoing training from Cal Fire throughout their time in the program. An incarcerated person must volunteer for the fire camp program, and some individuals are ineligible for fire camp assignment based on their convictions, including convictions for sex offenses, arson, and escape with force or violence. (https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/facility-

locator/conservation-camps/faq-conservation-fire-camp-program/.)

Individuals who volunteer for fire camp must complete Cal Fire's Firefighting Training Program, and program participants become certified wildland firefighters after completing tis training. (<https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/facility-locator/conservation-camps/faq-conservation-fire-camp-program/)

The two-year Youth Offender Program (YOP) Camp Pilot Program was established in August 2023 at the Growlersburg Conservation Camp in Georgetown. The pilot program is intended to expand access to camp programs to individuals 25 years old and younger, and those programs are designed to help participants develop job skills and lead to self-improvement.

Camp participants receive wildland firefighter training as well as educational and rehabilitative programming. The program provides additional hand crew members for emergency response to fires, floods, and other disasters in the state.

YOP candidates are required to be between 18-25 years old and possess either a high school diploma, GED, or have enough time left to serve to obtain a degree at camp. The pilot program allows some individuals to participate who are currently ineligible for the conservation camp program on a case-by-case basis. Applicants who have been convicted of rape, lewd acts with a child under 14, a felony punishable by death or imprisonment for life, a sex offense requiring sex offender registration, escape within the previous 10 years, or arson are automatically disqualified.

The pilot program initially had 17 participants, and following its success at the Growlersburg Conservation Camp, the pilot program expanded to Pine Grove Conservation Camp. Throughout its first year, the pilot program maintained two full YOP crews and ensured Growlersburg operated with five fully staffed crews.

The pilot program is set to expire later this year. This bill makes the YOP pilot program permanent and authorizes its expansion.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

Initiate Justice Action (source)
ACLU California Action
California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

California Forestry Association
California Public Defenders Association
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Courage California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Prosecutors Alliance of California
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
The Forestry and Fire Recruitment Program
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
Vera Institute of Justice

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, 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, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Chen, McKinnor, Papan

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
6/24/25 16:35:55

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 962
Author: Hoover (R)
Amended: 6/13/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Laird
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil safety: comprehensive school safety plans: use of smartphones

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill authorizes a prohibition on smartphone use of a student in the case of emergency or in response to a perceived threat of danger, if that circumstance is explicitly addressed in a comprehensive school safety plan.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires the governing body of a school district, county office of education (COE), or charter school to develop and adopt a policy by July 1, 2026, to limit or prohibit the use of smartphones by students while they are at school or under the supervision of a school employee, and to update the policy every five years. (Education Code (EC) § 48901.7(a))

2) Prohibits an LEA's adopted smartphone use policy from restricting a student's use of a smartphone under any of the following circumstances:

   a) In the case of an emergency, or in response to a perceived threat of danger;

b) When a teacher or administrator grants permission to a student to possess or use a smartphone, subject to any reasonable limitation imposed by that teacher or administrator;

c) When a licensed physician and surgeon determines that the possession or use of a smartphone is necessary for the health or well-being of the student; or

d) When the possession or use of a smartphone is required in a student's individualized education program (IEP). (EC § 48901.7(b))

3) Requires each school district or COE to be responsible for the overall development of all CSSPs for its schools operating kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12. (EC § 32281)

4) Requires that the CSSP include an assessment of the current status of school crime committed on school campuses and at school-related functions and identification of appropriate strategies and programs to provide or maintain a high level of school safety and address the school's procedures for complying with existing laws related to school safety, including child abuse reporting procedures; disaster procedures; an earthquake emergency procedure system; policies regarding pupils who commit specified acts that would lead to suspension or expulsion; procedures to notify teachers of dangerous pupils; a discrimination and harassment policy; the provisions of any schoolwide dress code; procedures for safe ingress and egress of pupils, parents, and school employees to and from school; a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning; and rules and procedures on school discipline. (EC § 32282)

5) Requires the CSSP to be submitted annually to the school district or COE for approval and requires a school district or COE to notify the California Department of Education (CDE) by October 15 of every year of any school that is not in compliance. (EC § 32288)

This bill authorizes a prohibition on smartphone use of a student in the case of emergency or in response to a perceived threat of danger, if that circumstance is explicitly addressed in a comprehensive school safety plan.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill.* According to the author, "AB 3216 was signed into law in 2024 requiring all schools to adopt a student smartphone policy limiting their

use during the school day by July 2026. With this forthcoming requirement, there is anticipated confusion in regards to any potential conflicts between student smart phone policies and school safety plans when responding to an emergency. AB 962 would provide that unless a school's Comprehensive Safety Plan includes language that addresses student smartphone use during a school emergency, the student smartphone access requirements set by law in 2024 must apply. Eliminating this confusion will ensure smooth coordination amongst emergency responders (police, fire, EMTs) and school officials, and further protect the collective safety of students, teachers, and administrators."

2) *Comprehensive School Safety Plans.* LEAs, COEs, and charter schools serving students in grades kindergarten through 12 are required to develop and maintain a CSSP designed to address campus risks, prepare for emergencies, and create a safe, secure learning environment for students and school personnel.

   The law requires designated stakeholders to annually engage in a systematic planning process to develop strategies and policies to prevent and respond to potential incidents involving emergencies, natural and other disasters, hate crimes, violence, active assailants/intruders, bullying and cyberbullying, discrimination, and harassment, child abuse and neglect, discipline, suspension and expulsion, and other safety aspects.

   The law requires that each school update and adopt its CSSP by March 1 annually. Before an LEA, COE, or charter school adopts their CSSP, the schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must hold a public meeting at the schoolsite to allow members of the public to express an opinion about the school safety plan. The schoolsite council or school safety planning committee must also notify the local mayor and representatives of the following:

   - The local school employee organization.
   - The parent organization at the school site, including the parent-teacher association and parent-teacher clubs.
   - Each teacher organization at the school site.
   - The student body government.

- All persons who have indicated they want to be notified.

Once the public meeting has been held and the CSSP is adopted, the school must submit its CSSP to its respective LEA or COE for approval. LEAs and COEs must annually notify the CDE by October 15 of any schools that have not complied with requirements. Statute also requires the CDE to develop and post on its website best practices for reviewing and approving school safety plans.

3) *School smartphone use policies.* Since the passage of AB 272 (Muratsuchi, Chapter 42, Statutes of 2019), LEAs have had the explicit authorization to adopt policies to limit or prohibit student use of smartphones while they are on a schoolsite or are under the supervision of an LEA employee. Alongside this authorization, AB 272 also established circumstances under which a pupil *shall not* be prohibited from possessing or using a smartphone. These circumstances are as follows:

   - In the case of an emergency, or in response to a perceived threat of danger.

   - When a teacher or administrator of the school district, COE, or charter school grants permission to a pupil to possess or use a smartphone, subject to any reasonable limitation imposed by that teacher or administrator.

   - When a licensed physician and surgeon determines that the possession or use of a smartphone is necessary for the health or well-being of the pupil.

   - When the possession or use of a smartphone is required in a pupil's IEP.

   With the passage of AB 3216 (Hoover, Chapter 500, Statutes of 2024), this authorization afforded to LEAs became a requirement, thus requiring the governing boards of LEAs, to develop and adopt a smartphone use policy by July 1, 2026, and update that policy every five years thereafter.

4) *Mixed messaging.* This bill aims to address a point of confusion that has arisen as LEAs prepare to adopt smartphone use policies in compliance with the new requirement. According to this bill's proponent, the Association of California Schools Administrators:

> The CSSP, developed in collaboration with school communities and emergency responders, often includes policy limiting student smartphone use during emergencies unless at the direction of school personnel. This is for several reasons including mitigating the spread of misinformation as well as protecting against location sharing that could inadvertently increase the risk for a student and those around them.
>
> .. [C]urrent law related to student smartphone use policies provides some exceptions to restricting smartphone use, including in the case of an emergency, or in response to a threat of danger. Our members have expressed concerns about potential inconsistencies with their CSSP and we believe addressing the issue now will help ensure a more seamless policy adoption and revision process.

Examples of CSSP provisions that address smartphone use during emergencies include the following:

> While in the area under threat, all cell phones, beepers and hand-held radios should be turned off since many explosive devices can be triggered by radio transmissions. Bomb threat experts recommend no radio transmission within 500 feet of a device, or suspected location of a device. Use of any electronic device within the 500' restriction zone must be cleared in advance with the Incident Commander.
>
> In the event of an emergency, the safety and well-being of the students is the top priority. In certain emergency situations, students will be allowed access to their cell phones, and staff will ensure that students can use their devices when it is deemed safe and necessary.
>
> This measure (smartphone use) is intended to allow students to communicate with their families to give and receive important updates. Our staff is trained to assess emergency situations and will guide students appropriately to ensure that the use of cell phones does not interfere with safety protocols or emergency procedures.

This bill addresses this conflict by establishing that if a comprehensive school safety plan has provisions that address smartphone use during emergency situations or incidences of perceived threats, then those provisions serve as a permitted exception to the mandated access provisions under existing law.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/12/25)

Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials
California IT in Education
California School Nurses Organization
Small School Districts Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/12/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, 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, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Chen, Gallagher, Harabedian, Lackey

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/16/25 9:10:00

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 990
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 990
Author: Hadwick (R)
Introduced: 2/20/25
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Dahle, Hurtado, Menjivar, Pérez
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez, Padilla

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Public water systems: emergency notification plan

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill authorizes and encourages a public water system, when updating an emergency notification plan, to provide notification to water users in their preferred language, if resources are available.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

1) Establishes the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) that requires drinking water to meet specified standards for contamination as set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). (42 United States Code § 300(f) et seq.)

Existing state law:

1) Requires, pursuant to the California SDWA, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to regulate drinking water and to enforce the federal SDWA and other regulations. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 116275, et seq.)

2) Declares that it is the established policy of the state that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. (Water Code (WC) § 106.3)

3) Establishes, under the California SDWA, the following definitions:

    a) "Maximum contaminant level" (MCL) means the maximum permissible level of a contaminant in water;
    b) "Primary drinking water standards" means:

        i) MCLs that may have an adverse effect on human health;
        ii) Specific treatment techniques adopted by the State Water Board in lieu of MCLs; or,
        iii) The monitoring and reporting requirements specified in regulations, adopted by the State Water Board, that pertain to MCLs;

    c) "Person" means an individual, corporation, company, association, partnership, limited liability company, municipality, public utility, or other public body or institution, including the United States to the extent authorized by federal law; and,
    d) "Public water system" means a system for the provision of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances that has 15 or more service connections or regularly serves an average of at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days out of the year. (HSC § 116275)

4) Prohibits a person from operating a public water system without an emergency notification plan that has been submitted to and approved by the State Water Board. (HSC § 116460)

5) Requires the emergency notification plan to provide for immediate notice to the public water system's customers of any significant rise in bacterial count, or other failure to comply with any primary drinking water standard that represents an imminent danger to the health of water users. (HSC § 116460)

6) Authorizes and encourages a public water system, when updating an emergency notification plan, to provide notification to water users by means of other communication technology, including, but not limited to, text messages, email, or social media. (HSC § 116460)

7) Requires water systems to provide public notice in response to any one of several events, including occurrence of a microbial disease outbreak or violations of specified MCLs. The public notice requirements are specified in three tiers and include language content requirements as follows:

    a) Tier 1 public notices are to be provided in English, Spanish, and the language spoken by any non-English-speaking group exceeding 10% of the persons served by a public water system. Otherwise, for any non-English speaking group that exceeds 1,000 water users, notices must include information regarding the importance of the notice and contact information to access translated materials. (California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 64401.71, 64463.1, and 64465(c)); and,
    b) Tier 2 and 3 public notices are to be provided in English and contain information regarding the importance of the notice or contact information where water users may access translated materials for any size Spanish-speaking population and any other non-English speaking group that exceeds 1,000 residents or 10% of the residents served by the water system. (CCR § 64401.72, 64401.73, 64463.4, 64463.7, and 64465(c))

This bill:

1) Authorizes and encourages a public water system, when updating an emergency notification plan, to provide notification to water users in their preferred language, if resources are available.

2) Prohibits a permit, variance, or exemption from being issued or amended until an emergency notification plan has been approved by the State Water Board.

Background

1) *Drinking water contamination.* While most drinking water in California meets requirements for health and safety, surface waters and aquifers used for drinking water can be contaminated by various chemicals, microbes, and radionuclides. According to the U.S. EPA, common sources of drinking water contaminants include industry, agriculture, waste, and natural sources. The U.S. EPA reports that there is a broad range of health effects associated with exposure to drinking water contaminants. Ingestion or exposure to pathogens at sufficient doses can result in gastrointestinal illness with symptoms such as diarrhea, nausea, stomach cramps, and vomiting. Exposure to higher doses of chemicals, metals, or radionuclides through drinking water can produce biological responses, toxicological effects, and more severe health impacts

including cancer, developmental or reproductive effects, neurological changes, and organ damage.

2) *The regulation of drinking water contamination.* To regulate drinking water contaminants that pose significant health risks, the State Water Board can begin the process by requesting that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) establish a public health goal (PHG). PHGs are concentrations of drinking water contaminants that pose no significant health risk if consumed for a lifetime, based on current risk assessment principles, practices, and methods. Once OEHHA establishes a PHG, the State Water Board determines whether an MCL—a legally enforceable primary drinking water standard that applies to public water systems—should be considered. If the State Water Board determines that an MCL should be considered, it then conducts an in-depth risk management analysis and, if appropriate, initiates the regulatory process for adopting an MCL, enforceable under the California SDWA.

3) *Wildfires and drinking water contamination.* According to the California Air Resources Board, the frequency and severity of wildfires have been increasing, both in the state and all over the world. Since 1950, the area burned by California wildfires each year has been growing, as spring and summer temperatures increase and spring snowmelt occurs earlier. CalFire data show that four out of the five most destructive wildfires in California history happened in just the last 10 years. In 2025, the Eaton and Palisades fires in Los Angeles County destroyed over 16,000 structures and burned 38,000 acres combined; in 2018, the Camp Fire in Butte County destroyed nearly 19,000 structures and burned 153,000 acres; and in 2017, the Tubbs Fire in Napa and Sonoma counties destroyed more than 5,500 structures and burned nearly 37,000 acres.

   According to research reviewed by the Union of Concerned Scientists in a 2021 brief, "Wildfire and water supply in California", the Tubbs and Camp fires were the first known instances where widespread drinking water contamination was discovered in drinking water distribution systems after wildfire events. The brief describes how wildfires can negatively impact drinking water quality and infrastructure through multiple pathways, including the following:

   - Loss of pressure in water service lines can allow soil and contaminants, including bacteria, to enter the distribution system;

- Subsequent rainfall on burn scars can wash contaminants and sediment downstream into reservoirs, which can clog water system filters or fuel algal blooms; and,
- Burned or melted water infrastructure can release dangerous levels of volatile organic compounds, like benzene, into drinking water supplies.

Among other things, the brief recommends that officials ensure water safety communications and alerts are translated into locally accessible languages.

