2025-26 SESSION

SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET

MONDAY, JULY 14, 2025

OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-1520

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Monday, July 14, 2025.

Note	Measure	Author	Location
	SB 39	Weber Pierson	Unfinished Business
	SB 85	Umberg	Unfinished Business
	SB 119	Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review	Unfinished Business
+	SB 394	Allen	Unfinished Business
+	SB 459	Grayson	Unfinished Business
RA	SB 765	Niello	Unfinished Business
	SCR 11	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SCR 25	Blakespear	Unfinished Business
	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 89	Smallwood-Cuevas	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
	SCR 97	Seyarto	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 5	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 6	Cortese	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SJR 7	Cervantes	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 21	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 50	Archuleta	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 51	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	SR 53	Rubio	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 16	Alanis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 43	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 50	Bonta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 60	Papan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 87	Boerner	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 94	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 234	Calderon	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 243	Ahrens	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 248	Bryan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 263	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 287	Lackey	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 293	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 301	Schiavo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 310	Alanis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 321	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 330	Rogers	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

\+ ADDS
RA Revised Analysis
* Analysis pending

Note	Measure	Author	Location
	AB 373	Blanca Rubio	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 379	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	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
	AB 438	Hadwick	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 439	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 454	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 483	Irwin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
RA	AB 484	Dixon	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 492	Valencia	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 503	Mark González	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 516	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 519	Berman	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 523	Irwin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 540	Connolly	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 574	Mark González	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 581	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 583	Pellerin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 596	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 627	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 628	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 639	Soria	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 656	Schiavo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 663	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 677	Bryan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 709	Jeff Gonzalez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 761	Addis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 847	Sharp-Collins	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 867	Lee	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 870	Hadwick	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 904	Aguiar-Curry	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 931	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 952	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 962	Hoover	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 978	Hoover	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1004	Wallis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1008	Addis	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1014	Rogers	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1123	Muratsuchi	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1125	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1150	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1213	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1258	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1299	Bryan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1369	Ramos	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1374	Berman	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1384	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1389	Blanca Rubio	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1393	Blanca Rubio	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS
RA Revised Analysis
* Analysis pending

Note	Measure	Author	Location
	AB 1414	Ransom	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1430	Bennett	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AB 1523	Committee on Judiciary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1525	Committee on Judiciary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1526	Committee on Governmental Organization	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 54	Ta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 61	Stefani	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	ACR 70	Pellerin	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 83	Wilson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 93	Dixon	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 95	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	ACR 99	Davies	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 3	Schiavo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 5	Lee	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
	AJR 6	Aguiar-Curry	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS
RA Revised Analysis
* Analysis pending

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 39
Author: Weber Pierson (D)
Amended: 6/12/25
Vote: 27 - Urgency

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

SENATE FLOOR: 34-0, 3/28/25 (Consent)
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Becker, Hurtado, Jones, Reyes, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Cosmetic safety: vaginal suppositories

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill exempts boric acid vaginal suppositories (BAS) from a prohibition on boric acid, and requires BAS to include a product label commencing January 1, 2027, and bans BAS commencing January 1, 2035, unless the BAS product becomes regulated by the federal Food and Drug Administration.

Assembly Amendments requires boric acid vaginal suppositories (BAS) to include a product label commencing January 1, 2027, and ban BAS commencing January 1, 2035, unless the BAS product becomes regulated as a drug by the United States Food and Drug Administration.

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 1) found on one or more of the statutorily specified authoritative lists or 2) 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 a BAS product 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 Health and Safety Code (boric acid) under specified conditions.

2) Requires a person or entity that manufactures, sells, delivers, holds, or offers for sale in commerce a BAS product that is not regulated as a drug by the FDA to include a warning statement on the product label commencing January 1, 2027.

3) Prohibits the manufacture, sale, delivery, hold, or offering for sale in commerce of a BAS product that is not regulated as a drug by the FDA commencing January 1, 2035.

4) 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 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] 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 and Prevention (CDC) 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]

---

[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.

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 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 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. Food and Drug Administration (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

---

[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.
[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.

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. 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 this 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 recommends the use of BAS in their current STD guidelines (published 2015). Likewise, 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, 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. The temporary warning labeling requirement will provide such transparency for those who will continue to use BAS products until they are regulated by the FDA.

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).

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

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 7/7/25)

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

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Flora, Pellerin, Blanca Rubio

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
7/7/25 16:11:59

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 85
Author: Umberg (D)
Amended: 6/25/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 5/6/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE FLOOR: 34-0, 5/15/25 (Consent)
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Pérez, Richardson, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Cervantes, Grove, Padilla, Reyes, Rubio

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 6/30/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Civil actions: service of summons

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill allows for alternative service of a summons in a civil case where the plaintiff is unable to effect service using prescribed methods, despite reasonable diligence, including by email or other electronic technology, except in an action against a governmental entity or an agent or employee thereof.

Assembly Amendments Require a plaintiff to be unable to effect service by any methods provided for by statute and to set forth facts detailing these attempts before using the alternative means provided for by this bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Holds that parties whose rights are to be effected have a procedural due process right to be heard, and in order that they be heard, they must have notice of the legal proceeding against them. (*Fuentes v. Shevin* (1972), 407 U.S. 67, 80.)

2) Requires that notice to a party whose interests are to be effected in a legal proceeding be "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." (*Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust, Co.* (1950), 339 U.S. 306, 314.)

3) Where no provision is made in law for the service of summons, the court in which the action is pending may direct that summons be served in a manner which is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served and that proof of such service be made as prescribed by the court. (Code of Civil Procedure (Code Civ. Proc.) § 413.30.)

4) Requires a summons, except as otherwise provided by statute, to be served on a person:

    a) Within this state, as provided.
    b) Outside this state but within the United States, as provided, or as prescribed by the law of the place where the person is served.
    c) Outside the United States, as provided, or as directed by the court in which the action is pending, or, if the court before or after service finds that the service is reasonably calculated to give actual notice, as prescribed by the law of the place where the person is served or as directed by the foreign authority in response to a letter rogatory. (Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10.)

5) Provides that a summons may be served by personal delivery of a copy of the summons and the complaint on the person to be served, and that personal service is deemed complete at the time of such delivery. Requires that the date of the personal service must be affixed to the face of the copy at the time of delivery. (Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10.)

6) Provides that, in lieu of personal delivery of a copy of the summons and complaint to a corporate or public entity, as defined, the summons may be served by leaving a copy during usual office hours at their office, or if no physical address is known, at their usual mailing address, other than a United States Postal Service post office box, with the person apparently in charge of the office, and subsequently mailing a copy of the summons and complaint by first-class mail with prepaid postage to the place where the summons and complaint were left. If the summons is left at the mailing address, it must be left with a person who is at least 18 years old, and they must be informed of the contents of the summons. Substitute service through these methods is deemed complete on the tenth day after the copy is mailed. (Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a).)

7) Provides that, if a copy of a summons and complaint cannot, with reasonable diligence, be personally delivered to an individual to be served, a summons may be served by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint at the person's dwelling, usual place of abode, usual place of business, or usual mailing address other than a United States Postal Service post office box, in the presence of a competent member of the household or person apparently in charge of the office, place of business, or usual mailing address, who is at least 18 years old. The competent member of the household or person apparently in charge must be informed of the contents, and a copy of the summons and complaint must thereafter be mailed by first-class mail, with prepaid postage, to the person to be served at the address where the summons were left. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the tenth day after mailing. (Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b).)

8) Provides that, if the only address reasonably known for the person to be served is a private mailbox obtained through a commercial mail receiving agency, service of process may be effected on the first delivery by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint with the commercial mail receiving agency, as prescribed. (Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(c).)

9) Provides that, if a summons is to be served by mail, a copy of the summons and complaint must be mailed by first-class mail or airmail, with prepaid postage, with two copies of a specified notice, and with a prepaid return envelope for acknowledgement of receipt of summons. Specifies that service by this manner is deemed complete on the date of the written acknowledgement of receipt, if the acknowledgement is returned to the person sending service. (Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30.)

This bill:

1) Provides that if a plaintiff, despite exercising reasonable diligence, has been unable to effect service of the summons by any of the methods authorized by law, as provided, the court may direct that summons be served in a manner that is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served, including by email or other electronic technology.

2) Requires a plaintiff seeking to establish reasonable diligence hereunder to set forth facts detailing all attempts to serve the defendant by each of the methods prescribed by statute, including facts demonstrating why each method was unsuccessful at every address or location where the defendant is likely to be found.

3) Provides that this section does not apply in an action against a governmental entity or an agent or employee of the governmental entity who has been sued in an official or individual capacity.

Background

Current law provides that where no provision is made in law for the service of summons, the court in which the action is pending may direct that summons be served in a manner which is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served. However, concerns have arisen that there are many instances where the prescribed methods are ineffectual in certain circumstances and that more latitude should be provided where alternative methods of service are more likely to result in actual notice to the party to be served.

This bill provides that flexibility. It provides that if a plaintiff, despite exercising reasonable diligence, is unable to effect service of the summons by any method authorized by statute, the court may, upon motion, direct that summons to be served in a manner that is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served, including by electronic mail or other electronic technology, and that proof of such service be made as prescribed by the court. A plaintiff seeking to establish reasonable diligence must set forth facts detailing all attempts to serve the defendant by each of the methods prescribed by statute, including facts demonstrating why each method was unsuccessful at every address or location where the defendant is likely to be found. This bill carves out actions against governmental entities or their agents or employees who are sued in an official or individual capacity.

This bill is author-sponsored. It is supported by the Civil Prosecutors Coalition. No timely opposition has been received.

Comments

According to the author:

> SB 85 aims to allow a plaintiff alternative means of service through email or electronic means when they, with due diligence, cannot reasonably effect service.
>
> Service is one of the critical first steps in the California judicial process. It is the procedure by which one party in a lawsuit gives notice of legal action to another party in order to exercise jurisdiction over that party and compel them to appear in court. For instance, to affect service, a plaintiff (through a servicer) will deliver a printed court order to the defendant to give them notice of a lawsuit. In order for a party to exercise jurisdiction over another, they must serve the other so as to give them actual notice. While it is in the interest of all parties to act in good faith and accept service, some parties choose to try and evade being served so as to have not been given actual notice.
>
> Under the California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP), courts are only allowed to authorize alternative service "[w]here no provision is made in [the statute] or other law for service of summons". The California Court of Appeal has interpreted this to only permit alternative service if there is no other procedure authorized under the CCP—even if service under the statutorily authorized procedures are impractical or are ineffective despite a plaintiff's diligence. See Searles v. Archangel, 60 Cal.App.5th 43, 52-55 (2021). Notably, the California Court of Appeal recognized that California law is arguably out of step with other jurisdictions and urged the Legislature and Judicial Council to act.
>
> This is in contrast to states like New York, Texas, and Florida who do allow courts to authorize service of process by alternate means – including by email or other electronic technology – where a plaintiff has been unable to effect service through statutorily prescribed means after due diligence and the alternative service method is reasonably calculated to provide actual notice. On the other hand, California has no "due diligence" equivalent for alternative service.

SB 85 aims to solve this problem by amending the CCP so that after a showing of due diligence, courts may allow email/electronic service as an alternative service method if the plaintiff has been unable to effect service through statutory means.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

Civil Prosecutors Coalition

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Civil Prosecutors Coalition writes:

SB 85 addresses a critical gap in California law. Under current rules, even when a party has made every reasonable effort to serve notice under the Code of Civil Procedure, courts cannot authorize an alternative method—like email—unless no statutory method exists at all. This rigidity was highlighted in the 2021 *Searles v. Archangel* case, where the court acknowledged the limitations of existing law and called on the Legislature to act.

In our own enforcement work, we've seen firsthand how these limitations obstruct justice. In San Francisco's recent high-profile lawsuit against dozens of companies involved in creating and disseminating AI-generated deepfake pornography, our office struggled to serve parties who had no physical location but valid, verified email addresses. If SB 85 had been law at the time, it would have empowered us to reach these actors quickly and directly, ensuring that justice could proceed.

California should not lag behind other states like New York, Texas, and Florida, which already allow for electronic service after due diligence. SB 85 brings our procedures in line with these jurisdictions while preserving fairness and due process.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 6/30/25

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, 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: Quirk-Silva

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/8/25 11:52:03

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 119
Author: Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Introduced: 1/23/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Budget Act of 2025

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill expresses the intent of the Legislature to enact statutory changes relating to the Budget Act of 2025.

ANALYSIS: Senate Bills 100 through 219, inclusive, are to be considered as vehicles for the 2025-26 Budget Trailer Bills.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/12/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/12/25)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-1520
3/19/25 15:13:01

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 394
Author: Allen (D)
Introduced: 2/14/25
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 3/19/25
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Seyarto, Wiener

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

SUBJECT: Water theft: fire hydrants

SOURCE: Association of California Water Agencies and Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

DIGEST: This bill allows local agencies to establish ordinances specific to water theft from hydrants, modifies penalties for other water theft ordinances, and adds theft from fire hydrants to provisions of existing law related to civil suits for water theft.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes the legislative body of a local agency to make any violation of any ordinance enacted by the local agency subject to an administrative fine or penalty, and set forth by ordinance the administrative procedures that govern the imposition, enforcement, collection, and administrative review by the local agencies of those fines or penalties.

2) Authorizes a local agency that provides water services to adopt an ordinance that prohibits water theft and makes a violation of an ordinance enacted by the local agency regarding water theft subject to an administrative fine or penalty.

3) Establishes penalties for violation of an ordinance prohibiting water theft as follows:

   a) Meter tampering is punishable by a fine not to exceed: $130 for a first violation; $700 for a second violation within one year of the first violation; and $1,300 for a third violation and each additional violation within one year of the first violation.

   b) Any other water theft is punishable by a fine not to exceed: $1,000 for a first violation; $2,000 for a second violation within one year of the first violation; and $3,000 for a third violation and each additional violation within one year of the first violation.

4) Defines a "local agency" as a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency.

5) Authorizes a utility to bring a civil action for damages against any person who commits, authorizes, solicits, aids, abets, or attempts any of the following acts:

   a) Diverts, or causes to be diverted, utility services by any means whatsoever;

   b) Makes, or causes to be made, any connection or reconnection with property owned or used by the utility to provide utility service without the authorization or consent of the utility;

   c) Prevents any utility meter, or other device used in determining the charge for utility services, from accurately performing its measuring function by tampering or by any other means;

   d) Tampers with any property owned or used by the utility to provide utility services; and

   e) Uses or receives the direct benefit of all, or a portion of, the utility service with knowledge of, or reason to believe that, the diversion, tampering, or unauthorized connection existed at the time of the use, or that the use or receipt, was without the authorization or consent of the utility.

6) Establishes a rebuttable presumption that there is a violation of 5), above, if on premises controlled by the customer or by the person using or receiving the direct benefit of utility service, there is either, or both, of the following:

a) Any instrument, apparatus, or device primarily designed to be used to obtain utility service without paying the full lawful charge therefor; and

b) Any meter that has been altered, tampered with, or bypassed so as to cause no measurement or inaccurate measurement of utility services.

This bill:

1) Authorizes a utility to bring a civil action for damages against any person who commits, authorizes, solicits, aids, abets, or attempts to tamper with a fire hydrant, fire hydrant meter, or fire detector check, or diverts water, or causes water to be diverted, from a fire hydrant with knowledge of, or reason to believe, that the diversion or unauthorized connection existed at the time of use for nonfirefighting purposes or without authorization from the appropriate water system or fire department.

2) Provides that a person who tampers with or uses a fire hydrant, fire hydrant meter, or fire detector check without authorization to obtain water and without paying the full lawful charge of the water is presumed to be in violation of 1), above.

3) Revises the existing civil penalty for a third and each subsequent violation of a local ordinance against water theft to apply any time after a second violation, not just if the violation occurred within one year of the first violation.

4) Authorizes the legislative body of a local agency that provides retail water services to adopt an ordinance that prohibits unauthorized connection to a fire hydrant, and makes a violation of an ordinance enacted by the local agency regarding water theft committed via the unauthorized connection to a fire hydrant subject to an administrative fine or penalty, as provided.

5) Punishes a violation of an ordinance adopted under 4) is punishable as follows:

a) A fine not exceeding $2,500 for a first violation;

b) A fine not exceeding $5,000 for a second violation; and

c) A fine not exceeding $10,000 for a third violation and each additional violation.

6) Requires the local agency to adopt an ordinance that sets forth the administrative procedures governing the imposition, enforcement, collection, and administrative review by the local agency of the fines or penalties.

7) Provides that an "unauthorized connection to a fire hydrant" includes the unauthorized use of a fire hydrant, fire hydrant meter, or fire detector check.

8) Prohibits a local agency from imposing fines under this bill and existing water theft law.

Background

Responding to concerns that some water agencies lacked sufficient authority to impose fines to deter water theft, the Legislature enacted SB 427 (Eggman, Chapter 137, Statutes of 2021). SB 427 allowed, notwithstanding any other law, any local agency that provides water services to enact an ordinance that prohibits water theft and makes a violation of an ordinance enacted by the local agency regarding water theft subject to an administrative fine or penalty. SB 427 requires the local agency to establish procedures for the imposition, enforcement, collection, and administrative review of the administrative fines or penalties for water theft, and requires the local agency to establish a process for granting a hardship waiver to reduce the amount of the fine imposed for water theft upon a showing by the responsible party that payment of the full amount of the fine would impose an undue financial burden.

Water agencies note that water theft continues, despite the ability to adopt ordinances under SB 427. This water theft often occurs through unauthorized connections to fire hydrants, which can result in large water losses in short periods of time, damage water infrastructure, and contamination of water systems. They want the Legislature to increase the penalties that can be charged for water theft from fire hydrants, as well as other types of water theft.

Comments

1) *Purpose of the bill*. According to the author, "Water is one of California's most precious resources, especially as the state continues to face the challenges of drought and climate change. Unfortunately, the theft of water from fire hydrants has become a growing problem, costing local agencies millions of gallons of water and hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Illegal actors use specialized tools to steal water from hydrants for commercial purposes, such as

construction, landscaping, and farming. These costs are ultimately passed on to ratepayers, raising costs for paying customers. This activity not only undermines affordability but also jeopardizes public safety, conservation efforts, and the integrity of our water systems. Current penalties are insufficient deterrents to water theft and are a "cost of doing business" for the commercial entities responsible. SB 394 addresses this critical issue by enhancing penalties for water theft from fire hydrants and providing water agencies with the tools they need to hold perpetrators accountable."

2) *Stronger penalties needed?* State law caps violations of most local ordinances at $500 per violation after the second violation. However, violations of local building and safety codes, which can pose a direct risk to people and property, are penalized at higher rates. The implicit public policy in this fine structure is that violations that have greater potential for harm merit higher financial penalties. Water theft fines already exceed the rates that are charged for other violations of local ordinances—even those that pose a direct risk to people and property. SB 394 goes further in two ways:

   a) First, the existing fines for violations of building and safety codes reset after one year, so that a subsequent violation in the next year is fined at the lowest rate ($130), even if the same person has violated the law repeatedly in previous years. Existing water theft penalties follow this same pattern. SB 394 removes the requirement that the violations occurred in the same year for third and subsequent violations, so that those violations continue to be penalized at the highest rate.

   b) Second, current law defines water theft broadly to include any unauthorized connection to property owned or used by the utility, which includes fire hydrants. Accordingly, utilities can already punish water theft from fire hydrants, but they are bound by the fine limits in existing water theft law. SB 394 establishes an even higher tier of fines for tampering with a fire hydrant that are more than double the amount of other water theft violations, topping out at $10,000 per violation for three or more violations. Additionally—unlike existing water theft ordinances—SB 394 does not require that the local agency adopt a process for granting hardship waivers to individuals that don't have the ability to pay the fine.

   These are undoubtedly significant harms to local agencies and the public at large, because ratepayers bear these costs. On the other hand, there are many violations of local ordinances that have the potential for serious consequences that are penalized at lower rates. For example, the 2016 Ghost Ship fire in

Oakland resulted in the deaths of 36 people, but fines for code violations similar to those that led to the conflagration top out at $1,300—thousands of dollars less than the highest penalty for water theft from a hydrant. Given that the Legislature has not recently raised the fine amounts for code violations that endanger life safety, is an increase in the fines for water theft as proposed by this bill is justified?

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 4/21/25)

Association of California Water Agencies (co-source)
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (co-source)
Bella Vista Water District
Burbank/burbank Redevelopment Agency; City of
California Fire Chiefs Association
California Municipal Utilities Association
California Special Districts Association
California Water Association
Calleguas Municipal Water District
City of Fairfield
City of Roseville
Coachella Valley Water District
Community Water Systems Alliance
Crescenta Valley Water District
Crestline-lake Arrowhead Water Agency
Cucamonga Valley Water District
Desert Water Agency
East Bay Municipal Utility District
Eastern Municipal Water District
El Dorado Irrigation District
Elk Grove Water District
Fire Districts Association of California
Foothill Municipal Water District
Helix Water District
Kinneloa Irrigation District
Lakeside Water District
League of California Cities
Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation
Mesa Water District
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Mid-peninsula Water District
Monte Vista Water District
Orchard Dale Water District
Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Paradise Irrigation District
Placer County Water Agency
Rancho California Water District
Rosamond Community Services District
Rural County Representatives of California
San Juan Water District
Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency
Santa Fe Irrigation District
Santa Margarita Water District
Scotts Valley Water District
Three Valleys Municipal Water District
Tuolumne Utilities District
Utica Water and Power Authority
Valley Center Municipal Water District
West Valley Water District
Western Municipal Water District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 4/21/25)

None received

Prepared by: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
4/23/25 16:26:29

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SB 459
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 459
Author: Grayson (D)
Amended: 6/26/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 12-0, 5/6/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE FLOOR: 34-0, 5/15/25 (Consent)
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Pérez, Richardson, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Cervantes, Grove, Padilla, Reyes, Rubio

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 7/10/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Peace officers: confidential communications: exceptions: group peer support services

SOURCE: Police Officers Research Association of California

DIGEST: This bill gives law enforcement personnel the right to refuse to disclose, and prevent another from disclosing, confidential communications between the law enforcement personnel and a peer support team member or another law enforcement personnel, as specified, and authorizes the disclosure of a confidential communication in a juvenile delinquency proceeding.

Assembly Amendments expand the definition of "confidential communication," grants law enforcement personnel the right to refuse to disclose or prevent another from disclosing specified confidential communications, and provide that a confidential communication may be disclosed in a juvenile delinquency proceeding.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Law Enforcement Peer Support and Crisis Referral Program (hereinafter, "LEPS"). (Government (Gov.) Code, §§ 8669.1 et. seq.)

2) Provides that a local or regional law enforcement agency may establish a peer support and crisis referral program, which shall be responsible for providing an agency-wide network of peer representatives, reflective of the agency's workforce both in job positions and personal experiences, who are available to come to the aid of their fellow employees on a broad range of emotional or professional issues. (Gov. Code, § 8669.2, subd. (a).)

3) Provides that the peer support and crisis referral program may provide employee support and referral services for matters including, but not limited to, the following: Substance use and substance abuse, critical incident stress, family issues, grief support, legal issues, line of duty deaths, serious injury or illness, suicide, victims of crime, workplace issues. (Gov. Code, § 8669.2, subd. (b).)

4) Provides that a law enforcement personnel, whether or not a party to an action, has a right to refuse to disclose, and to prevent another from disclosing, a confidential communication between the law enforcement personnel and a peer support team member made while the peer support team member was providing peer support services, or a confidential communication made to a crisis hotline or crisis referral service. (Gov. Code, § 8669.4, subd. (a).)

5) Provides that notwithstanding the provision above, a confidential communication may be disclosed under the following circumstances:

    a) To refer a law enforcement personnel to receive crisis referral services by a peer support team member.

    b) During a consultation between two peer support team members.

c) If the peer support team member reasonably believes that disclosure is necessary to prevent death, substantial bodily harm, or commission of a crime.

d) If the law enforcement personnel expressly agrees in writing that the confidential communication may be disclosed.

e) In a criminal proceeding.

f) If otherwise required by law. (Gov. Code, § 8669.4, subd. (b).)

6) In order to be eligible for confidentiality protections afforded described above, requires peer support team members to complete a training course or courses approved by the law enforcement agency, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 8669.6.)

7) Sets forth several definitions for the purposes of the Law Enforcement Peer Support and Crisis Referral Program. (Gov. Code, § 8669.3.)

This bill:

1) Expands the definition of "confidential communication" for purposes of LEPS to include information transmitted between law enforcement personnel recipients of group peer support services while a peer support team member or mental health professional provides group peer support services to those recipients.

2) Defines "Group peer support services" as peer support services, as defined in existing law, comprised of at least one peer support team member or mental health professional and more than one recipient of group peer support services.

3) Expands the right of law enforcement personnel to refuse to disclose certain communications made while participating in peer support programs to include both of the following:

a) Confidential communications between the law enforcement personnel and a peer support team member made while the peer support team member was providing group peer support services;

b) Confidential communications between law enforcement personnel recipients of group peer support services made while a peer support team member or mental health professional provides group peer support services to those recipients.

4) Clarifies that, notwithstanding the protection provided by LEPS, a confidential communication may be disclosed in a juvenile delinquency proceeding.

Comments

In 2018, the author of this bill authored AB 1116, a first attempt at establishing LEPS, which would have, among other things, provided that a communication made by emergency service personnel or a peer support team member while that team member provides peer support services is confidential and shall not be disclosed in a civil, administrative, or arbitration proceeding. However, the bill allowed for the disclosure of such a communication in specified circumstances, including for consultation between peer support services team members, to prevent death, substantial bodily harm or commission of a crime, with consent, or if otherwise permitted under the policy of a governing body. AB 1116 was vetoed by then-Governor Jerry Brown, whose veto message included the following:

> I appreciate the author's sincere attempt to address the occupational stress experienced by some of our bravest public servants. However, I believe that the scope of confidentiality afforded under this bill is too broad and fails to strike the right balance between fostering collegial trust and concealing information necessary to ensure safe and healthy workplaces.

The following year, in 2019, Governor Newsom signed AB 1117, also authored by the author of this bill. AB 1117 established the LEPS program initially envisioned in AB 1116, the central piece of which is a grant of authority for local or regional law enforcement agencies to establish a peer support and crisis referral program, which "shall be responsible for providing an agency wide network of peer representatives, reflective of the agency's workforce both in job positions and personal experiences, who are available to come to the aid of their fellow employees on a broad range of emotional or professional issues." AB 1116 included a limitation of liability for peer support services team members, provisions limiting when team members may provide support services (i.e. situations involving conflicts of interest), and a requirement that team members complete a training requirement prior to the provision of services.

Regarding confidentiality, AB 1116 provided that a law enforcement personnel, whether or not a party to an action, has a right to refuse to disclose, and to prevent another from disclosing, a confidential communication between the law enforcement personnel and a peer support team member made while the peer support team member was providing peer support services, or a confidential communication made to a crisis hotline or crisis referral service. However, AB

1116 allowed for the disclosure of such statements in a broader range of circumstances than specified in AB 1117, including to refer a law enforcement personnel to receive crisis referral services, in a criminal proceeding, or if otherwise required by law, in addition to the circumstances laid out in AB 1117 (consultation, to prevent death/substantial bodily harm/crime, and consent).

This bill expands the applicability of the LEPS confidentiality protection enacted by AB 1116 to "group peer support services," which the bill defines as "peer support interactions comprised of at least one peer support team member or mental health professional and more than one recipient of group peer support services." The bill specifies that law enforcement personnel, whether or not a party to an action, has a right to refuse to disclose, and to prevent another from disclosing, a confidential communication between the personnel and a peer support team member while the team member was provided group peer support services, as well as a confidential communication between law enforcement personnel recipients of group peer support services made while a peer support team member or mental health professional provides group peer support services to those recipients.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/11/25)

Peace Officers Research Association of California (Source)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association

Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Santa Ana Police Officers Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/11/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 7/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, 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, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Bauer-Kahan, Carrillo, Flora, Gallagher, Gipson, Rivas

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
7/11/25 15:17:41

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 765
Author: Niello (R)
Amended: 6/23/25
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 15-0, 4/8/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0, 5/27/25
AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Reyes

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 7/7/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: State snake

SOURCE: California Rice Commission & Save The Snakes

DIGEST: This bill establishes the giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas) as California's official state snake.