4) *The need for emergency notification.* State law prohibits a public water system from operating without an emergency notification plan, which must be approved by the State Water Board. These plans contain emergency contact phone numbers for water system personnel and a description of the system's public notification methods. The plan must provide for immediate notice to customers, in the event that there is a significant rise in bacterial counts or other failures to comply with MCLs that pose an imminent threat to human health. Ensuring that public notification is accessible has been of interest to the Legislature. AB 3090 (Maienschein, Chapter 68, Statutes of 2024) authorized public water systems to provide notification to water users by various means of technology, including text messages and social media. This bill addresses potential language barriers water users may face when receiving information from public water systems about water contamination and any related threat to public health.

Comments

1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, "During an emergency, every second counts, and being notified in your preferred language could make all the difference. As California becomes increasingly more diverse and disaster prone, it is important that we do more to promote public safety and improve communications in an emergency. In some California counties, there are dozens of primary languages spoken. This bill would encourage public water systems, if resources are available, to update their emergency notification plan to include notifying users in their preferred language. AB 990 will improve emergency response and increase public safety."

2) *California's language landscape.* California's population consists of a very diverse language landscape. There is an estimated 200 languages spoken across the state. According to the 2015 Limited English Proficient (LEP) Language Map, nearly 20% of the population is LEP and the top five listed languages

spoken are Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Korean. Current regulations require public notification of certain specified violations and threats to be provided in English, Spanish, and any non-English speaking group exceeding 10% of the persons served by the public water system. Some public notices (Tier 2 and 3) are required to provide information in the respective language regarding the importance or contact information to access translated materials. For any population non-English or -Spanish-speaking population, especially those populations with less than 1,000 water users, access to translated information may be difficult. This bill encourages access to translated information regardless of population size, if resources are available. All Californians deserve to know about the safety of their drinking water, and this bill would encourage inclusive access to that knowledge.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 3090 (Maienschein, Chapter 68, Statutes of 2024) authorized and encouraged a public water system, when updating its emergency notification plan, to provide notification to water users by means of various technology.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/24/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, 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, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Chen, Gallagher, Harabedian, Lackey

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
6/27/25 11:10:48

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1008
Author: Addis (D)
Amended: 3/24/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 14-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Alcoholic beverages: licenses: County of San Luis Obispo

SOURCE: County of San Luis Obispo

DIGEST: This bill authorizes the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) to issue no more than 10 new original on-sale general licenses for bona fide public eating places in the County of San Luis Obispo, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Department of ABC and grants it exclusive authority to administer the provisions of the ABC Act in accordance with laws enacted by the Legislature. This involves licensing individuals and businesses associated with the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic beverages in this State and the collection of license fees.

2) Provides that the Department of ABC must deny an application for a license if issuance would create a law enforcement problem, or if issuance would result

in, or add to, an undue concentration of licenses in the area where the license is desired. However, for liquor stores and other specified retail licenses, the Department of ABC is authorized to issue a license if the respective local government determines that public convenience or necessity would be served by granting the license.

3) Caps the number of new on-sale and off-sale general licenses issued by the Department of ABC. The ratios are one on-sale general license for each 2,000 persons in the county in which the premises are situated and one off-sale general license for each 2,500 persons.

4) Defines an "on-sale" license as authorizing the sale of all types of alcoholic beverages: namely, beer, wine and distilled spirits, for consumption on the premises (such as at a restaurant or bar) and an "off-sale" license as authorizing the sale of all types of alcoholic beverages for consumption off the premises in original, sealed containers.

5) Defines "bona fide public eating place" to mean a place which is regularly and in a bona fide manner used and kept open for the serving of meals to guests for compensation and which has suitable kitchen facilities connected therewith, containing conveniences for cooking an assortment of foods which may be required for ordinary meals, the kitchen of which must be kept in a sanitary condition with the proper amount of refrigeration for keeping of food on said premises and must comply with all the regulations of the local Department of Health.

This bill:

1) Authorizes the Department of ABC to issue no more than a total of 10 new original on-sale general licenses for bona fide public eating places in the County of San Luis Obispo, as specified.

2) Prohibits the Department of ABC from issuing more than five of these licenses per year.

3) Provides that this bill does not prohibit a person that currently holds a valid on-sale general license for seasonal business from applying for an original on-sale general license.

4) Prohibits a license issued under this bill from being transferred from one county to another or from being transferred to any premises not qualifying under the provisions of this bill.

5) Provides that no license issued under this bill shall be sold or transferred for a price greater than the original fee paid by the seller.

6) Authorizes the Department of ABC to designate licenses issued by the provisions of this bill as on-sale general for special use.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "California's current system of allocating alcohol licenses based on population growth creates challenges for communities with tourism-based economies like San Luis Obispo County. Despite the fact that the county's population growth has remained steady, tourism has grown exponentially, driving an increased demand for alcohol licenses. When alcohol licenses are unavailable, it creates an unregulated secondary market where licenses sell for hundreds of thousands of dollars. This prevents existing restaurants from expanding their offerings and deters new restaurants and commercial developments from opening their doors. AB 1008 will alleviate this problem by authorizing up to 10 additional on-sale general licenses to be issued in the county, driving job growth, increased tax revenue, and the continued development of the tourism industry."

Type 47 Alcohol License. An on-sale general eating-place license, or Type 47 license, authorizes the consumption of beer, wine, and distilled spirits for consumption on the licensed premises. The licensee is required to operate and maintain the licensed premises as a bona fide eating-place, which must include suitable kitchen facilities. The licensee must make actual and substantial sales of meals for consumption on the premises. Generally, this means that the business must generate at least 51% of all gross sales from food. As such, a Type 47 license is one of the most common types of liquor licenses for restaurants in California.

Some common businesses that use the Type 47 license include full-service restaurants, hotels and resorts, bowling alleys, golf courses and other eating establishments. As of March 19, 2025, there were approximately 16,175 on-sale general (Type 47) licenses statewide.

Alcohol License Limitation. Existing law provides for a limitation on the number of new on-sale general licenses that may be issued in a given year by the

Department of ABC based on the population growth of the county in which the licensed premises are located. The ratio is one on-sale general license for each 2,000 residents. For example, if a county grows by 10,000 people in a given year, the Department ABC will issue five new licenses in that county.
If the Department of ABC receives more applications than there are licenses available, a public drawing is held. To participate in such a drawing, an applicant must have been a resident of California for at least 90 days prior to the date of the scheduled drawing. Successful drawing participants will be notified that they have 90 days to complete a formal application for their specific premises. The cost of these new licenses is $15,835 each.

Individuals seeking to open a full-service restaurant with a bar or cocktail menu who fail to obtain a liquor license through this process typically must locate an existing licensed owner willing to sell their license. Usually, that is done by contacting a liquor license broker. The cost of obtaining a license on the secondary market is driven by supply and demand and can reach upwards of $300,000 to $400,000 in certain counties, including in the County of San Luis Obispo.

Impact on Cities/Counties. As previously noted, when a county experiences a population growth, the Department of ABC issues additional licenses based on the population growth; currently 2,000 residents per one on-sale license. While this system tends to work for some counties, there are a substantial number of counties where the demand for alcohol licenses far outweighs the current number of alcohol licenses in those counties. The reasons for the lack of licenses are generally a lack of population growth or because of the amount of tourism in the particular county, which results in higher demand for these types of businesses.

For example, in Napa County the number of visitors to Napa continues to increase while the population of the county has not grown. While the majority of visitors to Napa take day trips, more than one million of these visitors spend at least one night in local lodgings. Tourism has therefore become one of the major economic drivers in the region. While legislation in 2017 authorized the issuance of five additional license over a four-year span, demand far outweighs the availability of these licenses. In 2018 for instance, while the Department of ABC issued five new licenses to Napa, there were a total of 38 applications for those five licenses.

According to the Department of ABC, in 2022 there were 31 counties that were eligible for more licenses because of population growth and 27 counties that were not eligible for more licenses because of a lack of population. Of those 27 counties, five counties received a handful of licenses through special legislation.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 395 (Wiener, 2025) authorizes the Department of ABC to issue up to 20 additional new original on-sale general licenses for bona fide public eating places located within a designated hospitality zone, as specified, in the City and County of San Francisco, as specified. (Pending in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee)

AB 445 (Aguiar-Curry, 2025) authorizes the Department of ABC to issue no more than 10 new original on-sale general licenses for bona fide public eating places in the County of Colusa, as specified. (Pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee)

AB 828 (Mark Gonzalez, 2025) authorizes the Department of ABC to issue no more than 12 new original neighborhood-restricted special on-sale general licenses per year to bona fide public eating places located in specified United States Census Bureau census tracts in the County of Los Angeles beginning on January 1, 2026, until a total of 40 new licenses have been issued, as specified. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee)

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

County of San Luis Obispo (Source)
California Distillers Association
City of Paso Robles
Family Winemakers of California
Paso Robles Distillery Trail
Paso Robles and Templeton Chamber of Commerce
Travel Paso
Visit SLO CAL
Woodstock's Pizza Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the County of San Luis Obispo (SLO County), "the current system of allocating licenses based on population creates challenges for local communities with tourism-based economies, like SLO County. Although population growth in SLO County has remained steady, tourism has grown exponentially, and tourist demand is driving an increased demand for alcohol licenses. The problem however, is that no new on-sale general license has not been issued in the county since 2014. This prevents existing restaurants from expanding their offerings to serve alcohol. It also deters new restaurants and commercial developments from opening in the county. San Luis Obispo is proud to sponsor AB 1008, because it provides a much-needed solution. This [bill] will drive job growth, generate tax revenue, and encourage the continued development of the tourism economy."

According to the City of El Paso Robles, "a recent tourism impact study conducted by the City of Paso Robles found that over 2.5 million visitors came to a region in 2023, generating more than $450 million in economic impact. Additionally, one in every five jobs in Paso Robles is directly tied to the hospitality and tourism industry, with the majority of the workforce in San Luis Obispo. By enacting AB 1008, we can increase the availability of licenses, which will facilitate the creation of additional hospitality and tourism jobs, strengthening both the local economy and the vibrant community fabric of Pas Robles and San Luis Obispo County."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/12/25
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, 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, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Stefani

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
6/24/25 16:32:53

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 1114
Author: Ávila Farías (D)
Amended: 6/12/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 14-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Gonzalez, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 5/23/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Emergency vehicles: fee and toll exemptions

SOURCE: California Ambulance Association

DIGEST: This bill (1) adds "Ambulance" to the authorized emergency vehicle agency identification required to be displayed with an exempt license plate, to be exempt from a toll or other charge. Also (2) clarifies that an ambulance corporation chief executive can certify a vehicle was responding to an emergency when billed for a toll.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines "authorized emergency vehicle" to mean:

   a) Any publicly owned and operated ambulance, lifeguard, or lifesaving equipment or any privately owned or operated ambulance licensed by the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to operate in response to emergency calls.

   b) Any publicly owned vehicle operated by any federal, state, or local agency, department, or district employing peace officers, as specified.

c) Any forestry or fire department of any public agency or fire department organized as provided in the Health and Safety Code.

d) Any vehicle owned by the state, or any bridge and highway district, and equipped and used either for fighting fires, or towing or servicing other vehicles, caring for injured persons, or repairing damaged lighting or electrical equipment.

e) Any state-owned vehicle used in responding to emergency fire, rescue, or communications calls and operated either by the Office of Emergency Services or by any public agency or industrial fire department to which the Office of Emergency Services has assigned the vehicle.

f) Any vehicle owned or operated by a federally recognized Indian tribe used in responding to emergency, fire, ambulance, or lifesaving calls, as specified.

g) Any vehicle owned or operated by any department or agency of the United States government when the vehicle is used in responding to emergency fire, ambulance, or lifesaving calls or is actively engaged in law enforcement work.

h) Any vehicle for which an authorized emergency vehicle permit has been issued by the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol

2) Defines “toll facility” to include a toll road, high-occupancy vehicle lane, toll bridge, or a vehicular crossing for which payment of a toll or other charge is required.

3) Defines “urgent response or call” to mean an incident or circumstance that requires an immediate response to a public safety-related incident, but does not warrant the use of emergency warning lights. Stipulates that “urgent” does not include any personal use, commuting, training, or administrative uses.

4) Exempts an authorized emergency vehicle from any requirement to pay a toll or other charge on a vehicular crossing, toll highway, or high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane, if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

a) The authorized emergency vehicle is properly displaying an exempt California license plate, and is properly identified or marked as an authorized emergency vehicle, including, but not limited to, displaying an

external surface-mounted red warning light, blue warning light, or both, and displaying public agency identification, including, but not limited to, "Fire Department," "Sheriff," or "Police."

b) The vehicle is being driven while responding to or returning from an urgent or emergency call, engaged in an urgent or emergency response, or engaging in a fire station coverage assignment directly related to an emergency response.

c) The driver of the vehicle determines that the use of the toll facility shall likely improve the availability or response and arrival time of the authorized emergency vehicle and its delivery of essential public safety services.

5) Clarifies that an authorized emergency vehicle is not exempt from any requirement to pay a toll while traveling in a HOT lane when returning from an urgent or emergency call, or from being engaged in an urgent or emergency response, or from engaging in a fire station coverage assignment directly related to an emergency response.

6) Requires that if the operator of a toll facility elects to send a bill or invoice to the public agency for the use of the toll facility by an authorized emergency vehicle, the fire chief, police chief, county sheriff, head of the public agency, or designee, is authorized to certify in writing that the authorized emergency vehicle was responding to or returning from an emergency call or response and is exempt from the payment of the toll or other charge in accordance with this section. The letter shall be accepted by the toll operator in lieu of payment and is a public document.

7) Requires that, upon information or belief that an authorized emergency vehicle did not meet the conditions to be exempted from liability to pay the toll, the public agency shall make accessible, upon written request, to the toll operator the dispatch records or log books relevant to the time period when the vehicle was in use on the toll facility.

8) Stipulates that upon request of a private or public local emergency provider, an owner or operator of a toll facility shall enter into an agreement to establish mutually agreed upon terms for the use of the toll facility by the emergency service provider, including, but not limited to, being exempt from toll payment. Provides that the provisions do not preclude a toll operator from establishing a policy that meets or exceeds the requirements.

9) Stipulates that the terms of an agreement between a toll operator and emergency service provider do not extend to other emergency service providers that may use a toll facility in the jurisdiction of the toll operator subject to the agreement.

This bill:

1) Adds "Ambulance," in addition to "Fire Department", "Sherriff" or "Police" to the authorized emergency vehicle agency identification required to be displayed with an exempt license plate, to be exempt from a toll or other charge.

2) Authorizes an ambulance corporation executive chief to certify in writing that a vehicle was exempt from a toll charge, if an operator of a toll facility elects to bill an agency or department for use of the facility.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill*. According to the author, "The use of toll roads is a crucial component of emergency response operations as it allows first responders to reach critical situations more efficiently, reducing travel time and improving patient outcomes. While current law exempts authorized emergency vehicles from paying toll fees when responding to and returning from emergency calls, this exemption does not explicitly extend to private ambulance providers. As a result, private ambulance companies face significant financial burdens due to toll costs, despite performing the same life-saving services as public ambulance providers.