Assembly Amendments Revise the Legislative findings and declarations in the bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law establishes the state flag and the California's myriad official state emblems, including, among other things, the California desert tortoise as the official state reptile, the Pacific leatherback sea turtle as the official state marine

reptile, the California red-legged frog as the official state amphibian, and serpentine as the official state rock and lithologic emblem.

This bill establishes the giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas) as the official state snake and includes related legislative findings and declarations, as specified.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "the giant garter snake is truly a giant and is the largest species of all garter snake species. Adult snakes have been documented to reach 64 inches in length. The giant garter snake is the most aquatic garter snake species and survives in habitat that is characterized by shallow, slow-moving streams, ponds, and marshes. The snake is also found in agricultural areas, such as rice fields, where it uses irrigation ditches and canals for transportation between water bodies. The giant garter snake is a threatened species and its population has declined by more than 90 percent in the past century."

Additionally, "the primary threats to the snake's survival are habitat loss and degradation, as well as predation by nonnative species. The giant garter snake was listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act in 1971 and Threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act in 1993. By naming the Giant Garter Snake as the State Snake of California acknowledges the importance of the species in the ecology, agriculture, and water resources of California."

Serpentes. According to Britannica, snakes (suborder Serpentes), are any of more than 3,400 species of reptiles distinguished by their limbless condition and greatly elongated body and tail. Classified with lizards in the order Squamata, snakes represent a lizard that, over the course of evolution, has undergone structural reduction, simplification, and asp-specialization. Notably, all snakes lack external limbs, but not all legless reptiles are snakes. Certain burrowing lizards may have only front or hind limbs or be completely legless. Unlike lizards, snakes lack movable eyelids, which results in a continuous – and often disconcerting – stare.

Nearly every culture since prehistoric times (including various present-day cultures) has worshipped, revered, or feared snakes. Serpent worship is one of the earliest forms of veneration, with some carvings dating to 10,000 BCE. A vast global compendium of superstitions and mythologies have resultantly sprung up. Many stem from the snake's biological peculiarities: their ability to shed skin is wrapped up together with perceived immortality in lore; their ever-open eyes represent omniscience; their propensity for coyly appearing and disappearing allies

the snake with magic and ghosts; and the ability to kill with a single bite engenders fear of any snakelike creature.

A recent study by the American Pet Products Association titled "National Pet Ownership Survey," notes that approximately 800,000 Americans keep snakes at home as pets. Meanwhile, a 2020 report available on the National Library of Medicine's website titled "Faster detection of snake and spider phobia: revisited," reveals that upwards of half of the population experiences some sort of anxiety elicited by snakes. Further, between three and four percent of individuals are estimated to have clinically relevant ophidiophobia (a crippling fear of snakes).

Notably, 2025 is the Lunar Year of the Wood Snake – symbolizing versatility, growth, and creativity. The Lunar Year of the Wood Snake was recognized earlier this Legislative Session by SR 12 (Wahab, 2025) on the Floor of the State Senate.

The Giant Garter Snake. Garter snakes are one of the most widespread snakes in North America, and are a species you might have run into (or from) before. Sometimes mistakenly called a "garden snake," garter snakes earned their name by resembling the female undergarment, the garter belt. The giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas) is one of the largest garter snakes, with the ability to reach a length of over five feet. The giant garter snake was federally recognized as a threatened species in 1993.

Historically, giant garter snakes were found along the edges of large flood basins, freshwater marshes, and tributaries in California's Central Valley from Butte County in the north to Kern County in the south. Today, their range extends from Butte and Glenn counties in the north to Fresno County in the south, where they are known to live in a variety of agricultural, managed, and natural wetlands. Giant garter snakes inhabit natural wetlands such as marshes, sloughs, ponds, and small lakes and streams. These snakes also live in artificial waterways and agricultural wetlands, like irrigation and drainage canals and rice fields, as well as adjacent uplands. Only about 5-10% of the giant garter snake's historical wetland habitat acreage remains.

The giant garter snake is brown or olive to black, with an underside that is light brown or grayish. The snakes typically have a yellowish dorsal stripe, a light gold to yellow stripe on each side, and two rows of dark blotches on their sides. It is a large snake with keeled dorsal scales and a head slightly wider than the neck.

Other Snakes for Your Consssideration. This bill presents a classic forked tongue dilemma. Should California name a state snake, and if so, just which snake is most deserving of the honor? When weighing options, the Legislature may wish to contemplate some of California's other iconic basilisks before deciding which species of snake tips the scales in favor of official state status. Alternatives include the California kingsnake, a non-venomous predator, helping control populations of rodents and even venomous snakes, contributing to natural pest control. Often admired for its adaptive behavior and beneficial role in the ecosystem, it has a positive reputation among ophidiophiles.

The Northern Pacific rattlesnake, also known as the Western rattlesnake, is one of the more iconic rattlesnakes in California, having long been a part of the local folklore and the natural history of the region. Despite its venomous reputation, it plays a vital role in maintaining balanced ecosystems by regulating prey populations. Its presence in rugged and wild areas can serve as a symbol of California's natural landscapes and the need to respect and protect them. The California striped whipsnake is known for its quick movements and sleek form, representing agility and resilience in California's diverse terrains.

The San Francisco garter snake is critically endangered and iconic for its vibrant colors, considered one of America's most beautiful snakes by the herpetologically inclined. It is estimated that there are only 1,000 to 2,000 adult snakes of the subspecies remaining, identifiable by their fierce blue-green coloring, bordered by stripes of black, red, orange, blue, and green – at times resembling a rainbow.

California's Official State Emblems. California is renowned for its diverse landscapes, 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, 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, nuts, prehistoric artifact, reptile, rock, seal, silver rush ghost town, soil, song, sport, tall ship, tartan, tree, and Vietnam veterans memorial.

Almost Official. It is not always smooth slithering for measures seeking official state symbol status. Examples include, 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 recognizing Zinfandel as "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 negotiation 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.

Slytherin' Down a Slippery Slope? Designating a new state symbol can briefly rattle a media response (whether that be negative or positive), 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 (United States of America), 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 – the official state animal – went extinct in 1922 when the last known bear was 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 Legislature 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 may include resolutions which are commonly adopted and allow the Legislature to highlight particularly notable animals, plants, places, or items within the state.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 12 (Wahab, 2025) recognized January 29, 2025, as the beginning of the Lunar New Year (Year of the Wood Snake), as specified.

AB 581 (Bennett, 2025) establishes the bigberry manzanita (Arctostaphylos glauca) as the official state shrub. (Pending on the Senate Floor)

AB 666 (Rogers, 2025) establishes Bigfoot as the official state cryptid. (Held in the Assembly Arts, Entertainment, Sports, & Tourism Committee without Recommendation)

AB 1334 (Wallis, 2025) establishes solar energy as the official state energy. (Pending in the Senate Governmental Organization)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/11/25)

California Rice Commission (Co-source)
Save The Snakes (Co-source)
Defenders of Wildlife
Grassland Water District

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/11/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: In support of this bill, the cosponsors write that, "California's rice industry has a strong reputation for partnering with organizations like Save the Snakes to create and protect habitat for a number of important species, including the giant garter snake. A recently released report by UC Davis entitled A Conservation Footprint for California Rice states, 'With the draining and loss of much historical wetland habitat, flooded rice now provides critical

surrogate habitat for the protected Giant Garter snake.'"

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 7/7/25
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, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, 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, Harabedian, Patterson, Sanchez

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
7/11/25 15:17:42

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SCR 25
Author: Blakespear (D) and McNerney (D), et al.
Amended: 6/27/25
Vote: 21

SENATE ENERGY, U. & C. COMMITTEE: 16-0, 3/24/25
AYES: Becker, Ochoa Bogh, Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Gonzalez, Grove, Hurtado, Limón, McNerney, Rubio, Stern, Strickland, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 36-0, 4/7/25
AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Reyes, Strickland, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 7/3/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Nuclear fusion

SOURCE: General Atomics

DIGEST: This resolution celebrates the numerous contributions of public and private sector organizations within California for advancing nuclear fusion energy research and supports developing the fusion energy ecosystem with the goal of siting a first-of-its-kind fusion pilot plant in California by the 2040s.

Assembly Amendments make minor technical and clarifying changes to the reference to the SB 100 report.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Declares the policy of the state to encourage the use of nuclear energy, wherever feasible, recognizing that such use has the potential of providing direct economic benefit to the public, while helping to conserve limited fossil fuel resources and promoting clean air. (Public Resources Code §800)

2) Prohibits any nuclear fission thermal powerplant from being permitted in the state until the federal government approves technologies to reprocess the spent nuclear fuel rods, and the California Energy Commission (CEC) reports to the Legislature affirmative findings of that federal action. (Public Resources Code §25524.1)

3) Requires the CEC, as part of its 2027 Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR), to include an assessment of the potential of fusion energy to contribute to the state's power supply. Defines "fusion" to mean a reaction in which at least one heavier, more stable nucleus is produced from at least one lighter, less stable nucleus, typically through high temperatures and pressures, and emitting energy as a result. Defines "fusion energy" to mean the product of fusion reactions inside a fusion device and used to generate electricity or other commercially usable forms of energy. (Public Resources Code §25302.4)

This resolution:

1) Proclaims that the State of California celebrates the numerous contributions of public and private sector organizations within California for advancing nuclear fusion energy research and development.

2) Applauds recent scientific breakthroughs at research facilities in San Diego and Livermore.

3) Recognizes the vast potential of nuclear fusion energy for addressing key climate and national security goals and the contributions of California's private fusion industry.

4) Commends the University of California's Office of the President for its leadership in establishing the Pacific Coalition for Advancing Research, Education, Science, and Technology (CREST) Fusion initiative.

5) Supports developing the fusion energy ecosystem with the goal of siting a first-of-a-kind fusion pilot plant in California by the 2040s.

Background

Nuclear energy. There are two fundamental ways to release energy from nuclear reactions: fission and fusion of atomic nuclei. Nuclear fission is a process where the atomic nucleus splits apart; nuclear fusion is where atomic nuclei combine (or fuse) together. Both processes are theorized to generate energy. In nuclear fission, the process often yields some combination of particles and energy, often with radioactive decay. In nuclear fusion, the process can manifest as either an absorption or release of energy, sometimes with radioactive decay.

Nuclear fission electricity generation is commercially available today, such as the electricity generated at the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Powerplant outside San Luis Obispo. Very generally, for fission-based electricity generation, the atomic splitting releases heat and energy which is used to boil water; the water produces steam, which turns a turbine to generate electricity. Electricity generation based on fusion has yet to become commercially viable, and is still in research and development. There are multiple fusion methods that are currently being pursued for use in a commercial reactor system. Similar to fission, the released energy from a fusion process would be converted to heat, which in turn is converted to electricity via a conventional generator cycle. Although the fusion reaction theoretically does not produce significant or long-lived radioactive byproducts, the high-energy particles irradiate the surrounding reactor vessel and associated components. The irradiated material could pose potential disposal problems similar to those for the irradiated fission reactor vessel.

Nuclear fusion as a zero-carbon energy resources. The need for zero-carbon and renewable energy resources is critical to advance the state's clean energy and climate goals, including those for 100% zero-carbon and renewable energy by 2045 as established by SB 100 (De León, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) and the interim targets established by SB 1020 (Laird, Chapter 361, Statutes of 2022). Nuclear fusion energy has the potential to become a source of clean and resilient energy, however, many important science and technological challenges remain. Unlike nuclear fission, there are less waste products, no risk of a nuclear melt down, and fusion power provides more energy for a given weight of fuel than any fuel-consuming energy source currently in use. The aim of any controlled fusion process is to achieve "ignition," which occurs when enough fusion reactions take

place for the process to become self-sustaining, with fresh fuel then being added to continue it. Once ignition is achieved, there is net energy yield – about four times as much as with nuclear fission. According to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the amount of power produced increases with the square of the pressure, so doubling the pressure leads to a fourfold increase in energy production.

Fusion energy is nascent technology. Multiple reports have stated that commercially available nuclear fusion technology may be decades away. Determining the potential of fusion energy as a meaningful source of electricity requires a leap ahead of the current stage of research and demonstration, to consider cost and scale. At this stage, cost is astronomical and scale is tiny. Recent technological breakthroughs have also spurred interest in nuclear fusion development. The team at the world's most powerful laser fusion facility, the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's, conducted the first controlled fusion experiment in history to reach the ignition milestone, meaning it achieved a net energy gain, producing more energy from fusion than the laser energy used to drive it. Using its 192 laser beams, NIF is able to deliver more than 60 times the energy of any previous laser system to its target.

California collaborative. In the hopes of advancing the state's efforts, the University of California's Office of the President established the Pacific CREST Fusion initiative and the concept of a Pacific CREST Fusion special purpose entity which was approved at the January 22, 2025 meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of California. The vision is to have the Pacific CREST Fusion organization be a University of California led not-for-profit organization to advance fusion energy in California through a public-private partnership. The Pacific CREST Fusion initiative is intended to build off the existing laboratories, research capabilities, and private companies to advance nuclear fusion energy. In addition to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, these include other research and development facilities in the state, specifically: the DIII-D National Fusion Facility in San Diego (a General Atomics facility), Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, and the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, as well as, the world-class researchers at the state's universities, including at several of the University of California campuses.

Federal funding opportunities. Under the Biden-Harris administration, the federal government announced and pursued efforts to advance fusion energy, including the U.S. Department of Energy's (US DOE) funding and initiatives to support Bold

Decadal Vision for Commercial Fusion Energy. The Pacific CREST initiative is largely positioning for potential US DOE funding via the Bold Decadal Vision for Commercial Fusion Energy, as well as, public-private collaboration to advance fusion energy research, development, deployment, and demonstration given the growing need for zero-carbon energy resources. However, early actions by the new federal administration, including the plethora of executive orders, federal employee layoffs, and other actions by the Trump administration, have created some uncertainty about the US DOE's continued efforts to advance nuclear fusion energy research and development. This in spite of nuclear energy likely viewed more favorable by the Trump administration compared to other zero-carbon energy resources, namely solar and wind.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 80 (Caballero) of the current legislative session creates the Fusion Research and Development Innovation Hub Program within the CEC to accelerate the development and growth of fusion energy with the goal of delivering the world's first fusion energy pilot plant in the state in the 2040s. The bill is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 86 (McNerney) of the current legislative session, authorizes the California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority to provide financial assistance, in the form of exclusions from sales and use tax, to electrical generation facilities using nuclear fusion technology. The bill is pending before the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.