   "AB 1114 clarifies the process for private ambulance service providers seeking agreements with toll agencies in order to waive toll fees while responding to an emergency."

2) *Emergency vehicles use of toll facilities.* The use of toll roads has become a necessity for first responders traveling to emergency situations. As a result of increased wildfires across the state, the COVID-19 pandemic, and staffing shortages, first responders of all kinds are traveling farther distances in order to respond to life threatening emergencies.

   AB 254 (Jeffries, Chapter 425, Statutes of 2009), created an exemption that allows authorized emergency vehicles to utilize all toll facilities, including HOT lanes, while responding to an incident, in order to decrease travel time. Specifically, authorized emergency vehicles are exempt from tolls on a toll

road, HOT lane, toll bridge, toll highway, or vehicular crossing while traveling to an urgent or emergency call, under certain circumstances. The emergency vehicles must have an exempt California license plate, and be properly identified or marked as an emergency vehicle, including warning lights and public agency identification.

3) *How do tolls work in California?* Toll systems in California rely on a few methods for registering a person's use of a toll facility and payment of the tolls. First, is via a vehicle-mounted toll tag or sticker transponder that is read by antennae and associated electronically to a person's FasTrak account. Second, license plate readers are cameras that are positioned in various entrances and/or exits to the toll lane or bridge to record images of the license plate as a vehicle passes and tolls are assessed electronically to a person's account or to a one-time payment transaction. Additionally, if a person has no transponder, the license plate information can be used to send a toll invoice to the registered owner of the vehicle.

4) *How do toll operators implement the emergency vehicle exemption?* Although authorized emergency vehicles are exempt from tolls in some circumstances, current law authorizes the toll operator to charge the authorized emergency vehicle public agency for any vehicles that have entered and used the toll facility. The charge can then be annulled with the written certification from a fire chief, police chief, county sheriff, head of the public agency, or designee, that the authorized emergency vehicle was responding to or returning from an emergency call, and the public agency is exempt from the payment of the toll. This back and forth review can be an administrative burden for both the toll operator and the public agencies.

   Current law also allows for agencies to enter into agreements, with mutually agreed upon terms, with toll operator; however, contracts can vary across the state. For example, the CHP has successfully implemented an ongoing agreement with toll agencies. Essentially, the agreement allows the public agency that owns and operates the authorized emergency vehicles to identify the eligible vehicles via license plates. The toll agencies set up a so-called "non-revenue" account with the public agency, free of charge, and register the license plates for plate readers and may issue transponders for use. This way the public agency is not issued a toll invoice for use of the facilities. The public agency can access its account at any time and update authorized vehicles. This type of agreement could be replicated by public agencies and private ambulance companies across the state.

5) *Private ambulances are not automatically exempt.* According to the California Ambulance Association, the sponsors of AB 1114, there are approximately 715 public and private ambulance services statewide, of which 170 are private, representing 74% of the ambulances. Additionally, California has 3,600 licensed ambulances covering 337 emergency ambulance service areas, of which more than 220 are served by private ambulance companies.

   Current law exempts authorized emergency vehicles from paying any vehicular tolls when driving to and returning from an emergency call. Although, private ambulance providers are not explicitly covered under this exemption, there is no prohibition for toll operators to enter into an agreement with them. In fact, in his veto message of AB 697 (Fong, 2017), which would have exempted privately owned emergency ambulances from requirements to pay tolls, Governor Brown stated, "Under existing law, the exemption sought by this bill can be granted by toll facility authorities and no evidence has been presented to show why the state should now step in."

6) *AB 1114 builds on previous agreements with toll operators*. As noted above, AB 2270 (Seyarto, Chapter 497, Statutes of 2022), required toll operators to develop and enter into agreements with authorized emergency services providers upon request of the agency to further streamline the toll exemption process. Additionally, the law stipulates the agreements must be mutually agreed upon terms.

   AB 902 (Rodriguez, Chapter 124, Statutes of 2023), built upon this process by adding "private or public" to the emergency service providers who can request the development of an agreement with toll operators. It also clarified that the agreements may include being exempted from toll payments. Again, AB 902 retained the requirements that the agreements must be mutually agreed upon terms.

   There has not been much progress on agreements for private ambulances since the passage of AB 902. According to the Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA), which operates toll roads in Orange County, they have only been approached by one ambulance company to pursue an agreement and those talks are proceeding.

   However, it appears that tolling authorities differ in how they interpret existing law when entering into these agreements. To try to ensure that exiting law is implemented uniformly, the California Toll Operators Committee (CTOC),

recently developed a process for exempting private ambulances from tolls. CTOC is made up of the state's 13 toll agencies and serves as the statewide oversight and standards committee for tolling interoperability. Specifically, CTOC states that "An agreement will need to be entered into with each agency from which the ambulance company is seeking toll exemption. Some toll agencies have voluntarily agreed to waive some conditions specified in Cal. Vehicle Code."

AB 1114 intends to ensure that private ambulance companies can enter into agreements with tolling agencies for use of the toll facility, which may include being exempt from tolls. Specifically, this bill adds "Ambulance," in addition to "Fire Department", "Sherriff" or "Police," to the authorized emergency vehicle agency identification required to be displayed to be exempt from tolls or other charges. This bill also clarifies that an ambulance corporation chief executive can certify a vehicle was responding to an emergency when billed for a toll.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Ambuserve
Amwest Ambulance
California Ambulance Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Lifewest Ambulance
Norcal Ambulance
Sierra Emergency Medical Services Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 5/23/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, 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, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Chen, Ellis, Nguyen, Sanchez, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Wicks

Prepared by: Melissa White / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
6/27/25 15:57:31

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1125
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1125
Author: Nguyen (D)
Amended: 4/21/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Cortese, Durazo, Laird

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 5/23/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Workers' compensation: peace officers

SOURCE: California Correctional Supervisors Organization

DIGEST: This bill expands an existing rebuttable presumption that heart trouble is an occupational injury to any peace officer employed by the Department of State Hospitals, as defined, instead of only security officers at Atascadero State Hospital.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes a comprehensive system of workers' compensation that provides a range of benefits for an employee who suffers from an injury or illness that arises out of and in the course of employment, regardless of fault. This system requires all employers to insure payment of benefits by either securing the consent of the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) to self-insure or by obtaining insurance from a company authorized by the state. (Labor Code §§3200-6002)

2) Creates a series of rebuttable presumptions of an occupational injury for peace and safety officers for the purpose of the workers' compensation system. These

presumptions include: heart disease, hernias, pneumonia, cancer, tuberculosis, blood-borne infectious disease or methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus skin infection (MRSA), bio-chemical illness, and meningitis. The compensation awarded for these injuries must include full hospital, surgical, medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits, as provided by workers' compensation law. (Labor Code §§3212-3213.2)

3) Specifically establishes that, in the case of officers and employees in the Department of Corrections having custodial duties, each officer and employee in the Department of Youth Authority having group supervisory duties, and each security officer employed at the Atascadero State Hospital, heart trouble that develops or manifests during the period of employment is presumed to arise out of that employment. The presumption is available for three calendar months for each full year of service, not to exceed 60 months, from the last date worked in the position. (Labor Code §3212.2)

4) Establishes the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) within the California Health and Human Services Agency. (Welfare and Institutions Code §4000):

    a) Specifies DSH has jurisdiction over the execution of the laws relating to care and treatment of persons with mental health disorders under the custody of DSH. (Welfare and Institutions Code §4011)

5) Defines "state hospital" to mean any of the following hospitals, under the jurisdiction of DSH:

    a) Atascadero State Hospital
    b) Coaling State Hospital
    c) Metropolitan State Hospital
    d) Napa State Hospital
    e) Patton State Hospital
    f) The Admission, Evaluation, and Stabilization (AES) Center in the County of Kern, and other AES Centers as defined by regulation, as specified.
    g) A county jail treatment facility under contract with DSH to provide competency restoration services.
    h) A facility under contract with DSH, as specified, excluding community-based restoration of competency services that are operated by the county.
    i) Any other DSH facility subject to available funding by the Legislature. (Welfare and Institutions Code §4100)

6) Specifies that the chief of police is responsible for preserving the peace in the hospital buildings and grounds, and authorizes the chief of police services to arrest or cause the arrest of all persons who attempt to commit or have committed a public offense. (Welfare and Institutions §4311):

    a) Provides the chief of police services, supervising investigators, investigators, and each hospital police officer with specified powers and authority, and specifies they will enforce the rules and regulations of the hospital, preserve peace and order on the premises, protect and preserve the property of the state, and help ensure integration of treatment, safety, and security. (Welfare and Institutions Code §4313)

7) Provides that officers of a state hospital under the jurisdiction of DSH, are peace officers, as specified. (Penal Code §830.38)

This bill:

1) Expands an existing rebuttable presumption that heart trouble is an occupational injury for security officers at Atascadero State Hospital to include any peace officer employed by the Department of State Hospitals, as defined.

2) Eliminates obsolete reference to the California Youth Authority, which was renamed to the California Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), until its closure in 2023.

3) Makes conforming, non-substantive changes.

Background

Workers' Compensation Presumptions. Under the California workers' compensation system, if a worker is injured on a job, the employer must pay for the worker's medical treatment, and provide monetary benefits if the injury is permanent. In return for receiving free medical treatment, the worker surrenders the right to sue the employer for monetary damages in civil court. This simple premise is sometimes referred to as the "grand bargain."

The Legislature has created disputable or rebuttable presumptions within the workers' compensation system, which shifts the burden of proof in an injury claim from the employee to the employer. If an injury is covered by a presumption, the employer carries the burden to prove the injury is not related to work. Presumptions reflect unique circumstances where injuries or illnesses appear to logically be work-related, but it is difficult for the injured worker to prove them as such. For certain occupations, such as firefighters and peace officers, where

workers can be exposed to more types of injuries than in other occupations, the law presumes certain injuries and illnesses (i.e. heart disease, hernias, pneumonia, cancer, post-traumatic stress disorder injuries, tuberculosis, blood-borne infectious diseases, bio-chemical illness, and meningitis) are occupational injuries for purposes of workers' compensation coverage.

State Hospitals. DSH operates and oversees five state hospitals – Atascadero, Coalinga, Metropolitan (in Los Angeles County), Napa, and Patton – that provide mental health services to patients admitted into DSH facilities. As of fiscal year 2021-22, DSH served more than 12,000 patients through its hospital system, conditional release and other communicated-based programs, and jail treatment programs and employed nearly 13,000 staff.

According to DSH, their patient population includes patients mandated for treatment by a criminal or civil court judge. In fact, more than 90 percent of DSH patients are forensic commitments (i.e. patients incompetent to stand trial, offenders with mental health disorders, mentally ill prisoners transferred from prison, and those found not guilty by reason of insanity). These patients are sent to DSH through the criminal court system and have committed or have been accused of committing crimes linked to a mental illness. In addition to forensic commitments, DSH treats patients who have been classified by a judge or jury as Sexually Violent Predators. These patients have served prison sentences for committing crimes enumerated under the Sexually Violent Predator Act (Welfare and Inst. Code Sections 6600 et. al.) and are committed to DSH for treatment until a judge deems they are no longer a threat to the community. The remainder of DSH's population have been committed in civil court for being a danger to themselves or others. These patients are commonly referred to as Lanterman-Petris-Short commitments.

Atascadero State Hospital and DSH Police Force. Atascadero State Hospital is a secure forensic hospital, open since 1954, and located on the Central Coast of California in San Luis Obispo County. The majority of the all-male patient population is remanded for treatment by county superior courts or by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), and the hospital does not accept voluntary admissions. Atascadero State Hospital has historically served the largest patient population, and has the largest criminal population of all the state hospitals. However, all five state hospitals are considered high-security and have patient populations generally assumed to present a higher risk of violence to staff, other patients, or themselves.

According to the author and sponsors, the California Correctional Supervisors Organization, Atascadero State Hospital was the first state hospital to employ its own security officers, but the other four state hospitals have since employed security officers for the protection of patients, workers, and the public:

> "When California Labor Code section 3212.2 was enacted in 1976, it did not include peace officers of the California Department of State Hospitals (DSH) because the Police Force for DSH did not exist at that time. Rather, they were designated as 'security officers employed at Atascadero State Hospital.'
>
> Since that time, the DSH Police Officers have evolved from covering one state hospital to covering all state hospitals and have grown to approximately seven hundred officers who provide public safety service, and security to patients, employees, and the general public in and around each hospital."

As mentioned, all five state hospitals now include the DSH police force, a 24-hour law enforcement agency, granted with the full authority to enforce relevant laws, make arrests, and issue citations. The author and sponsors further state:

> "In addition, DSH Police Officers are now covered by Penal Code Section 832 which requires basic Peace Officer training to hold the position. This makes the Police Force for the DSH a fully functioning police force with academy standards and qualifications equal to all other California law enforcement officers. The same issues impact these police officers as all other law enforcement listed in this labor code."

Day-to-day responsibilities and training for officers of the DSH police force do not differ considerably from other peace officers who are granted the occupational injury presumption for heart trouble during their course of employment. This is likely why this presumption was extended to officers employed at the Atascadero State Hospital. This bill, AB 1125, would expand the heart trouble workers' compensation presumption currently afforded to officers at the Atascadero State Hospital to the officers working at all the other four state hospitals as well.

This bill proposes to recognize the similar work conditions and experiences between peace offices that have an existing workers' compensation presumption for heart trouble, including the current peace officers that work at Atascadero State hospital, and peace officers that work at other state hospitals. As the Assembly Insurance Committee analysis points out, "[b]y expanding the existing presumption for heart trouble in security officers working at Atascadero State hospital to apply to peace officers at all state hospitals, the bill would avoid the

present two-tiered system that differentiates the worker's compensation claims process for those developing heart trouble at Atascadero State Hospital, and those working at other state hospitals with similar functions, populations, and responsibilities."

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1156 (Bonta, 2023) would have established workers' compensation rebuttable presumptions that specified diagnoses are occupational for a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital. These diagnoses included infectious diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and respiratory diseases. The bill would also have included the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) from SARS-CoV-2 and its variants, among other conditions, in the definitions of infectious and respiratory diseases. The bill would have further extended these presumptions for specified time periods after the hospital employee's termination of employment. This bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Insurance.

AB 597 (Rodriguez, 2023) would have, for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2025, created a rebuttable presumption for emergency medical technicians and paramedics that PTSI is an occupational injury and covered under workers' compensation. This bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Insurance.

AB 699 (Weber, 2023, Vetoed) would have extended rebuttable presumptions for hernia, pneumonia, heart trouble, cancer, tuberculosis, blood-borne infectious disease, methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus skin infection, and meningitis-related illnesses and injuries to a lifeguard employed on a year-round, full-time basis in the Boating Safety Unit by the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, as specified. It would also have expanded the presumptions for post-traumatic stress disorder or exposure to biochemical substances, as defined, to a lifeguard employed in the Boating Safety Unit by the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department. This bill was vetoed.

AB 1145 (Maienschein, 2023, Vetoed) would have provided, until January 1, 2030, that for specified state nurses, psychiatric technicians, and various medical and social services specialists, the term "injury" also included post-traumatic stress that develops or manifests itself during a period in which the injured person is in the service of the department or unit. The bill would have applied to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2024. The bill would have prohibited compensation from being paid for a claim of injury unless the member performed services for the department or unit for at least 6 months, unless the injury is caused by a sudden and extraordinary employment condition. This bill was vetoed.

SB 623 (Laird, Chapter 621, Statutes of 2023) extended the sunset until January 1, 2029 for a rebuttable presumption that a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder injuries for specified peace officers and firefighters is an occupational injury, and required the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation to submit both reports to the Legislature analyzing the effectiveness of the presumption and a review of claims filed by specified types of employees not included in the presumption, such as public safety dispatchers, as defined.

SB 416 (Hueso, 2019) would have expanded the presumption that certain defined injuries and illnesses are occupational injuries and therefore covered by workers' compensation for all peace officers, as specified. This bill was held at the Assembly Desk.

AB 2269 (Adams, 2010) would have expanded the workers' compensation presumption for peace officers working at Department of Developmental Services Developmental Centers (DC) and Department of Mental Health (DMH) psychiatric hospitals. Specifically, this bill would have extended a cardiac presumption available to officers at Atascadero DC to peace officers at the following facilities: a) Coalinga State Hospital, b) Metropolitan State Hospital, c) Napa State Hospital, d) Patton State Hospital, e) Porterville Developmental Center, f) Lanterman Developmental Center, g) Sonoma Developmental Center, h) Fairview Developmental Center, and i) Canyon Springs Community Facility. This bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

California Correctional Supervisors Organization (Source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the sponsors, the California Correctional Supervisors Organization:

"In 1976, California enacted legislation recognizing heart conditions experienced by security guards' staff at Atascadero State Hospital as work-related injuries if they occurred during employment or within three months after leaving the job. This classification established that heart trouble developing or manifesting while employed as a security guard at the Atascadero State Hospital is presumed to arise

out of and in the course of that employment for the purpose of awarding workers' compensation benefits. When this Labor Code section was enacted, it did not include peace officers of the California Department of State Hospitals (DSH) because the DHS Police Force did not exist at that time. Rather, they were designated as "security officers employed at Atascadero State Hospital. Since that time, the DSH Security Officers have evolved from covering one state hospital to covering all state hospitals and have grown to approximately seven hundred officers who provide public safety service to patients, employees, and the public in and around each hospital. In addition, DSH Security Officers have been reclassified as peace officers covered by Penal Code Section 832 which requires basic peace officer training to hold the position. This makes the DHS Police Force a fully functioning police force with academy standards and qualifications equal to all other California law enforcement officers. The same issues impact these police officers as all other law enforcement listed in this labor code."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 5/23/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, 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, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Chen, Ellis, Nguyen, Sanchez, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Wicks

Prepared by: Jazmin Marroquin / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556
6/27/25 11:11:35

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1150
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1150
Author: Schultz (D)
Amended: 5/20/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 6/17/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 4/10/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Local agencies: airports: alternative customer facility charges

SOURCE: California Airports Council

DIGEST: This bill amends the law governing "customer facility charges" (CFC) that airports can require rental vehicle companies to collect.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines CFC to mean any fee, including an alternative fee, required by an airport to be collected by a rental company from a renter for any of the following purposes:

    a) To finance, design, and construct consolidated airport vehicle rental facilities;
    b) To finance, design, construct, and operate common-use transportation systems that move passengers between airport terminals and those consolidated vehicle rental facilities, and acquire vehicles for use in that system; and
    c) To finance, design, and construct terminal modifications solely to accommodate and provide customer access to common-use transportation

systems. The fees designated as a CFC shall not otherwise be used to pay for terminal expansion, gate expansion, runway expansion, changes in hours of operation, or changes in the number of flights arriving or departing from the airport. (Gov. Code § 50474.21(a).)

2) Permits any airport to require rental companies to collect an alternative CFC to finance projects, as specified above, under specified conditions, including:

    a) The airport first conducts a publicly noticed hearing to review the costs of financing the projects in which the airport establishes the amount of revenue necessary to finance the reasonable costs of the project and that such revenue can only be generated by a daily rate through an alternative CFC rather than a traditional CFC;
    b) The alternative CFC can be charged on a per-day basis for a maximum of five days per rental contract but must not exceed $9 per day and cannot be required if a traditional-CFC is also required. (Gov. Code § 50474.3(b).)

3) Permits a CFC to be collected by a rental company under specified circumstances, including:

    a) An authorized airport requires the rental company to collect the fee;
    b) the fee is calculated on a per contract basis or as an alternative CFC, as specified;
    c) The fee shall be no more than $10 per contract, with limited exception, including when charged as an alternative CFC;
    d) The fee for a consolidated rental vehicle facility shall be collected only from customers of on-airport rental vehicle companies;
    e) Revenues collected from the fee do not exceed the reasonable costs of financing, designing, and constructing the facility and financing, designing, constructing, and operating any common-use transportation system, or acquiring vehicles for use in that system, and are not used for any other purpose; and
    f) The fee is separately identified on the rental agreement. (Gov. Code § 50474.3(a).)

This bill:

1) Allows for CFCs to be used for major maintenance on consolidated airport vehicle rental facilities.

2) Increases the maximum allowable alternative CFC to $12 per day.

3) Clarifies that the use of revenues from alternative CFCs can be used for the specified purposes.

Background

A CFC is a fee required by an airport to be collected by a rental company from a renter for specified purposes, including to finance, design, and construct consolidated airport vehicle rental facilities; common-use transportation systems that move passengers between airport terminals and those consolidated vehicle rental facilities, and acquire vehicles for use in that system; and terminal modifications solely to accommodate and provide customer access to common-use transportation systems.

There are two types of CFCs. The traditional CFC that can be charged is $10 per rental contract. Subsequent to the initial authorizing legislation, an alternative CFC was authorized. It currently allows airports to require rental companies to charge up to $9 per day per contract up to a maximum of $45 per rental car contract. As the authority for airports to charge CFCs has been consistently expanded over the years, the consistent concern of the Legislature has been assurances that consumers are being protected. CFCs generate a great stream of income for airports at the expense of consumers. The authorizing statutes have been fortified with various consumer protections as a result.

This bill amends several provisions of the CFC statutory scheme. First, it authorizes the use of any CFCs for performing major maintenance on consolidated airport vehicle rental facilities. Second, this bill raises the maximum amount for an alternative CFC to $12 per day. Finally, this bill clarifies that the revenues from alternative CFCs can be used for the specified purposes.

This bill is sponsored by the California Airports Council. No timely support or opposition was received. For a more thorough examination, please see the Senate Judiciary Committee analysis of this bill.

Comment

This bill makes several changes to these CFC laws. First, this bill again expands the acceptable uses for CFCs charged by airports to include performance of major maintenance on consolidated airport vehicle rental facilities. It also clarifies that revenues from CFCs can be used for the various prescribed purposes. This bill also

again increases the maximum amount that can be charged in connection with an alternative CFC from $9 to $12 per day, or from $45 to $60 maximum per rental vehicle contract.

According to the author:

> With California preparing to host major international sporting events in the coming years, our airports will face unprecedented demand, welcoming millions of visitors. To provide a positive experience for these travelers and uphold the state's reputation as a world-class destination, we must invest in maintaining sound infrastructure and creating efficient, future-ready facilities.
>
> AB 1150 is a critical step toward ensuring California's airports have the necessary resources to maintain and improve their infrastructure. By increasing the maximum daily user fee for airport rental car customers to $12 and implementing periodic inflation adjustments starting in 2029, this bill allows airports to address urgent maintenance needs, enhance safety measures, and modernize facilities to meet future demands.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/18/25)

California Airports Council (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/18/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Airports Council writes:

> Since 2010, the CFC has remained unchanged despite rising costs for airport infrastructure, maintenance, and operations. Adjusting the CFC for inflation will allow our airports to maintain safe, modern rental car facilities, enhance essential features like elevators, escalators, and HVAC systems, and prepare for global events such as the 2026 FIFA World Cup, the 2028 Summer Olympics, and two Super Bowls, by ensuring smooth, efficient travel experiences for athletes, media, and visitors.

Equally important, this legislation minimizes the impact on everyday Californians. Because the CFC applies only to airport rental car transactions—and most rentals last only three days—this adjustment will help maintain world-class airport facilities without broadly raising costs for all Californians.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 4/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, 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, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Castillo, Chen, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Soria, Ta, Tangipa

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/19/25 16:25:45

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1213
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1213
Author: Stefani (D)
Amended: 3/19/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Restitution: priority

SOURCE: San Francisco District Attorney

DIGEST: This bill clarifies that an order for victim restitution has priority over all other fines and fees associated with a criminal conviction and shall be paid first.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) States that it 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 seek and secure restitution from the persons convicted of the crimes causing the losses they suffer. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), art. I, § 28, subd. (b)(13)(A).)

2) Provides that restitution shall be 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) Requires the court to order the defendant to pay victim restitution in every case in which a victim has suffered an economic loss as a result of the defendant's conduct. (Pen. Code, § 1202, subd. (f).)

4) Prohibits consideration of a defendant's inability to pay in determining the amount of a restitution order. (Penal (Pen.) Code § 1202.4, subd. (g).)

5) Authorizes the victim to enforce the restitution order as a civil judgment. (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (i).)

6) Provides that in determining the amount and manner of disbursement under an order made pursuant to the Penal Code requiring a defendant to make reparation or restitution to a victim of a crime, to pay any cost of jail or other confinement, or to pay any other reimbursable costs, the court, after determining the amount of any fine and penalty assessments, and a county financial evaluation officer when making a financial evaluation, shall first determine the amount of restitution to be ordered paid to any victim, and shall determine the amount of the other reimbursable costs. (Pen. Code, § 1203.1d, subd. (a).)

7) States that with respect to installment payments and amounts collected by the Franchise Tax Board the board of supervisors shall provide that disbursements be made in the following order of priority:

   a) Restitution ordered to, or on behalf of, the victim pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 1202.4.

   b) The state surcharge ordered pursuant to Section 1465.7.

   c) Any fines, penalty assessments, and restitution fines ordered pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1202.4. Payment of each of these items shall be made on a proportional basis.

   d) Any other reimbursable costs.

8) Requires the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to deduct a percent of an incarcerated person’s wages and monies in their trust account if they owe a restitution fine or a restitution order, and requires the department to collect the restitution order first in the event the person owes both. (Pen. Code, § 2085.5, subds. (a), (c), & (g).)

9) Authorizes, when a person is serving a sentence in the county jail, the agency designated by the board of supervisors to deduct from the incarcerated person’s

wages and trust account if they owe a restitution fine or a restitution order, and requires the agency to collect the restitution order first in the event the person owes both. (Pen. Code, § 2085.5, subds. (b), (d), & (h).)

10) Authorizes collection of victim restitution and the restitution fine from a parolee and provides that the restitution order may be collected first. (Pen. Code, § 2085.5, subds. (e), (f), & (i).)

11) Authorizes the collection of victim restitution and the restitution fine from an individual on post-release community supervision, and provides that if the county elects to collect these, then the restitution order shall be collected before the restitution fine. (Pen. Code, § 2085.6, subds. (a), (b), & (d).)

This bill:

1) Clarifies that a victim restitution order shall be paid before all fines, restitution fines, penalty assessments, and other fees imposed on a criminal defendant.

2) States legislative intent that no other debt owed by a criminal defendant be satisfied before victim restitution is satisfied first.

3) Names these provisions the Restitution First Act.

Comments

Prioritization of Court Ordered Debt. Several existing statutes prioritize the order in which delinquent court-ordered debt received is to be satisfied. For example, Penal Code section 1203.1d directs the Franchise Tax Board to disburse monies in the following order of priority: 1) victim restitution, 2) state surcharge, 3) restitution fines, penalty assessments, and other fines, with payments made on a proportional basis to the total amount levied for all of these items, and, 4) state/county/city reimbursements, and special revenue items. (See Pen. Code, § 1203.1d.) Similarly, Penal Code section 2085.5 directs CDCR to first collect victim restitution before collecting a restitution fine from an incarcerated person's wages or trust account. The same is true for individuals serving a sentence in county jail pursuant to Criminal Justice Realignment. (Pen. Code, § 2085.5.)

Consistent with these existing mandates regarding the manner of disbursements, this bill specifies within the restitution statute itself that a victim restitution order shall be paid before all fines, restitution fines, penalty assessments, and other fees imposed on a criminal defendant.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/25)

San Francisco District Attorney Brooke Jenkins (source)
California District Attorneys Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/25)

None received

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT:

According to the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, the sponsor of this bill:

> AB 1213 will carry our Constitution's command into effect and ensure that victim restitution orders will receive priority in payment from a convicted defendant.
>
> Our Constitution guarantees a victim of a crime the right to restitution. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 28(b)(l3).) And the Constitution further provides that "All monetary payments, monies, and properties collected from any person who has been ordered to make restitution shall be first applied to pay the amounts ordered as restitution to the victim." (Cal. Const., Art. I, § 28(b)(13)(C).) While in practice victim restitution has always had priority (see e.g., *People v. Mozes* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 1124), no statute carries that constitutional command into effect. AB 1213 does just that by amending Penal Code section 1202.4 to clarify that a victim restitution order has priority over all other fines, fees, and penalty assessments imposed as part of a criminal conviction.
>
> Receiving restitution is an essential component to victims of crime being made whole after a crime is committed. By ensuring that such orders are satisfied first, victims of crime will begin to heal from the trauma that a defendant inflicted upon them. And, conversely, an incarcerated defendant, who has paid off their restitution order will

not be surprised upon their release to learn of an unpaid restitution order.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, 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, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Chen, McKinnor, Papan

Prepared by: Sandy Uribe / PUB. S. /
6/27/25 11:08:07

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1374
Author: Berman (D), et al.
Amended: 6/5/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-1, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Rental passenger vehicle transactions: third parties

SOURCE: Consumer Federation of California

DIGEST: This bill bolsters the law governing advertised rental vehicle rates.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Governs the obligations arising from rental passenger vehicle transactions. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1939.01 et seq.)

2) Defines "additional mandatory charges" as any separately stated charges that the rental company requires the renter to pay to hire or lease the vehicle for the period of time to which the rental rate applies, which are imposed by a governmental entity and specifically relate to the operation of a rental car business. (Civ. Code § 1939.01(c).)

3) Provides, that when providing a quote, or imposing charges for a rental, the rental company may separately state the rental rate, additional mandatory charges, if any, and a mileage charge, if any, that a renter must pay to hire or lease the vehicle for the period of time to which the rental rate applies. A rental

company shall not charge in addition to the rental rate, additional mandatory charges, or a mileage charge, as those may be applicable, any other fee that is required to be paid by the renter as a condition of hiring or leasing the vehicle. (Civ. Code § 1939.19(a).)