AB 1172 (Calderon, Chapter 360, Statutes 2023) required the CEC as part of its 2025 IEPR to include an assessment of the potential for fusion energy to contribute to California's power supply.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

General Atomics (Source)
City of Livermore
Cleantech San Diego
Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group
Kyoto Fusioneering America
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation

San Diego State University-Research & Innovation
Stanford University's Extreme Environment Microsystems Lab & nano@stanford

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: General Atomics states:

> … SCR 25 recognizes the significant contributions of public and private sector fusion organizations within California for advancing fusion energy research and development, celebrates recent scientific breakthroughs at public research facilities and the important role of California's growing private fusion industry, and recognizes the vast potential of fusion energy for addressing key climate and national security goals. The resolution further commends the University of California's Office of the President (UCOP) for its leadership in establishing the Pacific CREST Fusion initiative and calls for siting a first-of-a-kind fusion pilot plant in California by the 2040s.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 7/3/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, 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, 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: Arambula, Chen, Flora, Lee, Quirk-Silva

Prepared by: Nidia Bautista / E., U. & C. / (916) 651-4107
7/9/25 11:49:27

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 78
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

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
6/27/25 16:46:27

****** 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: 7/8/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Frontotemporal Degeneration Awareness Week

SOURCE: Author

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

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/8/25 add coauthors and make a technical change.

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 declares 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 7/9/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/9/25 16:03:41

****** 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 89
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 89
Author: Smallwood-Cuevas (D), et al.
Amended: 6/25/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 7/8/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SUBJECT: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution affirms the Legislature's commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) principles at a time when DEI efforts and programs are under attack.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides that no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (United States Constitution (U.S. Const.), 14th Amend., § 1.)

2) Provides that a person may not be denied the equal protection of the laws, and that a citizen or class of citizens may not be granted privileges or immunities not granted on the same terms to all citizens. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.,) art. I, § 7.)

3) Provides that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. (U.S. Const., 1st amend.)

This resolution:

1) Declares that:

   a) The American Dream has been a beacon of hope for generations.

   b) The American Dream embodies the ideals of opportunity, prosperity, and upward mobility, promising that every person should have the chance to achieve what they themselves define as success and fulfillment through hard work and determination.

   c) Many today feel that their American Dream is unattainable.

   d) The American Dream belongs to all of us.

   e) Our highest accomplishments as a state and nation have been achieved when we harness the strengths of all people regardless of their identities to overcome our greatest challenges.

   f) DEI is a centuries-old movement deeply rooted in America's founding principles and its subsequent legacy of civil rights and social justice efforts aimed at delivering the laws, policies, and initiatives that enable America to live up to our Constitution's promises.

   g) DEI policies, from the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, among others, reflect the corrective legislative and legal actions taken across our nation's history to expand and guarantee access to the educational, economic, and civic obligations and capacities of our nation.

   h) California has been a leader in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion within the California state service to achieve equitable work cultures.

   i) Governor Newsom signed an executive order directing state agencies and departments to take additional actions to embed equity analysis and considerations in their mission, policies, and practices and establishing the Racial Equity Commission.

   j) The California State Assembly passed a resolution to require the Assembly to explore methods to integrate equity more formally into its daily activities, including the potential adoption of an equity impact analysis into the existing committee and floor bill analysis process.

k) DEI principles and policies promote equal access to opportunities, foster an environment of respect and belonging, and ensure that every individual—regardless of background—can fully participate in all aspects of society.

l) DEI policies are intended not only to promote access, but to proactively dismantle systematic inequalities in education, employment, housing, health care, and civic participation that have disproportionately impacted communities of color, indigenous peoples, women, LGBTQ+ individuals, individuals with disabilities, and other historically excluded groups.

m) DEI initiatives often include targeted recruitment, culturally competent workplace training, equity-focused budgeting, inclusive curriculum development, and disaggregated data reporting to address measurable disparities in outcomes.

n) DEI is essential to creating a society where all individuals are valued, heard, and included.

o) DEI is based on removing barriers to opportunity so our merits can speak for themselves.

p) DEI is committed to widening pathways to the American Dream for every community so that all people can reap the benefits of shared prosperity in our nation.

q) Freedom of speech and expression are fundamental constitutional rights, protecting the ability of individuals to voice their ideas and opinions without interference, punishment, or retaliation by the government.

r) Retaliatory actions such as terminating, silencing, or marginalizing qualified public servants, educators, and professionals based on their advocacy for equity or their identities—including race, gender, or LGBTQ+ status—represent a dangerous erosion of civil liberties and a threat to representative leadership in public life.

s) Attempts to prohibit DEI practices diminish the diversity of perspectives that strengthen our society, and conflict with antidiscrimination laws.

t) The federal government under the Trump Administration and ongoing political actors have sought to dismantle DEI frameworks, including banning DEI training in federal agencies, attempting to eliminate race-conscious admissions policies, and threatening funding for universities that incorporate equity-related content.

u) These efforts not only undermine civil rights progress but contradict core democratic values enshrined in the United States Constitution and upheld through decades of precedent, such as *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*

v) Efforts to attack DEI are harmful to our country.

2) Resolves, by the Senate of the State of California and with the Assembly concurring:

a) The Legislature affirms its commitment to DEI as an essential foundation for achieving the American Dream and fostering environments where all individuals have the freedom to be healthy, prosperous, and safe and have the opportunity to realize their full potential.

b) The Legislature encourages local, state, and federal policymakers, educational institutions, workplaces, and other organizations to adopt and uphold DEI principles that promote inclusivity, protect freedom of expression, remove barriers, and provide equitable opportunities for all individuals to pursue their dreams.

c) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the author for appropriate distribution.

Comments

In the face of ongoing attacks on DEI and the dismantling of DEI programs, this resolution reaffirms the Legislature's commitment to DEI as a necessary foundation for ensuring that all persons have the opportunity to realize their full potential. This resolution recites the history and purpose of DEI and California's leading role in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion within state government and across the state. This resolution also recognizes that attempts to prohibit DEI practices and programs diminish the diversity of perspectives, which weakens, rather than strengthens, our society. This resolution states that these anti-DEI efforts are harmful to our country. Finally, this resolution states that the Legislature encourages local, state, and federal policymakers, educational institutions, workplaces, and other institutions to adopt and uphold DEI principles that promote inclusivity, protect freedom of expression, remove barriers, and provide equitable opportunities for all individuals to pursue their dreams.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/9/25 16:03:42

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

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 ******

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SCR 97
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SCR 97
Author: Seyarto (R), et al.
Introduced: 6/25/25
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: California Emergency Preparedness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims September 2025 as California Emergency Preparedness Month.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Launched in 2004, National Preparedness Month is an annual preparedness outreach effort led by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

2) California faces complex and severe disaster and emergency conditions due to its unique geography and extreme weather, as demonstrated by the hurricane-force wind-driven firestorms in January 2025 that destroyed separate urban and coastal areas of the County of Los Angeles.

3) Over the last decade, California has experienced significant increases in the frequency, intensity, and duration of a variety of disasters and emergencies, including severe heat waves, rolling blackouts, wildfires, rainstorms, floods, mudslides, and prolonged droughts.

4) National Preparedness Month serves as a reminder that preparedness should be an ongoing practice, not a one-time occurrence, as disasters and emergencies can strike unexpectedly and at any time.

This resolution encourages Californians to acknowledge the importance of preparing for emergencies to keep themselves, their families, and their communities safe.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 223 (Rodriguez, Resolution Chapter 195, Statutes of 2024).

SCR 75 (Ochoa Bogh, Resolution Chapter 80, Statutes of 2024).
ACR 210 (Rodriguez, 2022) – Held in Senate Rules Committee.
ACR 101 (Seyarto, Resolution Chapter 141, Statutes of 2021).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/2/25 16:25:05

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SJR 5
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

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)

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

California Climate and Agriculture Network

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/19/25)

None received

Prepared by: Eric Walters / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
6/27/25 16:48:03

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SJR 7
Author: Cervantes (D), et al.
Amended: 7/8/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 8-3, 6/30/25
AYES: Ashby, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg, Weber Pierson
NOES: Choi, Niello, Strickland

SUBJECT: Tariffs

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution urges President Donald J. Trump to rescind the increase in tariffs that he has imposed since taking office in January 2025 and urges the United States Congress to enact a joint resolution to rescind President Trump's tariffs by terminating the national state of emergency declared by President Trump on April 2, 2025, and to oppose all future declarations of states of emergency through the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) that would permit future tariff increases.

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/8/25 made technical and conforming changes and added coauthors.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law authorizes the president, via the IEEPA, to regulate international commerce after declaring a national emergency in response to any unusual and extraordinary threat to the United States which has a foreign source. It further authorizes the president to block transactions, freeze assets, and restrict imports and exports of certain goods or technologies to deal with the threat and requires the president to report to Congress every six months on the circumstances, threats and actions taken. In the event of an actual attack on the United States, the president can also confiscate property connected with a country, group, or person

that aided in the attack. The act falls under the provisions of the National Emergencies Act and must be renewed annually to remain in effect. (Public Law 95-223; 50 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 1701-1705).

Existing state law:

1) Establishes the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) for the purpose of serving as the lead state entity for economic strategy and marketing of California on issues relating to business development, private sector investment and economic growth. (Government Code (GC) §§ 12096 – 12098.7)

2) Specifies that GO-Biz is the primary state agency authorized to attract foreign investments, cooperate in international public infrastructure projects, and support California businesses in accessing markets, and requires the Director of GO-Biz to develop an international trade and investment program (ITI Program) attracting employment-producing direct foreign investment to the state and providing support for California businesses in accessing international markets and increasing exports. (GC § 13996.41)

3) Authorizes GO-Biz to establish ITI offices outside of the U.S. according to certain requirements. (GC § 13996.42)

4) Requires GO-Biz to provide an ITI strategy to the Legislature based on current and emerging market conditions that identifies the process GO-Biz will use for ongoing evaluation of needs. (GC § 13996.55)

This resolution:

1) Urges President Donald J. Trump to rescind the increase in tariffs that he has imposed since taking office in January 2025 and urges the United States Congress to enact a joint resolution to rescind President Trump's tariffs by terminating the national state of emergency declared by President Trump on April 2, 2025, and to oppose all future declarations of states of emergency through IEEPA that would permit future tariff increases.

2) Makes various declarations about consensus relating to free trade and statements from Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan about free trade.

3) Highlights a 2022 address by Donald J. Trump to the Heritage Foundation and Heritage Foundation produced 2025 Presidential Transition Project, commonly

known at Project 2025, which argues for the imposition of severe tariffs on foreign trade.

4) States that President Trump declared a national emergency on April 2, 2025 pursuant to IEEPA which allowed him to impose a 10% base tariff on all foreign goods imported from foreign countries into the United States and imposed even higher tariffs on 57 countries. States that after the tariff announcement, stock markets around the world engaged in panic selling, which caused the largest decline in global stock markets since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

5) States that there is near consensus among economists that the President's tariffs will increase the price of goods.

6) States that low-income American households will be hit hardest by the price increases caused by President Trump's tariffs, with the price of essential goods like bananas, coffee, and toilet paper set to rise.

7) States that while California faces an ongoing housing crisis, the increase in prices caused by President Trump's tariffs will raise the price of building materials, which will in turn make the cost of a new home rise by about $9,200 according to the National Association of Home Builders based on data from March 2025.

8) States that California farmers exported more than $23 billion worth of food in 2022, with almonds topping the list, followed by dairy products, pistachios, and wine. According to a 2024 study by the University of California Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, if the United States imposed a 10% tariff on all goods from all countries and those countries responded similarly, estimated annual export losses would be between $3.1 billion and $4.8 billion for California agribusiness.

9) States that due to the imposition of tariffs, shipping volume for the beginning of May 2025 at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach has fallen by up to 40%, imperiling the supply chain of goods from Asia into the United States, a development which President Trump called "a good thing."

10) States that President Trump's tariffs have caused global chaos and threaten the strength of the United States' longstanding relationships with foreign nations and longtime American allies like the United Kingdom, Japan, and South

Korea; and President Trump's agenda to impose tariffs on imports will harm American working families by increasing the costs of everyday goods, increase inflation and derail the nation's economic recovery from the recession caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, leave small businesses reeling from unpredictable periods of tariffs being imposed then paused without warning, and dangerously undermine the standing of the United States on the global stage.

Background

Currently, GO-Biz administers an International Affairs and Business Development Unit, which serves as California's primary point of contact for expanding international trade and investment relations. This unit focuses on foreign direct investment (services for foreign investors, foreign investment technical assistance, and the EB-5 Investor Visa Program), international trade promotion (STEP program, trade missions, export assistance, and the California-China Trade Office), and international agreements.

GO-Biz currently has authority for undertaking international trade and foreign investment activities. The *International Affairs and Trade Program* report prepared by GO-Biz in 2023 notes that the International Affairs and Trade team (IAT) advises the Governor on international affairs and trade issues, implements strategies to develop and grow partnerships and engagement with foreign partners, and provides recommendations to promote and expand California's trade and foreign direct investment. According to the report, IAT works with a robust network of international partners to promote California exports, support small businesses in accessing global markets, and attract inward investment that brings high-quality jobs to Californians. IAT executed several major international events, including a Clean Energy Trade Mission to Japan with over 100 delegates from California's public and private sectors, a climate-focused gubernatorial visit to China, and a California pavilion at the annual Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit. IAT also successfully implemented trade missions to key markets such as Mexico, China, Japan, and Germany in a variety of strategic sectors, among other efforts and activities.

According to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, industrial goods encompass all non-agricultural goods and include products such as machinery, autos and transportation equipment, information technology products, minerals and metals, petroleum, chemicals, textiles and clothing, leather and footwear, consumer goods, wood products, and fish and fish products. Industrial tariffs are customs duties on non-agricultural merchandise imports, levied either as a percentage of the value or on a specific basis (e.g., $1 per 100 pounds).

According to February 2025 information from the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), "In 2024, California's total merchandise trade reached $675 billion—close to 16% of state GDP. California imports 2.7 times more goods than it exports, reflecting the purchasing power of the state's market. However, imports also include intermediate goods used in the manufacturing of California products that could eventually be exported. In this way, tariffs on imported goods may have direct effects on consumers, producers, and exporters in the state.

Manufactured goods dominate California exports at 87% ($159 billion)—computer equipment, semiconductors, instruments, and aerospace products and parts are at the top of manufacturing exports. The state also leads the nation in agricultural exports ($15 billion), with products like nuts, processed and fresh fruits, and processed vegetables generating an important revenue stream for California farmers.

PPIC noted that "tariffs imposed in 2018 and 2019 led to higher prices across the country for consumer goods—like washing machines and solar panels, and for intermediate goods—like aluminum and steel. Higher costs were largely paid by American consumers and firms. At the time, these higher prices didn't necessarily impact overall prices—that is, inflation—in a major way. In manufacturing sectors, such as aluminum production and household appliances, lower employment and output in the short-term were due to rising costs of imported materials necessary for production and retaliatory tariffs."

The Budget Lab at Yale University, in its *State of U.S. Tariffs: May 12, 2025* analysis, notes that "consumers face an overall average effective tariff rate of 17.8%, the highest since 1934. The reduction since the April 15 report is almost entirely due to the lower rates on Chinese imports—the US-UK trade deal has minimal effects on average tariff rates. Even after consumption shifts, the average tariff rate will be 16.4%, the highest since 1937." The analysis also states that "the price level from all 2025 tariffs rises by 1.7% in the short-run, the equivalent of an average per household consumer loss of $2,800 in 2024. Annual pre-substitution losses for households at the bottom of the income distribution are $1,300. The post-substitution price increase settles at 1.4%, a $2,300 loss per household." The analysis further notes that "the 2025 tariffs disproportionately affect clothing and textiles, with consumers facing 15% higher shoe prices and 14% higher apparel prices in the short-run. Shoes and apparel prices stay 19% and 16% higher in the long-run respectively" and that "US real GDP growth is -0.7pp lower from all

2025 tariffs. In the long-run, the US economy is persistently -0.4% smaller respectively, the equivalent of $110 billion annually in 2024."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. /
7/9/25 16:03:43

****** 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 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: SR 51
Author: Becker (D)
Amended: 6/25/25
Vote: Majority

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 6-0, 7/8/25
AYES: Limón, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

SUBJECT: Protecting The Amazon Rainforest In Ecuador

SOURCE: Amazon Watch

DIGEST: This resolution commends the advocacy of the Nacionalidad Waorani del Ecuador, the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador, the Nacionalidad Kichwa de Pastaza, and their communities for their steadfast work in protecting the Amazon biome and safeguarding the future for their children and our entire planet, and commits the Senate to investigating the impact of California's role in the consumption of crude sourced from the Amazon region and exploring ways that changes to state policies and practices can assist with efforts to preserve and protect the Amazon rainforest.

ANALYSIS:

This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) The Amazon basin is critical for the health of our planet and climate.

2) The Amazon is threatened by deforestation and degradation, driven by large scale agribusiness, the extractive industry, illegal logging, and other activities that have caused the Amazon to reach a dangerous ecological tipping point.

3) Indigenous people play an essential role in the protection of the Amazon and its biodiversity.

4) An overwhelming majority of Ecuadorians voted in a national referendum to keep 847,000,000 barrels of crude permanently in the ground in Ecuador's Yasuní National Park to fight climate change and protect the rights of indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation.

5) California has been a global leader in addressing climate change and has made important commitments and ambitious goals to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions in line with the Paris Agreement.

6) In 2023, the State of California endorsed the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty, a global initiative aimed at accelerating the transition to clean energy and equitably phasing out fossil fuel production.

7) Three indigenous leaders from the Ecuadorian Amazon have come to Sacramento to educate California's decisionmakers on the status of deforestation in the Amazon and to explore opportunities to work together on solutions.

8) Like other communities around the world, California's fate is interconnected to the health and preservation of the Amazon basin and we are linked in our consumption of natural resources extracted from the Amazon.

This resolution:

1) Commends the advocacy of the Nacionalidad Waorani del Ecuador, the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador, the Nacionalidad Kichwa de Pastaza, and their communities for their steadfast work in protecting the Amazon biome and safeguarding the future for their children and our entire planet.

2) Commits the Senate to investigating the impact of California's role in the consumption of crude sourced from the Amazon region and exploring ways that changes to state policies and practices can assist with efforts to preserve and protect the Amazon rainforest.

Background

The Amazon rainforest. The Amazon, covering a broad swath of South America and multiple countries, is home to over 10% of the planet's known species, numerous indigenous peoples, and is an important component of the Earth's hydrological and carbon cycles. In the last several decades, increasing deforestation – now estimated to be on the order of 20% with another 6% degraded –for settlement, illegal logging, agricultural, and industrial purposes has adversely

impacted the Amazon, its biodiversity, and its ecological and climate resiliency. Recent scientific research suggests that the Amazon will reach an ecological "tipping point" at 25% deforestation and convert to savannah conditions with disruptive impact to biodiversity, the peoples who live there, and the Earth's climate. Massive wildfires in recent years have had both immediate local and worldwide impacts.

Ecuador. Ecuador, located in northwestern South America, includes on the order of 52,400 square miles of the Amazon. Ecuador was in recession in 2024 with an economic contraction of about 2.5% due in part to high rates of violence, political uncertainty, and energy shortages, according to the World Bank. The energy shortages were due to the worst drought in 60 years impacting hydroelectric generation. In 2023, Ecuador's primary commodity exports were crude petroleum, shellfish and fish, bananas, and gold.

According to the US Energy Information Administration (USEIA), Ecuador has 0.5% of the world's oil reserves (at about 8.3 billion barrels) and produced approximately 482,000 barrels per day of petroleum and other liquids, primarily from its Amazon region in 2022. State-owned Petroecuador produced about 80% of the country's oil production and also controls refining. Mineral rights are owned by the federal government in Ecuador, although several indigenous peoples – the Sápara, Shiawiar, Kichwa, Waorani, Achuar, and Shuar – collectively hold title to millions of hectares of land in and around the Ecuadorean Amazon where the oil reserves are located. There is indigenous resistance to continued oil development, and the legal framework to obtain consent from indigenous peoples for oil development is considered ineffective by many. Recent reviews and surveys show an association between health problems – such as cancer – and oil development in Ecuador, particularly in indigenous populations, likely stemming from contamination by hazardous compounds. According to the sponsor, indigenous resistance has resulted in oil majors leaving Ecuador.

Ecuador's oil industry has struggled to maintain production because of aging fields, pipeline disruptions, and environmental concerns. Pipeline disruptions have increased in recent years. Both pipelines have also been affected by natural disasters and protests. Production fell by almost 18% from January to February 2023 due to pipeline restrictions.

In August 2023, the citizens of Ecuador voted by nearly a 20% margin to reject oil development in Yasuní National Park in its Amazon region. Estimates vary, but reserves on the order of over 700 million barrels are located there. The initiative

required that there was one year for 247 wells to be plugged-and-abandoned. After one year, one well was plugged-and-abandoned. Court orders were ignored by the operator.

The federal government of Ecuador continues to plan to hold auctions of additional oil blocks totaling about 2.3 million hectares of intact Amazon rainforest starting in the 1st quarter of 2026 with the goal of increasing production by 600,000 barrels per day by the early 2030s. These oil blocks have no existing oil infrastructure or production. This rainforest is home to the Sapara, Shiwiar, Kichwa, Waorani, Andoa, Shuar, and Achuar peoples who oppose the drilling. The federal government of Ecuador's oil development plans include additional pipelines and a new coastal refinery.

California and oil from Ecuador. In 2024, Ecuador was the #4 source of imported oil to the state's refineries at 43.8 million barrels. This was about 14% of the oil imported that year. In-state production produced 23.3% of the oil refined in the state that year (510.7 million barrels). In previous years, larger amounts and higher percentages of the state's imported oil were sourced from Ecuador.

According to materials provided by Amazon Watch, California is the top consumer of crude oil from the Amazon rainforest. Approximately 50% of all oil exported from the Amazon goes to California refineries.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

Amazon Watch (sponsor)
350 Bay Area Action
California Environmental Voters
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment
Climate Hawks Vote
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of the Earth - US
Natural Resources Team, Climate Action California
Oil and Gas Action Network
Pesticide Action and Agroecology Network (PAN)
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
SanDiego350
Stand.earth

Sunflower Alliance
The Climate Center

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author, "SR 51 is a resolution that connects the California Senate to a matter of global urgency: protecting the Amazon rainforest, defending Indigenous rights, and confronting our shared climate crisis. Ecuador's Yasuní National Park in the Amazon rainforest – one of the most biodiverse places on Earth – over 5 million people recently voted in a national referendum to keep nearly 850 million barrels of oil in the ground–a powerful act of climate leadership. But instead of honoring that vote, Ecuador's government continues to drill – and is opening up more rainforest to oil extraction. Why does this matter to California? Because California is one of the top importers of crude oil from the Amazon. That oil is refined in places like Richmond and Wilmington – communities already burdened by pollution. And when we burn it, we send greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, accelerating the climate crisis that's drying the Amazon and worsening wildfires here at home. This resolution calls on us to investigate our role in Amazon oil consumption and explore how California policy can help protect this critical biome. It's a call for solidarity – with Indigenous defenders, with the planet, and with future generations."

Prepared by: Katharine Moore / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
7/9/25 17:52:30

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE SR 53
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 53
Author: Rubio (D)
Introduced: 6/24/25
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: Childhood Cancer Awareness Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares the month of September 2025 as Childhood Cancer Awareness Month and encourages individuals, businesses, and organizations throughout the state to participate in activities and events that promote the awareness of childhood cancer and support families affected by this devastating disease, not just during September, but throughout the year.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) According to the National Cancer Institute, childhood cancer is the leading cause of death by disease for children in the United States. The American Cancer Society estimates that approximately 9,550 children in the United States under 15 years of age will be diagnosed with cancer in 2025.

2) The State of California is number one in the country for pediatric leukemia incidence rates and number 21 in the country for overall incidence rates.

3) The California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) provides over $3 billion total in funding for stem cell research and therapy development, including cancer research, making the State of California a leader in the nation for funding and research, but more targeted efforts on childhood cancer are still needed.

4) Childhood Cancer Awareness Month is an important nationwide tool for raising awareness among governmental officials and the public of the nature and scope of this problem.

This resolution supports young Californians who are fighting cancer, honors young people who have lost their lives to childhood cancer, expresses gratitude to the

doctors, nurses, and parents who provide special care to patients and families affected by childhood cancer, and encourages all residents in this state to join the fight against childhood cancer.

Related/Prior Legislation

SR 122 (Roth, 2024) – Adopted in Senate.
HR 118 (Gabriel, 2024) – Adopted in Assembly.
SCR 80 (Roth, Resolution Chapter 202, Statutes of 2024).
SCR 71 (Rubio, Resolution Chapter 7, Statutes of 2024).
ACR 93 (Choi, Resolution Chapter 3, Statutes of 2022).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/2/25 16:25:06

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 16
Author: Alanis (R)
Amended: 4/21/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Cervantes, Choi, Allen, Limón, Umberg

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

SUBJECT: Vote by mail ballots: processing

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill permits election officials to begin processing vote by mail (VBM) return envelopes and VBM ballots on the day VBM ballots are mailed.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires an elections official to mail a ballot to every active registered voter for every election in which the voter is eligible to participate and to begin mailing VBM ballots no later than 29 days before the election.

2) Permits any jurisdiction to process VBM ballot return envelopes beginning 29 days before the election. Processing VBM ballot return envelopes may include verifying the voter's signature on the envelope and updating voter history records.

3) Permits any jurisdiction having the necessary computer capability to start processing VBM ballots on the 29th day before the election. Provides that processing VBM ballots includes opening VBM return envelopes, removing ballots, duplicating damaged ballots, preparing ballots to be machine read, or

processing ballots through the machine. All other jurisdictions are required to start processing VBM ballots at 5 p.m. on the day before the election.

4) Prohibits a vote count from being accessed or released until 8 p.m. on Election Day.

This bill permits election officials to begin processing VBM return envelopes and VBM ballots on the day VBM ballots are mailed.

Background

Vote by Mail. Californians have increasingly relied on VBM ballots to cast a vote. According to the Secretary of State's office, the 1962 general election saw 2.63% of Californian voters vote by mail. For the 2024 presidential general election, 80.76% of Californian voters voted by mail. This massive increase in mail voting over the past 60 years is a result of many factors ranging from legislation expanding access to VBM ballots, paid postage on return envelopes, and additional elected offices resulting in longer, sometimes more complicated, and time-consuming ballots.

Restriction on Pre-Processing of VBM Ballots. The limitation that counties must have "necessary computer capability" in order to begin processing VBM ballots a day before the election dates back to 1975, when some counties still tallied ballots manually rather than by a computerized voting system. This restriction appears to be intended to prevent those counties from manually tallying ballots the day before the election, potentially due to concerns that the process would make election results publicly available before Election Day. It should be noted that no California county has conducted a full manual tally of all ballots cast at a statewide election since 1984 and the language related to counties having "necessary computer capability" in order to begin processing VBM ballots earlier appears to be obsolete.

Comments

Author's Statement. Recent elections have revealed a significant deficiency in the state's ability to process and count VBM ballots in a timely manner. The sheer volume of ballots requires additional verification steps and, unfortunately, that has led to delays in providing election results to the public. Voters, candidates, and the public have grown increasingly frustrated with these delays, and that frustration undermines trust in our electoral system. This bill addresses this issue by requiring

county election officials to begin processing and counting VBM ballots as soon as ballots are mailed. This will allow them to begin verifying signatures, processing ballots, and preparing them for machine counting without compromising the integrity of the election process. As a whole, this bill is about transparency, efficiency, and public confidence in our elections.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 37 (Berman, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2021), among other changes to VBM ballots, changed the starting date that counties were permitted to process VBM ballots from 15 business days before an election to 29 days before an election if the jurisdiction has the necessary computer capability. This practice was permitted for the November 3, 2020, statewide general election pursuant to AB 860 (Berman, Chapter 4, Statutes of 2020) and AB 37 made the change permanent.

AB 3370 (Committee on Elections and Redistricting, Chapter 106, Statutes of 2020), among other changes, modified the starting date that counties were permitted to process VBM ballots from 10 business days before an election to 15 business days before an election other than the November 3, 2020, statewide general election if the jurisdiction has the necessary computer capability.