4) Requires a rental company, if additional mandatory charges are imposed, to do each of the following:

   a) At the time the quote is given, provide the person receiving the quote with a good faith estimate of the rental rate and all additional mandatory charges, as well as the total charges for the entire rental. The total charges, if provided on a website, shall be displayed in a typeface at least as large as any rental rate disclosed on that page and shall be provided on a page that the person receiving the quote may reach by following a link directly from the page on which the rental rate is first provided. The good faith estimate may exclude mileage charges and charges for optional items that cannot be determined prior to completing the reservation based upon the information provided by the person.
   b) At the time and place the rental commences, clearly and conspicuously disclose in the rental contract, or that portion of the contract that is provided to the renter, the total of the rental rate and additional mandatory charges, for the entire rental, exclusive of charges that cannot be determined at the time the rental commences. Charges imposed pursuant to this paragraph shall be no more than the amount of the quote provided in a confirmed reservation, unless the person changes the terms of the rental contract subsequent to making the reservation.
   c) Provide each person, other than those persons within the rental company, offering quotes to actual or prospective customers access to information about additional mandatory charges, as well as access to information about when those charges apply. Any person providing quotes to actual or prospective customers for the hire or lease of a vehicle from a rental company shall provide the quotes in the manner specified. (Civ. Code § 1939.19(b).)

5) Provides additional pricing protections for renters, including disclaimers about additional fees for optional items or services and certain mileage or gas fees.

This bill:

1) Requires a rental company or third party to provide the total charges estimate for the entire rental, including all taxes and fees imposed by a government, as soon as dates, location, and vehicle type or class, which can include all vehicles, for the rental are provided to the rental company or third party.

2) Changes the requirement for rental companies to provide a good faith estimate of rates to a requirement to provide the total charges estimate of the rental rate.

3) Applies the statutory requirements governing disclosures associated with the costs of renting a car to third parties.

4) Provides that rental companies and third parties are not responsible for the failure of the other to comply with the relevant rental rate laws.

5) Requires a rental company or third party to clearly indicate the fuel source of the vehicle prior to completion of a reservation.

Background

The issue of "junk" fees and other pricing schemes gained more prominence nationally when President Joe Biden took aim at them in his State of the Union address in February 2023. There are various types of pricing schemes generally deemed unfair or unlawful business practices and California has a host of laws aimed at rooting them out. This includes recent statutes that require pricing transparency and reasonable methods for cancellation of automatic renewal and continuous service offers.

Current law provides certain consumer protections for Californians and visitors renting cars from short-term rental car companies. One imposes requirements on the advertised rates for rental periods. Rental vehicle transactions are specifically exempted from a recent law aimed at combatting "drip pricing" and other junk fees. Concerns have arisen that some rental companies are not being fully transparent in their pricing schemes. Furthermore, there is concern that third parties advertising these rates are deceptive and need to be further regulated.

This bill updates the existing pricing transparency law applying to rental vehicle companies to require these companies to provide the total charges estimate for the entire rental, including all taxes and fees imposed by a government, as soon as dates, location, and vehicle type or class for the rental are provided to the rental

company or third party. Third parties are also incorporated into the regulatory scheme. This bill is sponsored by the Consumer Federation of California and supported by the Consumer Attorneys of California. It is opposed by Booking Holdings.

Comments

To provide consumers with more effective price transparency protections, this bill requires rental companies to provide the total charges estimate for the entire rental, including all taxes and fees imposed by a government, as soon as dates, location, and vehicle type or class, which can include all vehicles, for the rental are provided to the rental company. This ensures a clear price is communicated to consumers once the key variables that greatly affect the final price are established. Given concerns that third parties are separately advertising rates in a deceptive manner, this bill imposes the obligations of the pricing law to third parties. To ensure neither party is held liable for the conduct of the other, this bill makes clear that a failure of a rental company or third party to comply with these provisions does not result in any liability for the other. This bill also requires clear disclosures about the fuel source of rental vehicles before a reservation is completed.

According to the author:

> Deceptive price advertising, such as hidden or surprise fees, has significantly increased over time and frustrated consumers. In 2023, I authored legislation that was signed into law to address hidden fees in the hotel and short-term lodging industry. Similarly, consumers are not always shown the full price of a rental car upfront. After being drawn in with a lower initial price, additional mandatory fees and taxes are later revealed to consumers during the reservation process. While there are those in the rental car space that already provide upfront pricing on their websites, others have not been fully transparent. For those that do not provide the full price upfront, these deceptive tactics mislead consumers and limit their ability to comparison shop.
>
> To ensure price transparency across the board, AB 1374 would require that the total estimated charges of a rental car be disclosed as soon as consumers select dates, rental location, and vehicle type. This bill is a continuation of consumer protection efforts to ensure that the upfront price is the real price consumers pay enabling consumers to make informed decisions and comparison shop.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Consumer Federation of California (source)
Consumer Attorneys of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

Booking Holdings

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Consumer Federation of California, the sponsor of this bill, writes:

Consumers' time and money is valuable; therefore, they should not be deceived into rental car contracts that lack transparency in their pricing models and instead mislead consumers with low prices that are later not upheld. AB 1374 aims to address these challenges by ensuring that consumers are equipped with all the necessary information to make an informed decision and that businesses with fair practices are rewarded. Through this legislation, we can ensure a fair, competitive market that is driven by the consumer's best interest.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Booking Holdings argues:

Our mission is to make it easier for everyone to experience the world. We provide a marketplace built on transparency, trust, responsibility and fair competition, in order to serve our customers, who deserve choice, great value and an easy shopping experience.

Accordingly, we support price transparency in the travel sector which has been recently addressed in California and the nation by 2023's AB 537 (Berman) and SB 478 (Dodd), and the Federal Trade Commission's rule on accommodations and live event fees. As such, we feel that AB 1374 is unnecessary for addressing price transparency in the rental car sector, especially for third parties which, unlike rental agencies, are subject to the obligations added to the Consumer Legal Remedies Act with SB 478.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-1, 5/19/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin,

Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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

NOES: DeMaio

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Papan

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/26/25 16:11:41

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1384
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1384
Author: Nguyen (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 10-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Caballero, Valladares, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/21/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Summary proceedings for obtaining possession of real property: procedural requirements

SOURCE: California Business Properties Association

DIGEST: This bill specifies that a hearing on a motion to demur or strike in an unlawful detainer action may only be delayed beyond seven court days from the filing of the notice of motion for good cause in an unlawful detainer action involving a commercial tenancy.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes summary civil proceedings by which landlords may seek a court order for the eviction of tenants from their rental property, for specified reasons. (Code Civil (Civ.) Procedure (Proc.) §§ 1159 et seq.)

2) Requires that a defendant's response in a summary proceeding to obtain real property must be filed within ten days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays and other judicial holidays, after the complaint is served upon the defendant. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1167(a).)

3) Provides that, if a defendant in an unlawful detainer proceeding appears, and a request to set the case for trial is made, the trial of the proceeding must be held within 20 days of the date of the request for a hearing. Provides that the judge may extend the period for trial upon the agreement of all of the parties. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.5.)

4) Specifies that a motion for summary judgment may be made at any time after the answer is filed, upon giving five days' notice. Summary judgment shall be granted or denied on the same basis as a motion under Code of Civil Procedure Section 437. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7.)

5) Provides that all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before a hearing, and that the moving and supporting papers served shall be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1005 (b).)

6) Provides that a tenant has committed unlawful detainer when they continue in possession of the property without the landlord's permission after:

   a) The tenant remains in possession of the premises after the expiration of the term of the tenancy without permission of the landlord or otherwise not permitted by law;
   b) The tenant's nonpayment of rent and service of a 3-day notice to pay or quit, stating the amount that is due;
   c) The tenant has breached a covenant of the lease or failed to perform other conditions under the lease, and after service of a 3-day notice requiring performance of such covenants or conditions;
   d) The tenant has breached a covenant of the lease prohibiting subletting, assignment, or waste; has committed or permitted a nuisance on the premises; or used the premises for an unlawful purpose; or
   e) The tenant gives written notice of the tenant's intention to terminate the tenancy, but fails to deliver possession of the premises to the landlord at the specified time. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1161.)

7) Provides that, on or before the day fixed for their appearance, a defendant in an unlawful detainer action may appear and answer, demur, or move to strike any portion of the complaint. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.)

8) Specifies that, in any unlawful detainer action in which the defendant demurs or moves to strike the complaint or any portion of it, the hearing on the demurrer

or motion must be held no less than five court days or more than seven court days after the filing of the notice of motion. Specifies that, for good cause shown, the court may order the hearing to be held on a later date, as specified. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170(b)(1).)

COMMENTS:

The unlawful detainer process for residential and commercial tenants. This bill specifies that the provision in 8), above, for the delay of a hearing on a motion to demur or strike for good cause shown, only applies in an unlawful detainer action involving a residential tenancy.

In order to ensure that a tenant's rights are respected and they have an opportunity to be heard before being forced out of the property that they rent, California law closely prescribes when a landlord may evict a tenant and the process that must be followed to do so. Almost all forced evictions in the residential and commercial context must take place through a judicial process, called an unlawful detainer. A tenant is guilty of an unlawful detainer and subject to eviction if they: remain on the property beyond the expiration of the lease without the landlord's permission; default on rent and fail to pay what they owe within three days of receiving notice from the landlord; violate a term of the rental agreement without correcting the violation within three days of notice; commit waste or a nuisance on the property; or remain on the property after they terminate the lease or surrender the lease. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1161.)

The unlawful detainer process is governed by Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1159 to 1179. These sets of laws and procedures recognize the importance to tenants of their rented property, whether they are renting it as their residence or for their business, and the significant disruption that eviction poses to both residential and commercial tenants. When a residential tenant is evicted, the consequences can be dire, as they can become homeless and have to expend significant financial resources for any temporary housing, to move their possessions, and to find new housing. For commercial tenants, eviction can mean a significant interruption to their business operations at the least, and the shuttering of their business in the worst instances. When a local small business closes, the impacts are also felt throughout the community, and it can contribute to the gentrification and displacement that many working-class communities of color have experienced in recent decades. However, to balance these interests with the interests of landlords to be able to promptly re-rent their properties if the current tenant is not paying rent or subject to eviction, the unlawful detainer process is also a summary proceeding,

meaning that it is a streamlined, fast-tracked judicial proceeding that is given priority among superior courts' civil cases. In fact, unlawful detainers are meant to take precedence in courts' civil dockets so that all unlawful detainer actions are quickly heard and determined. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1179a.)

In order to evict a tenant, a landlord must file an unlawful detainer action and request a judicial order that the tenant be evicted. An unlawful detainer proceeding is very similar to standard civil proceedings, though with significantly shortened timelines. A defendant must file a response to the unlawful detainer complaint within 10 court days of being served with the complaint, for example, while in standard civil proceedings, the defendant is provided 30 days to respond to a complaint. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1167 and 1167.3; 412.20; 430.40; 471.5.) Generally, a defendant may either answer the complaint by conceding or contesting the allegations in the complaint, or they can demur. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.) A demurrer alleges that the complaint is legally deficient, such as by failing to state a cognizable claim, rather than challenging the factual allegations in the complaint. A demurrer may be sustained with leave to amend, such that the plaintiff can re-file their complaint stating sufficient facts to state a claim, or it may be sustained without leave to amend, in which case the case is dismissed. If a defendant answers the landlord's complaint, and requests a trial, the trial must be held within 20 days of the request for a trial, unless extended by agreement of the parties. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.5.) Parties in unlawful detainer proceedings may also file motions for summary judgement, make motions for discovery, file a motion to strike portions of the complaint, and conduct depositions. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1170, 1170.7, 1170.8.) In each of these contexts, the timelines for notice are also shortened.

If the judge or the jury rules for the landlord, the court will issue a writ of possession, and the sheriff will notify the tenant that they have five days to vacate the premises before being forcibly removed. If the tenant wins the case, they will be allowed to remain in the premises, and may even be owed money from the landlord.

Previous attempts to create a statutory timeline for hearings on motions to demur or strike in an unlawful detainer case. Prior to this year, state law provided no specific timeline for a court to hold a hearing regarding motions to demur or strike that are filed in response to an unlawful detainer case. Instead, the California Rules of Court provided that demurrers must be set for a hearing within 35 days of the filing of the demurrer, or on the first date available to the court thereafter. (Cal. Rules of Court 3.1320(d).) That rule also provided that, for good cause shown, the

court may order the hearing on the demurrer to be held either earlier or later than the date set for the hearing.

Last year, the author of this bill authored a similar bill, AB 3196 (Nguyen, 2024). That bill would have required, for commercial unlawful detainer cases, a hearing on a motion to demur be held within 20 court days of the filing of the motion. It would not have permitted this hearing to be delayed beyond that 20-day timeline in any circumstance, unlike the rule contained in the Rules of Court. Similar to this bill, the author for AB 3196 cited examples of commercial unlawful detainer cases where hearings on the motion to demur were not scheduled for two, four, five, or seven months after the filing of the motion to demur as reason for why the change was needed. While AB 3196 passed this Committee, it was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

However, another bill from last year that did create a statutory timeline for demurrer motions was enacted into law. That bill was AB 2347 (Lee, Chapter 512, Statutes of 2024), though its primary purpose was to extend the period of time a tenant has to respond to the unlawful detainer complaint from five to ten days. In addition to this change, AB 2347 also specified that a hearing on a motion to demur or strike must be held within five to seven court days of the filing of notice of the motion. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1170). This timeline is significantly shorter than the timeline required by the Rules of Court, though it also included an exception to allow for delays for good cause. The changes made by AB 2347 have only been law since the beginning of this year.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/25)

California Business Properties Association (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/25)

Judicial Council of California

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the California Business Properties Association, which is the sponsor of AB 1384:

> AB 2347 was enacted to help ensure swift resolution in UD cases by creating standardized timelines for hearings on motions such as demurrers

and motions to strike. However, the bill did not distinguish between residential and commercial cases. In the commercial context, where delayed proceedings can result in prolonged vacancies, stalled lease negotiations, and operational uncertainty, timely resolution is essential.

AB 1384 simply clarifies that the "good cause" delay provision established in AB 2347 applies only to residential UD cases. Commercial cases would continue to follow the 5-to-7 court day hearing window. Courts still retain full authority to manage their calendars under Code of Civil Procedure Section 128(a)(8), and we are amenable to language allowing continuances where both parties submit a written stipulation.

This is a straightforward technical fix to ensure AB 2347 is implemented as intended. That's why AB 1384 passed both the Assembly Floor and Assembly Judiciary Committee on consent, with bipartisan support.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:
According to the Judicial Council, which is opposed to AB 1384:

The Judicial Council opposes Assembly Bill 1384 because it limits the court's authority to set a later hearing for a noticed motion in an action for unlawful detainer cases involving a commercial tenancy. Our courts already have heavily impacted calendars which have only been compounded by a bevy of legislatively mandated accelerated calendaring requirements. Because this bill would entirely eliminate the court's discretion to set a later hearing in these cases, even for good cause shown, the Judicial Council is opposed to AB 1284.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/21/25
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, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gallagher, Papan, Ramos, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Valencia

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/26/25 16:11:42

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1523
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1523
Author: Committee on Judiciary
Introduced: 3/18/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 9-0, 6/17/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Ashby, Valladares, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Court-ordered mediation

SOURCE: Assembly Judiciary Committee

DIGEST: This bill raises the threshold under which a court may order a case into mediation from $50,000 to $75,000 and places additional conditions which must be met before such an order can be made. This bill provides for the process of such mediation and its aftermath.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines "mediation" as a process in which a neutral person or persons facilitate communication between the disputants to assist them in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. (Code of Civil Procedure (Code Civ. Proc.) § 1775.1.)