SB 29 (Correa, Chapter 618, Statutes of 2014), among other changes, changed the starting date that counties were permitted to process VBM ballots from seven business days before an election to 10 business days before an election if the jurisdiction has the necessary computer capability.

AB 2606 (Keysor, Chapter 1275, Statutes of 1976), among other changes, permitted counties with the necessary computer capability to begin processing "absent voter ballots" on the fifth day prior to the election.

AB 50 (Unruh, Chapter 794, Statutes of 1961) required election officials to begin processing "absent voter ballots" at any time following the third day prior to an election.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

Election Integrity Project California, Inc.
One individual

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

In a letter opposing AB 16, Election Integrity Project California, Inc., stated, in part, the following:

> We must assume that a move to authorize earlier ballot processing has as its goal shortening the gap between California's outrageous 30-days-after Election Day certification deadline and the other 49 states' ability to certify within a day or two after Election Day. To that end, AB 16 accomplishes nothing.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, 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, 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: Bains, Bennett, Ellis, Lee

Prepared by: Scott Matsumoto / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
7/2/25 16:24:49

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 43
Author: Schultz (D)
Introduced: 12/2/24
Vote: 21

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-2, 6/24/25
AYES: Limón, Allen, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NOES: Seyarto, Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 57-3, 5/29/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Wild and scenic rivers

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill indefinitely extends the date by which the secretary of the Natural Resources Agency (secretary) is authorized to add rivers or segments of rivers to the state's wild and scenic rivers system.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law creates the national wild and scenic river system to preserve designated rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations.

Existing state law, pursuant to the California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5093.50 et seq.):

1) Establishes that it is the policy of the state that certain rivers that possess extraordinary scenery, recreational, fishery, or wildlife values shall be preserved in their free-flowing state, together with their immediate

environments, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the state, as specified.

2) Provides that the classification or reclassification of rivers or segments of rivers within the state as wild, scenic, or recreational within the state's wild and scenic rivers systems shall be by statute, but authorizes the secretary to recommend legislation to classify or reclassify rivers or segments of rivers within the system, and include specific land use restrictions relative to each particular classification in those recommendations.

3) Requires the secretary:

   a) If the federal government enacts a statute that would require the removal or delisting of any river or segment of a river in California that is included in the national wild and scenic rivers system and not in the state wild and scenic rivers system, or

   b) If the secretary determines that the federal government has exempted a river or segment of a river in California that protect rivers, segments of rivers, or values for which those rivers were established as part of the national system,

      i) To take both of the following actions:

         (1) Hold a public hearing to provide information and an opportunity for public comment on any proposed addition to the state wild and scenic rivers system resulting from federal action to remove, delist, or exempt that river or segment of a river from those protective provisions of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

         (2) Determine whether the provision of state protection for the river or segments of the river removed, delisted, or exempted from the national wild and scenic rivers system is in the best interest of the state and, if so, add the river or segment of the river that is removed, delisted, or exempted from those federal protective provisions to the state wild and scenic rivers system, and classify the river or segment of the river as wild, scenic, or recreational. (PRC § 5093.71)

4) Sunsets any designation made pursuant to PRC § 5093.71, and the secretary's authorities thereunder, on December 31, 2025.

This bill:

1) Repeals a provision in state law that sunset the effectiveness of any wild, scenic, or recreational designation by the secretary pursuant to PRC § 5093.71 on December 31, 2025.

2) Repeals the sunset date regarding the secretary's authorities under PRC § 5093.71.

Comments

Unconventional split Presidential terms. The authorities of the secretary of the Natural Resources Agency related to wild, scenic, and recreational rivers pursuant to PRC § 5093.71 were added to statute as the first Trump Administration and Congress at the time continually took steps to weaken environmental protections AB 2975 (Friedman Chapter 221, Statutes of 2018). In the language from AB 2975, a sunset date of December 31, 2025, was placed on those authorities in expectation of two consecutive Trump terms. As fate would have it, Mr. Trump lost his re-election bid in 2020, but won the presidential election in 2024. Expecting this second Trump Administration to continue their policy of weakening environmental protections for the country's natural resources, this bill repeals the sunset provisions in PRC § 5093.71 to continue protecting California's wild, scenic, and recreational rivers in perpetuity.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

All Outdoors
American River Conservancy
American Rivers
American Whitewater
Armargosa Conservancy
California Native Plant Society, Alta Peak Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
California Trout
Californians for Western Wilderness
Calwild
Center for Biological Diversity
Central Valley Partnership
Clean Earth 4 Kids
Clean Water Action
Coast Action Group

Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Defense Fund
Epic (Environmental Protection Information Center)
Foothill Conservancy
Friends of the Eel River
Friends of the Inyo
Friends of the Lost Coast
Friends of the River
Keep It Wild Merced River
Klamath Forest Alliance
LA Waterkeeper
Latino Outdoors
Los Padres Forestwatch
Mother Lode River Center
Nature for All
Northcoast Environmental Center
Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International
O.a.r.s.
Planning and Conservation League
Protect American River Canyons
Restore Hetch Hetchy
Restore the Delta
Restoring the Stanislaus River
Safe Alternatives for Our Forest Environment
San Francisco Baykeeper
Save California Salmon
Save the American River Association
Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Sierra Club of California
Sierra Consortium
Sierra Nevada Alliance
Sierra State Parks Foundation
Smith River Alliance
The Climate Center
Trust for Public Land
Tuleyome
Tuolumne River Trust
Union of Concerned Scientists
Water Climate Trust

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:
According to the author:

> "Since 2011, the House of Representatives has considered at least four bills to remove federal protection for part of the Merced Wild River to allow for expansion of McClure Reservoir. The proposed expansion would drown a portion of this wild river and wipe out most of the known population of the state-protected Merced Canyon limestone salamander. Reservoir expansion also raises serious dam safety concerns. In addition, the Trump Administration has demonstrated a willingness to ignore or weaken environmental laws and regulations pertaining to federal public lands.
>
> […]
>
> Current law directs the California Natural Resources Agency Secretary to hold a public hearing on the federal action, determine whether to add the river or river segment threatened by the federal action to the state wild and scenic rivers system, and if the river is added to the state system, classify as wild, scenic, and recreational the appropriate river segments. However, this public process that allows the state to protect wild and scenic rivers sunsets at the end of the year. It is important for California to allow this process to be in place given threats to our natural resources from the federal government."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 57-3, 5/29/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: DeMaio, Gallagher, Patterson
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bryan, Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Nguyen, Sanchez, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Ward

Prepared by: Edith Hannigan / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
7/8/25 16:38:45

****** 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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 60
Author: Papan (D)
Amended: 7/3/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 7/2/25
AYES: Blakespear, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-4, 5/5/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Cosmetic safety

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the specified musk-related ingredients, beginning January 1, 2027.

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 (CFR) § 701.3)

Existing state law:

1) Defines, pursuant to the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law (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. Provides that the term "cosmetic" does not include soap. Makes it unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or offer for sale any cosmetic that is

adulterated. Makes it unlawful for any person to adulterate any cosmetic. Makes it unlawful for any person to receive in commerce any cosmetic that is adulterated or to deliver or proffer for delivery any such 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, pursuant to the Cosmetic Fragrance and Flavor Ingredient Right to Know Act of 2020, a manufacturer of a cosmetic product to disclose to CDPH a list of each fragrance ingredient or flavor ingredient that is included on a designated list (HSC § 111792.6)

4) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2025, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of 25 specified intentionally added ingredients. (HSC § 108980 (a))

5) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of 44 specified intentionally added ingredients. (HSC § 108980 (b))

This bill:

1) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale, in commerce any cosmetic product that contains any of the following intentionally added ingredients:

    a) Musk ambrette (CAS no. 83-66-9);
    b) Musk tibetene (CAS no. 145-39-1);
    c) Musk moskene (CAS no. 116-66-5); and
    d) Musk xylene (CAS no. 81-15-2).

2) Prohibits, beginning January 1, 2027, a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale in commerce a cosmetic product

that contains more than 1.4% in fine fragrance products, 0.56% in eau de toilette, 0% in oral products, and 0.042% in all other products of musk ketone (CAS no. 81-14-1).

3) Defines "oral products" as a cosmetic product that is intended to be applied on teeth or the mucous membranes of the oral cavity.

Background

1) *Public health concerns with cosmetics*. Cosmetic products are sold to consumers across California, including to children who are still in the formative years of development. These products are used as part of daily beauty and cleansing routines, often times on the skin's most sensitive areas, like the face, eyelids, and lips. Cosmetic products are most heavily used by women, including those of childbearing age, increasing the likelihood of exposing mothers, fetuses, and nursing children to substances that can cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. It is important that cosmetic products are safe, properly labeled, and free of contamination.

2) *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 defines cosmetics 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. 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 law also considers any cosmetic to be adulterated, "if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance that may render it injurious to users."

3) The Cosmetic Act, established by SB 484 (Migden, Chapter 729, Statutes of 2005), requires the manufacturer, packer, and 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 maintains an active, searchable database with all of the data collected from manufacturers and makes that data available to the public. CDPH does not have any enforcement authority or penalty authority over the manufacturers that are covered, so not all manufacturers are currently complying and

submitting their products' information. State law does not currently contain a mechanism that would allow the state to compel these manufacturers to comply. Manufacturers are also required to disclose to CDPH a list of fragrance ingredients within products that are included on specified lists determined by various international agencies.

4) *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 69 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 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 regulation defines "cosmetic product" as "any substance or mixture intended to be placed in contact with the external parts of the human body (epidermis, hair system, nails, lips and external genital organs) or with the teeth and the mucous membranes of the oral cavity with a view exclusively or mainly to cleaning them, perfuming them, changing their appearance, protecting them, keeping them in good condition or correcting body odors." 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.

   The intent of this bill is to be consistent with the approach of the EU's cosmetic regulation. All of the chemicals listed in AB 60 have been fully banned or otherwise restricted in the EU Directive and its Annexes and consequently, the chemicals have already been removed or reduced in cosmetic products sold in the EU.

   The chemical bans have been enacted under statutes that have been referred to as "orphan codes" because there is no state agency designated to provide oversight to these provisions of the law. Under orphan codes, there is no direct

enforcement, no compliance program, no guidance for manufacturers seeking to comply with these laws, and often no related information for consumers. Additionally, chemical bans without the appropriate scientific assessment may result in the use of regrettable substitutions that may prove more harmful to public health.

5) *DTSC Safer Consumer Products Program*. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) administers the Safer Consumer Products (SCP, previously known as Green Chemistry) Program, which aims to advance the design, development, and use of products that are chemically safer for people and the environment. DTSC's approach provides science-based criteria and procedures for identifying and evaluating alternatives with the objective of replacing chemicals of concern, known as "Candidate Chemicals", with safer chemicals and avoiding the use of substitute chemicals that pose equal or greater harm.

   Beauty, personal care, and hygiene products, which include cosmetics, has been a category of SCP work plans since 2015 and the work to regulate toxic chemicals in this category is ongoing. After screening research, DTSC will designate a product as a "Priority Product". A Priority Product contains one or more Candidate Chemicals and that has the potential to contribute to significant adverse impacts on humans or the environment. Manufacturers of a Priority Product must submit an alternatives analysis which determines whether there are any safer alternatives to the Candidate Chemical in the product or if there are other ways to make a safer version of the product. The alternatives analysis takes a life cycle approach, evaluating certain factors and the safety of the product from raw material extraction to disposal/recycling. The outcomes of the alternatives analysis could lead to alternative ingredients or product design or regulatory responses including, but not limited to: requiring the display of product information, chemical restrictions, product prohibitions, or end-of-life management requirements.

6) *Nitro musks in cosmetics.* Synthetic nitro musks are fragrant chemicals found in household and personal care products. In fragrances, they are used for their alluring scent and to prolong the quality of the product. Humans are directly exposed to these chemicals through skin absorption, inhalation, and oral consumption of contaminated liquids and foods. Consequently, nitro musks have been found in human blood, breast milk, and body fat. They are also environmentally persistent as they pass through wastewater treatment and enter the environment. Though epidemiologic studies evaluating the effects of nitro

musk exposure in humans are lacking, there is evidence that these chemicals may impact hormone levels and are associated with an increased risk of tumor formation in mice.[1] The evidence also suggests that while nitro musks are not genotoxic alone, they may increase the genotoxicity of other chemicals and research outcomes have been species specific. Further research is necessary as current evidence regarding developmental effects, while suggestive of adverse outcomes, are considered conflicting and inconclusive.

Due to bans on nitro musks in several countries, manufacturers have replaced nitro musks with polycyclic musks. However, there are products with nitro musks that are used in the United States are still being produced by China and India. Some experts have suggested the use of the precautionary principle, which encourages caution in decision-making if scientific evidence is lacking, when addressing exposure to nitro musks in products.

7) *Risk assessments of nitro musks.* In Australia, the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS), recently known as the Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme, regulates chemicals that are manufactured or imported into Australia for industrial use and personal care products. In 2019, NICNAS released a risk assessment of nitro musks. The assessment indicated that musk ketone and musk xylene are suspected carcinogens and the main organ impacted by repeated exposure is the liver. However, the conducted hazard and risk assessments demonstrated that musk ketone and musk xylene in cosmetic products are not considered to pose an unreasonable risk to public health.[2]

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "AB 60 will eliminate and restrict the use of nitro musks in everyday products like perfumes, body washes, and personal care items, thereby reducing Californians' exposure to toxic chemicals. Nitro musks have been known to disrupt the endocrine system. The endocrine system, which governs the body's communication network, is critical to the development and regulation of the reproductive system. Endocrine-disrupting chemicals, such as nitro musks, contribute to an alarming rise in reproductive health issues, including early puberty, endometriosis, and infertility. While the European Union has already banned or heavily regulated

[1] Taylor, K. M., et. al. (2014). Human exposure to nitro musks and the evaluation of their potential toxicity: an overview.
[2] National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme. (2019). Nitromusks: Human health tier III assessment.

these harmful compounds, the U.S. has failed to take similar action, leaving Californians vulnerable to their effects."

"By aligning California's regulations with stricter EU safety standards, AB 60 will eliminate these unsafe ingredients from personal care products, minimizing Californians' contact with unhealthy substances. California has a responsibility to lead on environmental justice and addressing the toxins in consumer products is a vital first step. AB 60 is essential for a healthier, safer future."

2) *Ensuring safer alternatives.* While addressing toxic chemicals in products through bans may immediately lead to source reduction, thus reducing the potential for harm, it is important to consider whether their replacements present unforeseen risks. Many manufactures have already replaced nitro musks with unregulated polycyclic musks where nitro musks have been restricted or banned. Research has suggested that some polycyclic musks may degrade into other chemicals with high toxicity and persistence, such as formaldehyde, which can cause relatively more harm to the ecological environment and human health.[3] There is conflicting evidence that polycyclic musks exhibit toxicity at the hormonal or cellular levels of aquatic organisms. Moreover, more research is needed as there is a lack of data and evaluation on the overall ecological risk and impact to human health.[4] It is uncertain whether the replacements of nitro musks will cause less harm, and typically there is a lack of transparency surrounding the types of replacements because ingredients tend to list musks as "fragrances".

   DTSC has indicated that they will conduct screening research on fragrances in cosmetics for "Candidate Chemicals" in their 2024-2026 Three-year Priority Product Work Plan as part of SCP. Only musk xylene is listed as a "Candidate Chemical", so it is possible that could be the only chemical evaluated. Though there is a level of uncertainty on when an assessment and regulatory decision for fragrances in cosmetics may be completed and going through this process would increase the costs associated with implementation, SCP would fully evaluate the safety of alternatives and make a science-based regulatory decision in the interest of public health. Banning certain fragrances may disrupt progress within SCP and increase the use of chemicals with unknown impacts. The Legislature could require DTSC to evaluate other chemicals within

[3] Dodson, R. E., et. al. (2012). Endocrine disruptors and asthma-associated chemicals in consumer products.
[4] Liu, J., et. al. (2021). Polycyclic musks in the environment: A review of their concentrations and distribution, ecological effects and behavior, current concerns and future prospects.

fragrances or other products of concern not currently listed as a Candidate Chemical, instead of a chemical ban. If ingredient bans are to be put in place, policies could also require the transparency of any alternatives used to promote additional research.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/4/25)

A Voice for Choice Advocacy
California Environmental Voters
California Health Coalition Advocacy
California Water Association
California Women's Law Center
City of San Mateo
First 5 San Mateo County
Glendale; City of
Green Policy Initiative
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/4/25)

Fragrance Creators Association

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-4, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, 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, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio, Gallagher, Lackey, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Castillo, Chen, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Macedo, Michelle Rodriguez, Sanchez, Ta

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
7/7/25 16:11:55

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 87
Author: Boerner (D)
Amended: 7/10/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 10-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Wahab, Seyarto, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Padilla
NOES: Ochoa Bogh

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 7/9/25
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Seyarto, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Housing development: density bonuses

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill provides that a local government is not required to grant a concession or incentive to a hotel or motel as part of a housing development project, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires each city and county to adopt an ordinance that specifies how it will implement state density bonus law (DBL). Requires cities and counties to grant a density bonus when an applicant for a housing development — defined as "five or more units" including mixed-use developments — seeks and agrees to construct a project that will contain at least one of the following:

   a) 10% of the total units of a housing development for lower-income households;

b) 5% of the total units of a housing development for very low-income households;
c) A senior citizen housing development or mobile home park;
d) 10% of the units in a common interest development for moderate-income households;
e) 10% of the total units for transitional foster youth, veterans, or persons experiencing homelessness;
f) 20% of the total units for lower-income students in a student housing development; or
g) 100% of the units of a housing development for lower-income households, except that 20% of units may be for moderate-income households.

2) Requires a city or county to allow an increase in density on a sliding scale from 20% to 80%, depending on the percentage of units affordable to low- and very low-income households, over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan. Requires the increase in density on a sliding scale for moderate-income for-sale developments from 5% to 50% over the otherwise allowable residential density.

This bill:

1) Provides that a local government is not required to grant a concession or incentive to a hotel, motel, bed and breakfast inn, or other transient lodging, other than a residential hotel, as part of a housing development project. "Other transient lodging" does not include a resident's use or marketing of their unit as short-term lodging.

2) Makes other technical changes.

Background

Density bonus law. Given California's high land and construction costs for housing, it is extremely difficult for the private market to provide housing units that are affordable to low- and even moderate-income households. Public subsidy is often required to fill the financial gap on affordable units. DBL allows public entities to reduce or even eliminate subsidies for a particular project by allowing a developer to include more total units in a project than would otherwise be allowed by the local zoning ordinance, in exchange for affordable units. Allowing more total units permits the developer to spread the cost of the affordable units more

broadly over the market-rate units. The idea of DBL is to cover at least some of the financing gap of affordable housing with regulatory incentives, rather than additional subsidy.

Under existing law, if a developer proposes to construct a housing development with a specified percentage of affordable units, the city or county must provide all of the following benefits: a density bonus; incentives or concessions (hereafter referred to as incentives); waiver of any development standards that prevent the developer from utilizing the density bonus or incentives; and reduced parking standards. To qualify for benefits under DBL, a proposed housing development must contain a minimum percentage of affordable housing. If one of these options is met, a developer is entitled to a base increase in density for the project as a whole (referred to as a density bonus) and one regulatory incentive. Under DBL, a developer is entitled to a sliding scale of density bonuses, up to a maximum of 50% of the maximum zoning density and up to four incentives, as specified, depending on the percentage of affordable housing included in the project. At the low end, a developer receives 20% additional density for 5% very low-income units or 20% density for 10% low-income units. The maximum additional density permitted is 50%, in exchange for 15% very low-income units or 24% low-income units. Additionally, specified 100% affordable housing projects may receive up to an 80% density bonus. The developer also negotiates additional incentives, reduced parking, and design standard waivers, with the local government. This helps developers reduce costs while enabling a local government to determine what changes make the most sense for that site and community.

Comments

1) *Author's statement*. "AB 87 ensures Density Bonus Law is being applied as it was intended, to increase California's affordable housing stock to meet increasing needs. Density Bonus Law is a tool that is meant to encourage the construction of units for low income Californians. However, there is currently a loophole in DBL that allows developers to gain incentives while not meaningfully contributing to affordable housing. In my district, a project application was submitted that allowed the development to exceed the city's height limit, a proposed 238-foot tower adding 139 hotel rooms and only 10 affordable units. California needs affordable housing options, and we need to hold developers using DBL to the intent of the law, which is to increase access to affordable housing for hard-working Californians."

2) *Tower at the Beach.* In recent years, as DBL has been expanded to increase its efficacy and the amount of bonuses, incentives, and concessions, it has come under increased scrutiny regarding its intersection with local planning regulations. In San Diego, a proposed 22-story project at 970 Turquoise Street serves as an interesting case study on the intersection of state and local laws. The project developer is taking advantage of the project vesting provisions established under SB 330 (Skinner, Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019), in combination with DBL, a local San Diego density bonus program, and a unique-to-San Diego hotel provision to propose a 239 foot tall building where ordinarily a 30 foot height limit would apply. The site's 30 foot height limit was established by a 1972 local voter initiative, Proposition D, which created San Diego's Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone (not to be confused with California's Coastal Zone).

   The site is locally zoned to permit high-density commercial uses and limited residential development. Under this zoning, only 31 residential units would typically be allowed on the 0.67-acre site. However, by designating 15% of those base units (five units) for very-low-income households, the developer qualifies for a 50% density bonus under DBL, allowing for 16 additional market-rate units. A second 50% bonus, enabled by AB 1287 (Alvarez, Chapter 775, Statutes of 2023), which went into effect on January 1, 2024, was granted for the inclusion of another five units for moderate-income households. This added 16 more market-rate units. In total, DBL increased the project's residential count by 32 units, in exchange for 10 affordable units, raising the unit count from 31 to 63 units. Additionally, the project leverages local incentives under San Diego's municipal code to access 11 more residential units, through a local density bonus, because the proposal includes three-bedroom units. This brings the total number of residential units to 74.

   The remaining 139 "units" included in the proposed development at 970 Turquoise Street are hotel rooms, classified as "visitor accommodations," which are allowed by-right under San Diego's commercial zoning for the site. The developer requested an incentive to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements of the City's municipal code to increase the project size and financial feasibility, and applied the entirety of that FAR incentive to the "commercial" component of the site (the hotel rooms). This is how the nearly 240-foot development in a zone with a 30 foot height limit came to be.

   Notably, these hotel units are not intended for short-term tourist stays. Under the version of San Diego's local municipal code in effect at the time the

developer submitted its preliminary application, visitor accommodations could legally be rented for more than 30 days, essentially allowing them to be used as housing units. The developer intends to use this provision to operate the hotel rooms, which will include kitchens, as long-term market-rate rental housing. Although San Diego has since updated its development code to prohibit the long-term rental of visitor accommodations, the project is vested under the prior rules under SB 330. As such, the new restrictions on using hotel rooms for long-term rentals do not apply to 970 Turquoise.

In total, the combination of DBL, San Diego's local bonus program, and San Diego's unique provision which previously allowed for the long-term rental of hotel units, resulted in this "213 residential unit" proposal that was not contemplated under San Diego's local planning regulations, in exchange for 10 affordable units under DBL. DBL directly unlocked an extra 32 market-rate units in exchange for only 10 affordable units. San Diego's own bonus program provided an extra 11 units. Finally, the provisions of San Diego's municipal code that allowed hotel units to function as apartment units unlocked an extra 139 "units" once the FAR incentive provided under DBL was applied to the hotel use.

In order to prevent similar projects from taking advantage of state DBL, this bill provides that a local government is not required to grant a concession or incentive to a hotel or motel as part of a housing development project, as specified.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/11/25)

League of California Cities
New Livable California DBA Livable California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/11/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 5/12/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, 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, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Sanchez, Stefani, Tangipa

Prepared by: Alison Hughes / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124
7/11/25 15:48:46

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 94
Author: Bennett (D)
Introduced: 1/7/25
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Cervantes, Choi, Allen, Limón, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Recall elections: successors

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a recalled local officer from being appointed to fill the vacancy of that office.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Law:

1) Provides that recall is the power of the electors to remove an elective officer.

2) Defines "local officer" as an elective officers of a city, county, school district, community college district, or special district, or a judge of a trial court.

3) Requires the Legislature to provide for the recall of local officers, but provides that this provision does not affect counties and cities whose charters provide for a recall.

4) Requires, in the case of a recall of a state officer, other than a judge of the Supreme Court or a court of appeal, the following:

   a) The recall election to include both an election to determine whether to recall the officer and an election to elect a successor.

b) Provides that if the majority vote on the question is to recall, the officer is removed and the candidate who receives a plurality is the successor.

c) Prohibits the officer who is the subject of the recall from being a candidate in the election to choose a successor.

5) Provides at a statewide election if an officer is recalled, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes for the office is declared elected for the unexpired term of the recalled officer.

6) Provides there shall not be an election for a successor in a recall of a local officer. If the majority votes to recall a local officer, then the officer is removed and the vacated office is filled according to law.

This bill bars a recalled local officer from being appointed to fill the vacancy of that office and corrects a technical error relating to statewide election.

Background

Recall Changes. In 2022, the Legislature passed and Governor Newsom sign AB 2582 (Bennett, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2022) which changed how local recalls are conducted. Before AB 2582, state and local election recalls had the same process. The ballot asked voters two questions: 1) should the officer sought to be recalled be recalled, and 2) who should replace the recalled officer if the recall is successful. AB 2582 removed the second question and made it so local recall elections would only ask one question: should the local officer sought to be recalled be removed from office? As a result, any vacancy created from a successful recall is now be filled in accordance to law.

In 2024, the Legislature passed the proposed constitutional amendment SCA 1 (Newman, Resolution Chapter 204, Statutes of 2024). SCA 1, if approved by voters, would only ask one question at a state recall election: should the officer being recalled be removed? SCA 1 is similar to the local recall election processes created by AB 2582. SCA 1 also creates a provision that prohibits the recalled officer from being appointed to fill the vacancy, similar to what this bill is aiming to do.

Comments

Authors Statement. AB 94 seeks to align the local recall process with the recall process laid out in SCA 1 of 2024, and to clarify ambiguity in the code. There is currently inconsistency between the proposed ballot measure regarding recalls of state officers and AB 2582, as well as ambiguity in existing law.

Statewide or State Officer. AB 2582 created provisional changes in the Elections Code, which previously covered state and local election recalls. One change created a provision about statewide recall elections. However, the term statewide unintentionally left out state elected officers who are not elected statewide. For example, members of the Board of Equalization and Legislature are not included in current language. This bill clarifies that any state officer is subject to the provision.

Related/Prior Legislation

SCA 1 (Newman, Resolution Chapter 204, Statutes of 2024), would if passed by voters, eliminate the successor election for a recalled state officer and would provide, in the event an officer is removed in a recall election, that the office will remain vacant until it is filled in accordance with existing law. This constitutional amendment also repeals the prohibition against the officer subject to the recall from being a candidate to fill the office in a special election, but prohibits the appointment of the officer subject to the recall election to fill the vacancy.

AB 2582 (Bennett, Chapter 790, Statutes of 2022) requires a local recall election to include only the question of whether the elected officer sought to be recalled should be removed from office. It also requires the office, if a local officer is successfully recalled, to become vacant and to be filled in accordance with existing law.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/1/25)

SEIU California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

Election Integrity Project California, Inc.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Essayli, 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, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bennett, Davies, Wicks

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell, Rida Shaikh / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
7/2/25 16:24:51

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 243
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 243
Author: Ahrens (D)
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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Postsecondary education: student financial aid dependency status: juveniles

SOURCE: County of Santa Clara

DIGEST: This bill (1) authorizes personnel at a county child welfare department, county probation department, or local educational agency (LEA), upon the request of a youth formerly in the foster care or probation system, to provide certain personal information to an institution of higher education (IHE) to assist the youth's attendance at that IHE. It further (2) requires a financial aid administrator to accept a sworn attestation as sufficient documentation for adjusting a financial aid applicant's dependency status who is attending or applying to a California State University (CSU), California Community College (CCC), or University of California (UC) campus. Lastly, it (3) makes any information received by an IHE

confidential, and a violation of the confidentiality provisions subject to a misdemeanor of up to a $500 fine.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) for the purpose of administering specified student financial aid programs. (Education Code (EC) § 69510, et seq.)