2) Prohibits the court from ordering a case into mediation where the amount in controversy exceeds $50,000. The determination of the amount in controversy shall be made in the same manner as provided in Section 1141.16 and, in making this determination, the court shall not consider the merits of questions of liability, defenses, or comparative negligence. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.5.)

3) Provides that the determination of the amount in controversy shall be made by the court and the case referred to arbitration after all named parties have appeared or defaulted. The determination shall be made at a case management conference or based upon review of the written submissions of the parties, as provided in rules adopted by the Judicial Council. The determination shall be based on the total amount of damages, and the judge may not consider questions of liability or comparative negligence or any other defense. At that time the court shall also make a determination whether any prayer for equitable relief is frivolous or insubstantial. The determination of the amount in controversy and whether any prayer for equitable relief is frivolous or insubstantial may not be appealable. No determination pursuant to this section shall be made if all parties stipulate in writing that the amount in controversy exceeds the amount specified. The determination and any stipulation of the amount in controversy shall be without prejudice to any finding on the value of the case by an arbitrator or in a subsequent trial de novo. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.16.)

4) Provides that in the courts of the County of Los Angeles and in other courts that elect to apply this section of law, all at-issue civil actions in which arbitration is otherwise required, whether or not the action includes a prayer for equitable relief, may be submitted to mediation by the presiding judge as an alternative to judicial arbitration. Any civil action otherwise within the scope of this title in which a party to the action is a public agency or public entity may be submitted to mediation. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.3.)

5) Requires a mediator to be selected for the action within 30 days of its submission to mediation. The method of selection and qualification of the mediator shall be as the parties determine. If the parties are unable to agree on a mediator within 15 days of the date of submission of the action to mediation, the court may select a mediator pursuant to standards adopted by the Judicial Council. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.6.)

This bill:

1) Raises the threshold at which a court may not order a case into mediation to an amount in controversy exceeding $75,000. It makes clear that this determination and any stipulation thereto is without prejudice as to any finding on the value of the case.

2) Imposes additional conditions that must be met before a case can be ordered into mediation as follows:

    a) The case has been set for trial.
    b) At least one party has notified the court of its interest in mediation.
    c) There are no ongoing discovery disputes impacting the case.
    d) The parties have been notified of their option to stipulate to a mutually agreeable mediator.
    e) The parties have the ability to mediate through the use of remote technology upon the stipulation of all parties.

3) Provides that if the parties do not stipulate to a mutually agreeable mediator within 15 days of the date the case is submitted to mediation, the court shall select a mediator, at no cost to the parties, pursuant to standards adopted by the Judicial Council.

4) Requires all parties and counsel attending the mediation to comply with subdivision (a) of Rule 3.894 of the California Rules of Court.

5) Provides that such mediation shall conclude in the form of a mutually acceptable agreement or statement of nonagreement, as described in Section 1775.9, no later than 120 days before the trial date.

6) Prohibits the mediation from delaying the trial date.

Background

"Mediation" means a process in which a neutral person or persons facilitate communication between the disputants to assist them in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. Generally, mediation is entered into voluntarily by the parties to a dispute. However, the law provides a limited authorization for courts to order the parties to an action into mediation. Courts may not order a case into mediation if the amount in controversy exceeds $50,000.

This bill raises that threshold to $75,000 and places additional conditions that must be met, including that the case must be set for trial and that there are no ongoing discovery disputes. This bill also lays out the relevant process, including the selection of a mediator and the rules to apply in such mediation.

This bill is sponsored by the Assembly Judiciary Committee. It is supported by the California Dispute Resolution Council. No timely opposition has been received.

Comment

According to the author:

> AB 1523 raises the amount in controversy level for referring civil disputes to mediation from $50 thousand or less to $75 thousand or less. Given that the existing amount in controversy level has not been increased in decades, this straightforward bill will permit courts to direct more litigants to mediation. This bill also recognizes some of the flaws in the existing mediation system and add safeguards to the existing law to ensure that only cases with a legitimate chance of being resolved are sent to litigation, thus avoiding unnecessary expense and delay.

"Mediation" is the process in which a neutral person or persons facilitate communication between the disputants to assist them in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.1.) The law currently provides a narrow authorization for courts to force a case into mediation without the parties consent. The law provides that in the courts of the County of Los Angeles and in other courts that elect to do so, specified civil actions may be submitted to mediation, as provided. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.3.)

A mediator must be selected for the action within 30 days of its submission to mediation. The method of selection and qualification of the mediator shall be as the parties determine. If the parties are unable to agree on a mediator within 15 days of the date of submission of the action to mediation, the court may select a mediator pursuant to standards adopted by the Judicial Council. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.6.)

However, currently the law prohibits the court from ordering a case into mediation where the amount in controversy exceeds $50,000. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1775.5.)

This bill amends the statute in several ways. First, it raises the threshold at which a court may not order a case into mediation to an amount in controversy exceeding $75,000. It also establishes a series of conditions that must be met for the case to be eligible. It requires that no outstanding discovery disputes exist and that at least one party notify the court of interest in mediation. Parties must be able to mediate through remote technology, if the parties so stipulate, and they must be notified of the option to stipulate to a mutually agreeable mediator. However, if the parties do not so stipulate within 15 days, the court shall select a mediator, as provided, at no cost to the parties.

The conditions also require that the case must already be set for trial, and this bill prohibits the mediation from delaying that trial date.

As the author asserts, these conditions work to ensure that only cases likely to benefit from such mediation are eligible, reducing the inefficiencies attendant to unsuccessful mediation.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/18/25)

Assembly Judiciary Committee (Source)
California Dispute Resolution Council

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/18/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Dispute Resolution Council states:

> There has been a sharp rise in civil filings in the past few years. This rise has taxed the resources of our courts and mediation has proven to be one of the most effective methods of resolving these disputes. However, courts are generally prohibited from ordering mediation, See *Jeld-Wen, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 536. An exception to this restriction is set forth in former section 1775.5, which allowed court-ordered mediation where the amount in controversy did not exceed $50,000. The $50,000 limitation has been in effect for over 30 years and so an increase in the limitation is long overdue.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/19/25
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, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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: Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Papan

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/19/25 16:25:47

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 2
Author: Jackson (D), et al.
Introduced: 12/2/24
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes March 21, 2025, as the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and declare racism as a public health crisis.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The United Nations General Assembly proclaimed March 21 as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, marking the day when police in Sharpeville, South Africa, opened fire and killed 69 people at a peaceful protest against apartheid laws in 1960.

2) Racial discrimination remains a persistent challenge worldwide, undermining the dignity, rights, and potential of individuals and communities. This day serves as a reminder of the ongoing struggle against racial discrimination and the need to promote equality, justice, and human rights for all.

3) The 2025 observance of this day offers an opportunity to reflect on the progress made in combating racial discrimination, as well as the work that remains to be done to eliminate all forms of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, or color.

This resolution encourages individuals, communities, and nations to engage in dialogue, education, and action to foster a culture of respect and understanding.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 37 (Jackson, Resolution Chapter 165, Statutes of 2023)
SCR 17 (Leyva, Resolution Chapter 21, Statutes of 2021)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/28/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/28/25)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-1520
4/2/25 15:47:03

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 30
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 30
Author: Jackson (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/10/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Black History Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes February 2025 as Black History Month, urge all citizens to join in celebrating the accomplishments of African Americans during Black History Month, and encourages the people of California to recognize the many talents of African Americans and the achievements and contributions they make to their communities to create equity and equality for education, economics, and social justice. The resolution also recognizes the significance in protecting citizens' right to vote and remedying racial discrimination in voting.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The history of the United States is rich with inspirational stories of great individuals whose actions, words, and achievements have united Americans and contributed to the success and prosperity of the United States. Among those Americans who have enriched our society are the members of the African American community, individuals whose accomplishments have contributed to every endeavor throughout the history of our nation and who have been steadfast in their commitment to promoting brotherhood, equality, and justice for all.

2) Dr. Carter Godwin Woodson, the distinguished African American author, editor, publisher, and historian who is known as the "Father of Black History," founded Negro History Week in 1926, which became Black History Month in 1976, with the intent to encourage further research and publications regarding the untold stories of African American heritage.

3) From the earliest days of the United States, the course of its history has been greatly influenced by African American heroes and pioneers in many diverse

areas, including science, medicine, business, education, government, industry, and social leadership.

4) Despite decades of progress, African Americans continue to face racial and social injustices, voter suppression, economic stagnation, and voting barriers in jurisdictions with a history of discrimination. To build a stronger and more cohesive state and nation, we must continue to help advance the cause of voter equality and equal access to the political process for all people in order to protect the rights of every American.

This resolution recognizes February 2025 as Black History Month, urges all citizens to join in celebrating the accomplishments of African Americans during Black History Month, and encourages the people of California to recognize the many talents of African Americans and the achievements and contributions they make to their communities to create equity and equality for education, economics, and social justice.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCR 21 (Smallwood-Cuevas, 2025) – In Assembly held at desk.
ACR 136 (Holden, Resolution Chapter 28, Statutes of 2024).
SCR 107 (Smallwood-Cuevas, Resolution Chapter 35, Statutes of 2024).
ACR 15 (Wilson, Resolution Chapter 19, Statutes of 2023).
SCR 30 (Smallwood-Cuevas, Resolution Chapter 22, Statutes of 2023).
ACR 143 (Bryan, Resolution Chapter 27, Statutes of 2022).
SCR 67 (Bradford & Kamlager, Resolution Chapter 41, Statutes of 2022).
HR 12 (Jones-Sawyer, 2021) – Adopted in the Assembly.
ACR 18 (Kamlager, Resolution Chapter 10, Statutes of 2021).
SCR 10 (Bradford, Resolution Chapter 5, Statutes of 2021).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/4/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/4/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
3/5/25 15:32:45

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 32
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 32
Author: Carrillo (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/13/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: March4Water Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of March to be March4Water Month in California and encourages all Californians to participate in activities and programs during March4Water Month to promote awareness, education, and actions that prioritize water as a vital resource for the state's future.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) California has faced ongoing challenges related to water, including droughts, water scarcity, infrastructure needs, and water quality issues that require immediate and sustained attention.

2) An estimated 2.2 million Americans lack access to safe water and sanitation while 6 to 10 million lead service lines remain in use across the United States, many of which are in underserved communities.

3) The International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials is headquartered in California, playing a critical role in addressing water-related challenges by advancing safe and sustainable water systems through the development of standards and codes, education, and advocacy.

4) March4Water Month will serve as a platform for communities, organizations, and governmental agencies to raise awareness about water conservation, equitable access to clean and safe drinking water, and the importance of investing in water infrastructure and sustainability efforts.

5) Community engagement and education are critical to fostering a culture of water stewardship and advancing innovative solutions to California's water challenges.

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 4/1/25)

International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials

OPPOSITION: (Verified 4/1/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 3/20/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Castillo, Davies, Essayli, Gallagher, Hadwick, Krell, Macedo, Papan, Wallis

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
4/2/25 15:50:15

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 40
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 40
Author: Fong (D) and Celeste Rodriguez (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/25/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Laird

SUBJECT: Student financial aid: Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) data

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution states the Legislature and the State of California's commitment to protecting, to the fullest extent of the law, all the data and information provided by students and their families to California's postsecondary education.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

1) The federal Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-579, as amended) prohibits the disclosure of an individual's data from a system of records without written or verbal consent, and the landmark 1982 United States Supreme Court decision, *Plyler v. Doe* (1982) 457 U.S. 202, held that states cannot constitutionally deny students a free public education based on immigration status.

2) The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is a federal law that affords parents the right to have access to their children's education records, the right to seek to have the records amended, and the right to have some control over the disclosure of personally identifiable information from the education records. When a student turns 18 years old, or enters a postsecondary institution at any age, the rights under FERPA transfer from the parents to the student

("eligible student"). (20 U.S.C. § 1232g and 34 Code of Federal Regulations Part 99)

Existing state law:

3) Declares that the attainment of education for the betterment of the individual and the community is paramount regardless of one's immigration status, protects undocumented students from fear and discrimination in educational institutions, and prohibits police from providing or retaining personal information and immigration status for immigration enforcement purposes. (Education Code § 220-221)

This measure:

1) Resolves all of the following:

   a) That the Legislature of the State of California denounces any deportation plans that would disrupt the education of students.

   b) That the Legislature and the State of California maximize state resources and investments to ensure that all students, regardless of their immigration status or that of their parents or spouse, can access all forms of financial aid available to them, as well as enroll and succeed in postsecondary education.

   c) That the Legislature and the State of California commit to protecting, to the fullest extent of the law, all the data and information provided by students and their families to California's postsecondary education.

   d) That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the author for appropriate distribution.

2) Makes several findings and declarations regarding the negative impacts that the Trump administration's threat of mass deportation has had on the completion rates of student aid applications. This decline is attributed to the fear of sharing information with federal authorities.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill*. According to the author, "California's higher education system and financial aid infrastructure serves millions throughout the state. The FAFSA is the primary form that millions of students use to apply for financial support and afford tuition for college. The FAFSA collects various data, including information on whether or not a student or parent is a U.S. citizen. Unfortunately, due to threats and concerns from actions emanating from the federal government, we have seen a decline in applications which directly threaten the ability of our students to access and complete their education. We must ensure all students have the opportunity to attend and receive a postsecondary education, especially those from underserved communities."

The author further asserts, "ACR 40 reaffirms the state's commitment towards ensuring access to higher education through all forms of financial aid and protecting student information."

2) *FAFSA.* The United States Department of Education (USDE) administers the FAFSA. It is the core document used to determine eligibility for all major federal and state financial aid programs, including Cal Grant, Pell Grant, institutional aid at the University of California and the California State University, work-study awards, scholarships, and federal student loans. Because financial aid for college considers the cost of attendance and a family's ability to pay in determining eligibility for financial aid, the FAFSA completion requires personal information such as income and tax information and a social security number. The FAFSA Simplification Act came into effect in 2020. According to the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC), "The new FAFSA for the 2024-25 academic year introduced significant changes to the way students and families apply for and submit a FAFSA, which introduced barriers for many students, but especially for those in mixed-status families who are now required to undergo a substantial burden of proof compared to their peers. A key change to the FAFSA includes a direct data exchange of federal tax information with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) intended to simplify and shorten the historically lengthy application. For such direct data exchange to occur, federal law requires that individuals (referred to as "contributors") whose information is required to determine students' eligibility (the applicant themselves, as well as their parent(s) or spouse) consent to the disclosure of their individual IRS data. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) now requires all contributors to create their own StudentAid.gov account for purposes of providing individual consent to such

data sharing. The process for non-Social Security Number contributors to create a StudentAid.gov account requires such individuals to manually verify their identity with FSA by providing copies of documentation with their name and/or address. CSAC has seen a 32 percent decrease in FAFSA submissions among California high school seniors from mixed-status families compared to 2023-24."

3) *Mixed-status families.* The vast majority of high school and college students qualify for FAFSA application completion and can access both federal and state financial aid programs, including US citizen students with undocumented contributors such as parents or spouses. With the new FAFSA application changes, concerns regarding arrests, detention, and deportations of undocumented individuals under the Trump administration have been raised about data collected for the FAFSA and whether it may be used for purposes other than determining financial aid. Mixed-status families may face a difficult decision regarding the FAFSA application. They may have to choose between disclosing personal information to USDE about vulnerable contributors, and forgoing federal student aid opportunities, which may potentially affect their ability to finance their student's college education. It is vital for students and families to be well informed about each option and to have choices regarding those options. This measure aims to solidify this state's commitment to safeguarding the data and information provided by students and their families to California's postsecondary education.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/25)

California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office
California Student Aid Commission
CFT - A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Community College League of California
Faculty Association of California's Community Colleges
University of California Student Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/25)

None received

Prepared by: Olgalilia Ramirez / ED. / (916) 651-4105
6/26/25 16:11:43

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 61
Author: Stefani (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/1/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Filicide Awareness Week

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims April 9, 2025, to April 15, 2025, inclusive, as Filicide Awareness Week.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The month of April has been recognized as National Child Abuse Prevention Month since 1983.

2) Too many children are often targets of neglect and mental, physical, and sexual abuse that occur mainly within their household and, tragically, sometimes lead to filicide.

3) There are approximately 500 filicide cases in the United States every year that are made all too easy by limitless access to guns.

4) On average, one child per week is murdered by a parent or stepparent during divorce, separation, visitation, or custody negotiations.

5) Family law attorneys have the power to contribute their efforts to protect minor children during these proceedings.

This resolution proclaims the week of April 9, 2025, to April 15, 2025, inclusive, to be Filicide Awareness Week, supports the efforts of Pierce's Pledge, and encourages all family law attorneys to take Pierce's Pledge in an effort to keep all children safe.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 4/30/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 4/30/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
4/30/25 16:48:22

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 70
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 70
Author: Pellerin (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/24/25
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 6/3/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Suicide Prevention Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims September 2025 as Suicide Prevention Awareness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) September is known nationally as "Suicide Prevention Awareness Month" to raise the visibility of the mental health resources and suicide prevention service available in our community.

2) Suicide is a serious public health problem that affects individuals, families, and communities across California. Four thousand three hundred twelve people died by suicide in California in 2022, which, according to the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, was more than twice the number of homicides.

3) LGBTQIA+ youth were almost five times as likely to have attempted suicide compared to heterosexual youth, 54% of transgender and nonbinary youth in California considered suicide, and 19% of transgender and nonbinary youth attempted suicide in the past year.

4) It may be beneficial to focus prevention programs and resources on vulnerable populations who are most at risk of suicide, including White males, LGBTQIA+ individuals, particularly transgender individuals, youth, veterans and military personnel, Native Americans, rural and underserved populations, and Black Californians who have seen an increased rate of suicide.

5) California's goal is to ensure that individuals, friends, and families have access to the resources they need to discuss suicide prevention and to seek help.

This resolution hereby proclaims the month of September 2025 as Suicide Prevention Awareness Month.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 229 (Pellerin, Resolution Chapter 198, Statutes of 2024)
ACR 106 (Pellerin, Resolution Chapter 167, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 6/3/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, 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, 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: Davies, Quirk-Silva

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/11/25 15:57:10

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 77
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 77
Author: Davies (R), et al.
Introduced: 5/5/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Drowning Awareness and Prevention Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of May 2025 as Drowning Awareness and Prevention Month in California and recognizes Nadina Riggsbee, her daughter, Samira, and her son, JJ, in honor of Ms. Riggsbee's retirement from her position as the President and Founder of the Drowning Prevention Foundation.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) According to the Drowning Prevention Foundation and the State Department of Public Health's EPICenter injury surveillance system, drowning is the leading cause of death among children 1 to 4 years of age, inclusive, the second leading cause of death for children 5 to 14 years of age, inclusive, and the third leading cause of death for teenagers and youth 15 to 24 years of age, inclusive.

2) More than 430 Californians of all ages suffer fatal drowning incidents annually and hundreds more become nonfatal, rescued, drowning victims.

3) In the United States, for every child who dies from drowning, another seven receive emergency department care for nonfatal submersion injuries. Survivors of nonfatal drowning are often left with permanent brain damage and require lifelong assistance.

4) Two-thirds of all drowning accidents occur between the months of May and August.

5) It is crucial for families to learn essential lifesaving practices to prevent drowning and to safeguard their children's safety.

This resolution recognizes Nadina Riggsbee, her daughter, Samira, and her son, JJ, in honor of Ms. Riggsbee's retirement from her position as the President and Founder of the Drowning Prevention Foundation and acknowledges her role as California's matriarch of drowning prevention. Ms. Riggsbee has worked tirelessly for more than 30 years to further the cause of drowning prevention in California and to support the development of many successful state, regional, and local drowning prevention and child safety organizations while providing care and support to other families affected by the loss of a child to drowning.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 45 (Rubio, 2025) – Held in Senate.
ACR 168 (Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 98, Statutes of 2024).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/27/25)

California Coalition for Children's Safety and Health

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/27/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
5/27/25 17:45:34

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 90
Author: Gipson (D), Bonta (D), Bryan (D), Elhawary (D), Jackson (D), McKinnor (D), Ransom (D), Sharp-Collins (D) and Wilson (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/22/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Juneteenth

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes June 19, 2025, 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.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Juneteenth, also known as "Juneteenth Independence Day," "Emancipation Day," "Emancipation Celebration," and "Freedom Day," is the oldest African American holiday observance in the United States.

2) Juneteenth, or June 19, 1865, is considered the date when the last slaves in America were freed when General Gordon Granger rode into the City of Galveston, Texas, and issued General Order No. 3, almost two and one-half years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. 2025 marks 160 years of freedom celebrations.

3) 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.

4) 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, 2025, as Juneteenth.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 192 (Jones-Sawyer, Resolution Chapter 152, Statutes of 2024).
SCR 152 (Bradford, Resolution Chapter 145, Statutes of 2024).
ACR 94 (Jones-Sawyer, Resolution Chapter 122, Statutes of 2023).
SCR 76 (Bradford, Smallwood-Cuevas, Resolution Chapter 142, Statutes of 2023).
ACR 190 (Jones-Sawyer, Resolution Chapter 139, Statues of 2022).
SCR 109 (Bradford, Kamlager, Resolution Chapter 117, Statutes of 2022).
ACR 82 (Cooper, Resolution Chapter 95, Statutes of 2021).
SCR 41 (Bradford, Kamlager, Resolution Chapter 99, Statutes of 2021).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/24/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/26/25 9:03:09

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 92
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 92
Author: Mark González (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/29/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Electronic Dance Music Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of June 2025 as Electronic Dance Music Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Electronic dance music, or "EDM," traces its roots back to the 1970s with the rise of disco and the innovative use of synthesizers in popular music.

2) EDM encompasses a wide array of subgenres, including, but not limited to, disco, synthpop, techno, house, trance, drum and bass, dubstep, trap, hardstyle, and many more.

3) EDM is a vibrant and inclusive musical form that brings people of all backgrounds together on the dance floor.

4) EDM culture is rooted in the core values of Peace, Love, Unity, and Respect, commonly abbreviated as "PLUR". These values reflect the spirit of California, a state that celebrates diversity, inclusion, and creative expression.

5) California is home to some of the world's most iconic EDM festivals, hosted in cities across the state, including the Cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, San Jose, San Bernardino, Bakersfield, Palm Springs, Coachella, and across the North Coast region. These festivals not only serve as cultural landmarks, but also generate millions in economic impact for local communities and the state.

This resolution declares the month of June 2025 as Electronic Dance Music Month.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
6/26/25 9:03:10

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AJR 3
Author: Schiavo (D), et al.
Introduced: 3/3/25
Vote: 21

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/16/25
AYES: Arreguín, Ochoa Bogh, Becker, Limón, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-2, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Public social services: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid

SOURCE: California Alliance for Retired Americans
California State Council of Service Employees International Union
Health Care for All – California

DIGEST: This resolution urges the President of the United States and Congress not to cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid benefits.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Federal Law:

1) Establishes the Social Security Act, a system of monthly federal benefits for older people. (42 United States Code (USC) § 7 et seq.)

2) Establishes Medicare as a federal health insurance program for older people, people with disabilities and for people needing dialysis or kidney transplants for the treatment of end-stage renal disease. (42 USC § 1395 et seq.)

3) Establishes the Medicaid program to provide health insurance to qualified, low-income individuals and families. (42 USC § 1396 et seq.)

Existing State Law:

1) Establishes the In- Home Supportive Services program to provide supportive services to individuals who are aged, blind, or living with disabilities, and who are unable to perform the services themselves or remain safely in their homes without receiving these services. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) § 12300 et seq.)

2) Establishes the Medi-Cal Act to implement the requirements of the federal Medicaid program and meet the needs of low income individuals and families for health care and related remedial or preventive services. (WIC § 14000 et seq.)

This resolution:

1) States that Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid are foundational to the income and health security of many Americans.

2) Makes declarations about the importance of Social Security income to older Californians and their children and that federally proposed tax cuts and other proposed policies would cause the Social Security Trust Fund to be depleted two years sooner than currently projected.

3) States that eliminating the cap on income subject to the Social Security tax would ensure the Social Security Trust Fund will have sufficient resources to meet its obligations for at least another 20 years.

4) Makes declarations about the importance of Medicare to seniors and people with disabilities.

5) States that Congressional proposals could result in increased health care insecurity and costs for seniors and disabled beneficiaries.

6) Makes declarations about the importance of Medicaid to low-income Americans and the benefits of the expansion of Medicaid through the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

7) States that current congressional proposals would cause people who rely on In-Home Supportive Services for help staying healthy at home to be forced into costly institutions.

8) Resolves that the Legislature is opposed to cuts to and proposals to privatize Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, as well as proposals to indirectly cut these programs by defunding them, while giving tax breaks to multinational corporations and billionaires.

9) Calls on California Representatives in Congress to vote against the efforts to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid as described above.

10) Calls on President of the United States to honor his campaign promise not to cut these programs, and not to defund them, to veto any legislation to do so, and instead work to protect these programs.

Comments

According to the author, "While the California Legislature cannot change federal policy, this resolution sends a strong message that we are committed to protecting Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare for our most vulnerable: seniors, children, and people with disabilities. Any cuts to these programs will only create irreparable harm for Californians, but especially those with low and middle incomes and our disabled community whose quality of life, and in some cases their very lives, depends on the vitality of these programs. The administration made a promise to the American people about these programs, and this resolution would urge them to honor it."

Social Security. Social Security was created in 1935 under President Franklin D. Roosevelt in response to the economic uncertainty created by the Great Depression. The program was created to balance the need for people to be economically secure without creating a new welfare assistance program. To qualify to receive monthly social security payments a person needs to pay payroll taxes for 10 years with the understanding they are investing in the program and will receive income when they need it in old age.[1] The program also operates as a life insurance policy because children of deceased workers can receive Social Security Disability Insurance. Though the benefits are not large—the average Social Security benefit in February 2024 was about $1,862 per month—it keeps many older adults out of poverty.[2] It is also especially impactful for communities of color. According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, "Black and Latino workers are less likely to be offered workplace retirement plans and more likely to work in low-paid jobs with little margin for savings. Social Security helps reduce these inequities between older white adults and older adults of color."[3] California has the most social security beneficiaries of any state, about 6.3 million people. This resolution calls on Congress to prevent any cuts to Social Security or attempts at privatization.

---

[1] https://www.ssa.gov/history/briefhistory3.html

[2] https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/top-ten-facts-about-social-security

[3] ibid

Medicare and Medicaid. Medicare and Medicaid were created in 1965 under President Lyndon B. Johnson. The law was an amendment to the Social Security Act of 1935 and was initially under the Social Security Administration but is now overseen by the Department of Health and Human Services and administered by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid.

Medicare is health insurance for people age 65 and older regardless of their income or health and people under 65 who have certain disabilities. It is an entitlement program and its health plans cover most of the services that traditional private plans cover. To enroll, older beneficiaries just need to show they or their spouse are eligible for social security and have paid payroll taxes for 10 years. According to the Department of Health Care Services, approximately 6.6 million Californians are covered by Medicare and 90 percent of them are 65 or older.

Medicaid was created to provide low-income individuals and families with health insurance and long-term services like In-Home Supportive Services. Seniors with low incomes can also receive health coverage through Medicaid for what is not covered by Medicare. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, in 2016, half of the Medicare enrollees made less than $26,000.[4] The program is jointly administered by federal and state governments with the federal government providing oversight funding and states administering the program, as well as providing additional funding. States have flexibility in the way they administer Medicaid and can apply for waivers that give them the additional flexibility to operate in ways not traditionally allowed through regulation.

In California, Medi-Cal, the state's Medicaid program, has 14.7 million people enrolled as of March 2025, according to the Department of Health Care Services. There have been a number of changes to the program recently which expanded eligibility and enrollment. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, these expansions include making "low-income undocumented immigrants eligible for comprehensive coverage… eliminating asset limit eligibility rules for seniors and persons with disabilities, reducing enrollee cost-sharing requirements, and restoring certain services cut during the Great Recession."[5] This resolution calls on Congress and the President to abstain from proposed funding cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, and any changes to the program that would effectively act as funding cuts.

---

[4] https://www.kff.org/medicare/issue-brief/an-overview-of-medicare

[5] LAO. The 2025-26 Budget: Medi-Cal in the May Revision. May 19, 2025.

Related/Prior Legislation:

AJR 11 (Davies, 2024) proposes cuts and measures to privatize social security and Medicare and calls on our state's Representatives in Congress to vote against cuts and measures to privatize and to support legislation to improve and expand these systems to strengthen their protections. This joint resolution was held on the Assembly Floor.

SJR 11 (Skinner, Chapter 157, Statutes of 2022) affirms the Legislature's support for expanding Social Security and requests California representatives in Congress to support expanding Social Security by voting in favor of the Social Security 2100 Act: A Sacred Trust.

SJR 5 (Wilk, Chapter 181, Statutes of 2022) urges the United States Congress to amend the United States Social Security Administration's index of earnings to ensure that a decline in aggregate wages due to COVID-19 does not result in decreased benefits.

AJR 9 (Cooper, Chapter 78, Statutes of 2021) requests the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President to sign, legislation that would repeal the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision from the Social Security Act.

AJR 8 (Kalra, Chapter 96, Statutes of 2017) calls on California's representatives in Congress to vote against cuts to, and proposals to privatize, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and calls on the President of the United States to veto any legislation to cut or privatize these programs.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/17/25)

California Alliance for Retired Americans (Co-Source)
California State Council of Service Employees International Union (Co-Source)
Health Care for All – California (Co-Source)
American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network INC.
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Afl-cio
Association of Regional Center Agencies
California Association of Food Banks
California Nurses Association
California Public Employees' Retirement System

California State Retirees
California Teachers Association
Californians for Ssi
Children Now
County Welfare Directors Association of California
Health Access California
Movement to End Privatization of Medicare
National Multiple Sclerosis Society
Peace and Freedom Party of California
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/17/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-2, 5/19/25
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, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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, Gallagher
NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Lackey, Macedo, Papan, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

Prepared by: Naima Ford Antal / HUMAN S. / (916) 651-1524
6/18/25 16:38:33

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AJR 5
Author: Lee (D), Fong (D), Haney (D), Kalra (D), Muratsuchi (D) and Patel (D), et al.
Amended: 6/10/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-1, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Birthright citizenship

SOURCE: Chinese for Affirmative Action

DIGEST: This resolution sets forth the Senate's opposition to Executive Order No. 14160, which purports to end birthright citizenship in the United States, affirms the Senate's commitment to birthright citizenship, and honors Wong Kim Ark's fight for legal recognition of birthright citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (U.S. Const.).

ANALYSIS:

Existing constitutional law:

1) Provides that the United States Congress has the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States. (U.S. Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 4.)

2) Provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. (U.S. Const., 14th amend., § 1.)

This resolution:

1) Declares that:

   a) On January 20, 2025, President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order No. 14160, entitled "Protecting the Meaning and Value of American Citizenship" (the "Executive Order"), which purports to end birthright citizenship for children born to (1) a mother who is unlawfully present or who is lawfully present in the United States but on a temporary basis, and (2) a father who is neither a citizen nor a lawful permanent resident.
   b) The Constitution has granted birthright citizenship for over 150 years, since birthright citizenship was enshrined in the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, ratified after the Civil War to repudiate the infamous decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857) 60 U.S. 393, which held that Black Americans of African descent could never be United States citizens.
   c) Birthright citizenship impacts every child born in California, regardless of race, color, sex, ability, class, parents' national origin, parents' immigration status, or any characteristic, because all persons born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens.
   d) Birthright citizenship is especially important in California, where one in four residents is an immigrant and where about one-half of all children in California have at least one immigrant parent.
   e) Denying birthright citizenship for children of certain immigrants could make hundreds of thousands of children ineligible for federal and state benefits and services such as CalWORKs and CalFresh, would damage their educational, economic, and health prospects, and would undermine community safety, political participation, and the economy.
   f) The unconstitutional Executive Order could block these children's access to United States passports, social security cards, free lunch programs, health care, and federal student aid, and denying these fundamental needs jeopardizes the well-being of these children and harms the broader community, leading to devastating social, political, and economic consequences.
   g) After the Executive Order was announced, California joined 18 other states, the City and County of San Francisco, and the District of Columbia in suing to block the Executive Order on the ground that it violates the Fourteenth Amendment to, and Article I of, the United States Constitution, the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act.

h) The Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of birthright citizenship was affirmed over 125 years ago in the landmark United States Supreme Court decision *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (1898) 169 U.S. 649, involving San Francisco-born Chinese American Wong Kim Ark.

i) Wong Kim Ark was born in 1873 at 751 Sacramento Street in Chinatown in the City and County of San Francisco to parents Wong Si Ping and Wee Lee, who owned a grocery store but were unable to naturalize as United States citizens due to prevailing anti-Chinese policies.

j) In 1895, Wong Kim Ark returned from visiting his family in China and, upon reentry, was denied admission on the false basis that he was not a citizen of the United States and was ordered to be deported under the Chinese Exclusion Acts.

k) The Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association in San Francisco hired an attorney to fight Wong Kim Ark's unlawful detention and the case was ultimately decided on March 28, 1898, which held that the Fourteen Amendment to the United States Constitution establishes birthright citizenship, with very few exceptions.

l) The Supreme Court's opinion in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* (1898) 169 U.S. 649 extends birthright citizenship to all persons born in the United States, "including all children here born of resident aliens," and excludes only children born to foreign sovereigns or their ministers; children born on foreign public ships; children born to enemies born within and during a hostile occupation of our territory; and children of members of some sovereign Indian tribes.

m) Wong Kim Ark's legacy and historic fight for justice ensured the United States Constitution's guarantee of birthright citizenship and empowers children born in California to achieve their full potential as Americans to grow up to become whatever they dream, including President of the United States.

n) The unconstitutional Executive Order ignores over 100 years of precedent and condemns babies to a legal status of statelessness, which will limit their lifetime access to schools, jobs, and medical care and subject them to social isolation, travel restrictions, and exploitation.

o) The unconstitutional Executive Order is just one of President Trump's draconian attempts to scapegoat and instill fear among immigrants, divide immigrants based on arbitrary distinctions, and roll back constitutional rights.

p) All residents, regardless of their immigration status, deserve dignity, fair treatment and due process under the law, and the opportunity to thrive in the

United States, and this belief serves as the foundation for state and local sanctuary laws in California, including the California's Values Act of 2017.

2) Resolves the following by the Senate of the State of California:

   a) The Senate hereby opposes the unconstitutional Executive Order purporting to end birthright citizenship as enshrined in the United States Constitution.
   b) The Senate affirms its commitment to birthright citizenship and recognizes and honors Wong Kim Ark's fight to affirm the fundamental right of birthright citizenship under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
   c) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

According to the author of this resolution:

> Birthright citizenship is rooted in our Constitution. It serves as a bedrock of our American values and has been upheld for over 150 years. The president's attempts to deny birthright citizenship is unconstitutional and undermines the core principles this country was founded upon. California is home to 10.6 million immigrants, with their contributions imprinted in every corner of our society. As we commemorate the legacy of Wong Kim Ark, I'm proud to introduce a state resolution to affirm the legislature's commitment to birthright citizenship and honor Wong Kim Ark's fight for this constitutional right.

This resolution is substantially similar to SR 32 (Wahab, 2025), which is pending on the Senate Floor.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/25/25)

Chinese for Affirmative Action (source)
AAPI Equity Alliance
Alianza
Alliance for Girls

American Community Media
API Equity-LA
AROC Action
ASATA Power
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders for Civil Empowerment
Asian Law Caucus
Asian Pacific Islander Council of San Francisco
Asian Youth Center
CAIR California
California Community Foundation
California Faculty Association
California Immigrant Policy Center
Cambodia Town Inc.
Catalyst California
Chinese Culture Center of San Francisco
Chinese Progressive Association
CHIRLA
CRLA Foundation
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities
Equal Justice Society
Filipino Migrant Center
Food Empowerment Project
Foundation for Filipina Women's Network
GRACE – End Child Poverty CA
HEAL Food Alliance
Hmong Innovating Politics
Immigrant Legal Resource Center
Immigrants Rising
Inclusive Action
Japanese American Citizens League
Khmer Girls In Action
La Raza Community Center Resource Center
Little Tokyo Service Center
Mixteco/Indigena Community Organizing Project
National Asian Pacific American Families Allied for Substance Awareness and Harm Reduction
National Pacific Islander Education Network
Nihonmachi Street Fair, Inc.
Pacific Asian Counseling Services

Pacifica Housing 4 All
Pacifica Peace People
Pacifica Progressive Alliance
Pacifica Social Justice
Pacoima Beautiful
PODER
Prevention Institute
San Francisco Japantown Task Force
San Francisco Senior and Disability Action
Search to Involve Pilipino Americans
SEIU California
South Asian Network
South Asian Resource Action Center
Southeast Asian Community Center
Stop AAPI Hate
Thai CDC
The Sikh Coalition
The Transgender District
United Parents and Students
Western Center on Law and Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/25/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to a coalition of the bill's supporters:

> Birthright citizenship is guaranteed by the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which says that "all persons" born in the United States are automatically citizens, with the exception of children whose parents are foreign diplomats. Over 125 years ago, Wong Kim Ark and the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of San Francisco fought to ensure that every child born in the United States, regardless of race, color, sex, ability, class, parents' national origin, and parents' immigration status, are automatically considered U.S. citizens through the U.S. Constitution.
>
> Ending birthright citizenship for children of immigrants would have devastating consequences in California. The state stands to lose tens of millions of dollars per year in federal funding it would have received if not for the termination of birthright citizenship. Experts estimate that the order would lead to the wrongful denial of citizenship to approximately 150,000 U.S. born citizens every year, including 24,500 children born annually in California; by 2050, the

population of undocumented individuals in the U.S. will more than double. Tens of thousands of babies would find themselves stateless without access to important social programs like CalFresh and CalWORKS, school lunch, and student financial aid. These children will grow up without passports, social security cards, access to jobs, and the right to vote. This would perpetuate racial inequality, make them vulnerable to exploitation, and lead to widespread economic, social, and political marginalization.

Trump's efforts to end birthright citizenship is just one of the many ways his administration has used xenophobic rhetoric and cruel executive actions to wreak havoc on immigrant communities and fuel racial profiling and anti-immigrant harm. The executive order is in opposition to California's values of inclusivity and history of multiracial democracy. Denying basic rights and services to U.S. citizen children based on their parents' immigration status is unconstitutional and creates an undue hardship, perpetuates inequality, and contravenes our nation's values of fairness and justice. We urge our state leaders to send a strong message in affirming birthright citizenship to ensure immigrants know they are welcome and belong in California.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-1, 5/19/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, 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, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, 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
NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Chen, Davies, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Papan, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
6/26/25 9:03:11

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

Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AJR 10
Author: Rogers (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/21/25
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Seyarto, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/8/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: United States Forest Service: federal funding

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This measure calls on the President of the United States to honor his promise to save American lives and communities through forest management and wildfire risk reduction projects, requests that he veto any legislation that defunds the United States Forest Service (USFS) and work with Congress to protect and improve these programs, and calls for related congressional action.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

1) Requires the United States Secretary of Agriculture to make provisions for the protection against destruction by fire and depredations upon the public forests and national forests which may have been set aside or which may be hereafter set aside. (Title 16, United States Code (USC), section 551)

2) Requires officials of the USFS designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, in all ways that are practicable, to aid in the enforcement of the laws of the states or territories with regard to stock, for the prevention and extinguishment of forest fires, and for the protection of fish and game, and with respect to national forests, to aid the other federal bureaus and departments on request from them,

in the performance of the duties imposed on them by law. (16 USC 553)

3) Directs, in order to determine and demonstrate the best methods for the conservative management of forest and forest lands and the protection of timber and other forest products, the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain, in cooperation with the state of California and with the surrounding states, a forest experiment station at such place or places as the Secretary may determine to be most suitable, and to conduct, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the federal government, the states, universities, colleges, county and municipal agencies, business organizations, and individuals, such silvicultural, dendrological, forest fire, economic, and other experiments and investigations as may be necessary. (16 USC 562)

Existing state law establishes the Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force (Task Force) and requires the Task Force to report to the appropriate policy and budget committees of the Legislature on progress made in achieving the goals and key actions identified in the state's action plan, on state expenditures made to implement these key actions, and on additional resources and policy changes needed to achieve these goals and key actions. (Public Resources Code 4771)

This resolution:

1) Makes findings related to:

   a) The administration of National Forest lands;
   b) The importance of healthy forestland to the state's economy, recreation, resource management, and water supply; and
   c) The value of a fully-staffed Forest Service.

2) Resolves that the Legislature calls on the President of the United States to:

   a) Honor his promise to save American lives through forest management and wildfire risk reduction projects;
   b) Veto any legislation that defunds the USFS; and
   c) Work with Congress to protect and improve related programs.

3) Further resolves:

   a) That the Legislature opposes direct and indirect cuts to the USFS and its programs; and

b) The Legislature calls on California's Congressional Representatives to vote against cuts to the USFS and support legislation to protect and improve the federal government's forest management activities in California.

4) Continues to resolve that the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

Background

United States Forest Service. Today, the USFS, with approximately 35,000 employees across the country, manages the National Forest System, which consists of 154 national forests and 20 national grasslands covering 193 million acres in 43 states, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. The USFS helps communities; state, local, and tribal governments; forest industries; and private forest landowners improve conditions in both urban and rural areas. In total, the USFS helps to steward about 900 million forested acres in the United States, including 130 million acres in urban areas, where most Americans live.

Roughly one-third of California is forested and more than half – 57%, or nearly 19 million acres – of the state's forestlands are owned and managed by the federal government. California has 20 national forests, and is second only to Alaska in federal forestland acres.

State-Federal Partnerships. In addition to the work USFS conducts independently in each state, it also has partnerships with states for joint forest management goals and projects. The USFS and California have committed to maintain and restore healthy forests and rangelands through the Agreement for Shared Stewardship of California's Forest and Rangelands to treat a million acres of forest and wildlands annually by 2025, committing to each sustainably treat 500,000 acres per year. The Good Neighbor Authority allows the USFS to enter into agreements with State, County, and Tribal agencies to perform forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services on, and adjacent to, National Forest System lands. The authority allows the USFS to enter into up to 10-year agreements with partner agencies that have the mandate to conduct forest and watershed restoration activities, who then perform the activities on behalf of the Forest Service.

Partnerships like those through the Good Neighbor Authority, where the state contributes funding and non-cash resources to perform fuels management on federal lands, are at risk. The amount of USFS managed lands and the federal appropriations for that land management are a significant part of California's overall wildfire risk reduction strategies – budget cuts to USFS activities may raise the cost of shared stewardship and Good Neighbor Authority projects to the state.

Cuts to federal workforce. In early April, *ProPublica* reported that about 700 USFS employees who were terminated in February were "red carded," a certification system indicating an employee is qualified to work on the fire line or supporting wildfire response. Understaffing in other units such as information technology also impacts firefighting.

Efficiency at what cost? According to reporting in *Politico,* President Trump has cut 10% of USFS employees. Chief Randy Moore, the former Regional Forester of the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), which covers California, resigned as USFS chief, and more than half of the regional chiefs are also retiring. Vicki Christiansen, who served as the USFS Chief during President Trump's first term, acknowledges the threat of these cuts – "$40 million in savings now just to have an additional $4 billion in wildfire expenses is crazy."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/10/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "The United States Forest Service staffing levels might seem like something far from our everyday lives, but it affects us all on a daily basis. So many of our water sources originate in National Forest lands. Critical species, icons like the California Condor, and vulnerable ecosystems rely on these natural lands for survival. These vast forests are the lungs of our state, soaking up carbon and helping keep our air clean."

"I'm immensely proud that the 2nd Assembly District is home to the Mendocino National Forest, the first established in the state. It spans an area covering almost 1 million acres and is close in size to the entire state of Rhode Island. This Forest and other National Forests in my district sustain tribal communities and thousands of

rural residents for their food sources, provide water from crystal clear rivers, and deliver jobs from recreation."

"These staffing cuts directly impact my constituents, literally taking food off the tables of longtime public servants who work in the Forest Service. In our small rural communities even a few jobs lost can have a large ripple effect on everyone. These cuts imperil residents in all corners of the state, from the Angeles National Forest to the slopes surrounding Lake Tahoe."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/8/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Boerner, Carrillo, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Macedo, Celeste Rodriguez, Wallis

Prepared by: Edith Hannigan / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
6/11/25 9:20:32

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