2) Establishes the Cal Grant program, administered by the CSAC, to provide grants to financially needy students to attend a college or university. The Cal Grant programs include both the entitlement and the competitive Cal Grant awards. The program consists of the Cal Grant A, Cal Grant B, and Cal Grant C programs, and eligibility is based upon financial need, grade point average (GPA), California residency, and other criteria. Maximum award amounts for the CSU and the UC are established in the annual Budget Act and have traditionally covered all system wide tuition and fees. Supplemental Cal Grant awards programs are available to students with dependents and former and current foster youth attending CSU, UC, or a CCC to assist with non-tuition costs, such as living expenses. (EC § 69430–69433 and § 69465-69470)

3) Establishes, the Cal Grant Reform Act commencing in the 2024-2025 fiscal year, if General Fund moneys over the multiyear forecasts are available to support ongoing augmentations and actions, and if funding is provided in the annual Budget Act (Act). Under the Act, the Cal Grant 2 and Cal Grant 4 programs are created. The Cal Grant 2 is for CCC students, and provides non-tuition support that grows annually with inflation. The Cal Grant 4 program is for students at the UC, CSU, and other institutions. The Act also states legislative intent that UC and CSU use institutional aid to cover non-tuition costs for their students. (EC § 69424, 69425, and 69428).

4) Requires the CSAC, through an interagency agreement with the Department of Social Services (DSS), to operate a federally-funded scholarship program that provides grant aid to California's current and former foster youth. Existing law requires funds to be used to assist students who are current and former foster youth, for career and technical training or traditional college courses. (EC § 69519)

5) Establishes the Middle Class Scholarship (MCS) Program to offset a portion of tuition costs for students attending the UC and the CSU. Starting in the 2022-23 academic year, MCS awards may be used to cover the total cost of attendance at UC and CSU. The maximum annual household income to qualify for an award is $234,000 for dependent students in 2025-26. (EC § 70020, et seq.)

6) Specifies the categories of individuals who are authorized to inspect a juvenile case file, and authorizes only certain individuals to inspect a juvenile case file, including, among others, a local child support agency for the purpose of establishing paternity and establishing and enforcing child support orders and members of children's multidisciplinary teams, persons, or agencies providing treatment or supervision of the minor. (Welfare & Institutions Code § 827)

7) Prohibits, in federal law, funds from being made available under any applicable program to any educational agency or institution that permits the release of a student's education records, or the personally identifiable information contained therein, other than directory information, without the written consent of their parents. (20 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 1232(b))

8) Specifies that a financial aid administrator has the authority to, on the basis of adequate documentation, make adjustments to the data used to determine a student's financial aid eligibility, based on "special circumstances or unusual circumstances." Further specifies that, in instances when the student or the student's parents or legal guardians are incarcerated, this documentation can be obtained with a documented phone call or a written statement from various officials, as specified. (20 U.S.C. § 1087tt et seq.)

This bill:

1) Requires a financial aid administrator to accept a sworn attestation as sufficient documentation for determining eligibility under federal regulations, specifically for making adjustments for unusual circumstances to the dependency status of an applicant for student financial aid, who is attending, or applying to, a CSU, CCC, or UC campus.

2) Requests the UC Regents to adopt a policy to implement this bill's provisions.

3) Authorizes, to support a person who is or was previously adjudged a dependent or ward of the juvenile court, placed in foster care or on probation, or taken into the custody of the county probation department, in attending an IHE by assisting the person with tasks, such as applying, registering, enrolling, and

obtaining financial aid or support, personnel at a county probation department or LEA to provide, upon request of the person, the IHE with either or both of the following:

a) A sworn attestation as defined to be used for the purpose of making an adjustment to a financial aid applicant's dependency status, as specified.

b) The information necessary to verify that the person is or was previously adjudged a dependent or ward of the juvenile court, placed in foster care or on probation, or taken into the custody of the county probation department.

4) Makes any information received by the IHE outlined in 3) above confidential, only to be shared among the IHE's personnel when necessary, and prohibits further disclosure or dissemination of that information by the IHE or its personnel.

5) Requires the IHE to retain the information received in a confidential file for three years after the person's last term of enrollment and thereafter destroy it.

6) Clarifies that nothing in this bill prohibits a financial aid administrator from accepting other types of adequate documentation to substantiate a student's unusual circumstances in accordance with federal financial aid law.

7) Makes an intentional violation of the confidentiality provisions of this bill subject to a misdemeanor of up to a $500 fine.

8) Defines, for the purpose of this bill, the following terms:

a) "Adjustment for unusual circumstances" to mean an unusual circumstances adjustment, as described in federal law as specified, regarding the dependency status of a financial aid applicant.

b) "Applicant" to mean a financial aid applicant attending, or applying to attend, the CSU, CCC, or UC.

c) "Financial aid" to mean any form of student financial aid or institutional financial aid.

d) "Financial aid administrator" to mean a financial aid administrator of the CSU, CCC, or UC for purposes of determining institutional financial aid of

the applicant, or the CSAC for purposes of determining student financial aid of the applicant, as applicable.

e) "Institutional financial aid" to mean all institutional grant aid, including institutional student need-based and merit-based aid.

f) "Local educational agency" to mean a school district, charter school, or county office of education.

g) "Sworn attestation" to mean a statement signed under penalty of perjury by an authorized representative of a LEA, county child welfare department, or probation department. The attestation shall include all of the following:

   i) The name, organization, and title of the attester.

   ii) A declaration that the attester has provided services, instruction, or assistance to the student.

   iii) A declaration that the attester is familiar with the student's relationship with their parent or parents, as defined in federal law.

   iv) A declaration that, to the best of the attester's personal knowledge, the student is either unable to contact their parent or parents, or contacting their parent or parents would pose a risk to the student.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the letter of support submitted by the County of Santa Clara to this Committee, "Under existing law, information related to a minor in juvenile court proceedings and child welfare systems is highly confidential, and access to case files is restricted to authorized individuals. Due to this youth involved in the juvenile justice or child welfare systems often encounter challenges when required to obtain proof of their financial independence, medical, disability, or other accommodations as part of their application or enrollment in higher education. These barriers disproportionately impact Latino and Black communities, which are overrepresented among system-involved youth. Currently, institutions of higher education in California are requesting a variety of different types of documentation from youth of financial independence.

"AB 243 addresses the challenges these youth face in providing necessary information during admissions, financial aid, enrollment, and accommodation processes. By requiring financial aid administrators at public higher education institutions in California to accept an attestation from local educational agencies, county probation departments, or welfare departments as sufficient documentation of financial independence, the bill streamlines access to affordable education for these students. This attestation approach also promotes consistent treatment of required information from students. For the rare instances in which the attestation is not sufficient, or where other information is needed to support the youth's successful enrollment and education, the bill allows county or county office of education staff to disclose to higher education institutions limited information about the youth's circumstances while maintaining confidentiality safeguards."

Why dependency status matters? Establishing an applicant's financial dependency status through the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) is necessary to determine their eligibility for student aid. Dependent students are considered to have parental support and must submit financial information for both themselves and their parents. In contrast, independent students are deemed financially responsible for themselves and only need to provide their own financial information or, if applicable, that of their spouse. This distinction is important as it affects their Student Aid Index calculation, which in turn impacts the amount and type of financial aid for which the student may qualify.

At the discretion of student financial aid administrators. FAFSA uses specific criteria (age, marital status, military service, etc.) to determine financial dependency status, and not all students who live independently or support themselves qualify as independent under FAFSA rules. As noted within the Federal Student Aid Handbook there are some unique situations where financial aid administrators need to exercise their professional judgment in determining dependency. This includes when to perform dependency overrides to account for a student's unusual circumstances that warrant making a dependent student an independent student. Specifically, federal law distinguishes between different categories of professional judgment that may be exercised for special circumstances or unusual circumstances. As it pertains to this bill, unusual circumstances refers to the conditions that justify an adjustment to a student's dependency status based on a unique situation including human trafficking, refugee or asylee status, parental abuse or abandonment, parental or student incarceration. Financial aid administrators may use their professional judgement to make adjustments that are appropriate to each student's situation with appropriate documentation. New FAFSA rules require institutions to develop policies for

reviewing professional judgment requests and must make students aware of their ability to request an adjustment for special or unusual circumstances.

This bill explicitly requires that a financial aid administrator at a California public higher education institution accept a sworn statement from the specified local agencies as sufficient proof for adjusting an applicant's dependency status thereby streamlining, in part, professional judgement determinations for foster youth or juvenile justice involved students. It further authorizes a LEA, county child welfare, or probation department to support these students in their pursuit of higher education by sharing limited information with financial aid administrators to verify their circumstances when requested by the student. Any information shared with the college must be kept confidential.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

County of Santa Clara (Source)
Alameda County Office of Education
Aspiranet
California Association for Bilingual Education
California Chamber of Commerce
California Coalition for Youth
California County Superintendents
CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Youth Law Center

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

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: Olgalilia Ramirez / ED. / (916) 651-4105
7/10/25 9:43:01

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 248
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 248
Author: Bryan (D), et al.
Amended: 6/27/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 51-12, 3/20/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: County jails: wages

SOURCE: Legal Services for Prisoners with Children

DIGEST: This bill authorizes a county board of supervisors to determine the sum for work completed by individuals incarcerated in a county jail.

Senate Floor Amendments of 6/26/25 clarify that "sum" means a "sum of money."

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law states that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, nor any place subject to their jurisdiction. (U.S. Constitution (Const.), 13th Amend.)

Existing state law:

1) Prohibits slavery. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.,) art. I, § 6.)

2) Prohibits involuntary servitude except to punish crime. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 6.)

3) Provides that the common jails in the several counties of this state are kept by the sheriffs of the counties in which they are respectively situated, and are used as follows:
   a) For the detention of persons committed in order to secure their attendance as witnesses in criminal cases;
   b) For the detention of persons charged with crime and committed for trial;
   c) For the confinement of persons committed for contempt, or upon civil process, or by other authority of law;
   d) For the confinement of persons sentenced to imprisonment therein upon a conviction for crime; and,
   e) For the confinement of persons for a violation of the terms and conditions of their postrelease community supervision. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 4000.)

4) Authorizes a board of supervisors to provide that each individual confined in or committed to a county jail be credited with a sum not to exceed $2 for each eight hours of work done by the incarcerated person. (Pen. Code, § 4019.3.)

This bill authorizes a county board of supervisors to determine the sum for work completed by individuals incarcerated in a county jail.

Background

Under current law, the board of supervisors of a county is authorized to credit a person incarcerated in the county jail up to $2 for each eight hours of work. (Pen. Code, § 4019.3.) In practice, many counties do not provide incarcerated workers with any monetary compensation. (Joe Garcia, *'Relic of slavery': California lawmakers are trying again to raise pay for incarcerated workers* (May 19, 2025) available at <https://www.calmatters.org/justice/2025/05/incarcerated-worker-pay/#:~:text=Most%20California%20county%20jails%20do,an%20hour%2C"%20explained%20Bryan.) The same article observed: "Mopping floors, cleaning toilets, preparing and distributing three meals a day for all persons in lockup — sheriffs and jailers treat these essential jobs as privileges bestowed on individuals who choose to trade work for time outside their cells and other perks, such as guaranteed daily showers or extra food." (*Ibid*.)

A prior effort to make changes to the wages of workers incarcerated in the state's prisons was unsuccessful. See SB 1371 (Bradford, Chapter 723, Statutes of 2022) of the 2021-2022 legislative session. In addition, Proposition 6 would have prohibited involuntary servitude with no exceptions and would have applied to both state prisons and county jails. It was rejected by the voters in November 2024.

This bill eliminates the current $2 cap per 8 hours of work and instead, authorizes a county board of supervisors to determine an amount for work completed by individuals incarcerated in a county jail. Proponents of this bill argue that the compensation currently provided, if any, to individuals incarcerated in county jails is so low that these individuals are unable to afford basic hygiene items and food products from the jail commissary, sometimes leading people to go into debt in order to purchase these types of products. Supporters of this bill also assert that low or no monetary compensation limits a person's ability to pay restitution, causing many to go into debt.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/25)

Legal Services for Prisoners With Children (source)
A New Way of Life Re-Entry Project
All Above All
All of Us or None
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Center for Employment Opportunities
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
Courage California
Debt Free Justice California
Disability Rights California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Freedom 4 Youth
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Greenpeace USA
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
LA County Public Defenders Union, Local 148
La Defensa
National Employment Law Project
One Fair Wage
Riverside All of Us or None
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
The Gathering for Justice
UAW Region 6

Vera Institute of Justice
Viet Voices
1 Individual

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/25)

California State Sheriffs' Association

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT:

The LA County Public Defenders Union, Local 148 writes:

> This bill would promote dignity, fairness, and financial stability for incarcerated workers in California's counties. Current law…sets a maximum wage of $2.00 per eight-hour shift for incarcerated workers in the custody of county jails. AB 248 would repeal this maximum wage and would allow counties to set their own wages for incarcerated workers under their jurisdiction. This bill does not require counties to pay wages to incarcerated workers; it simply gives them the authority to do so.
>
> …
>
> Incarcerated workers are workers and deserve to earn monetary wages. Currently, incarcerated workers in county jails do not earn monetary wages in over 90% of California's counties. In most counties, incarcerated workers are provided with sentence credits or other informal "compensation" such as additional recreational time.
>
> Paying fair wages to incarcerated workers has fiscal and non-fiscal benefits for the workers, their families, and society. First, paying incarcerated workers fair wages would allow them to potentially save money while incarcerated and help them to get back on their feet immediately post-release. This would positively impact recidivism rates and, therefore, reincarceration expenditures and crime costs for California. In addition, if incarcerated workers make monetary wage, they can better support family members, children, and other loved ones outside. Finally, paying fair wages to incarcerated workers can improve mental health outcomes, boost morale, and encourage personal agency.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION:

According to the California State Sheriffs' Association:

> AB 248 would allow the board of supervisors to credit each prisoner with a wage to be determined by the board if the prisoners is confined in or committed to a county jail and performs a work assignment.
>
> AB 248 could create significant fiscal pressure on counties already facing challenging budget times. Counties would likely be forced to consider a substantial new cost when determining if and how to deploy inmate workers. Inmates are already eligible to earn credit toward early release by completing work assignments as well as some form of monetary compensation. AB 248 would create pressure on counties to increase the fiscal recompense provided to inmate workers, thereby potentially limiting the availability of opportunities for work while incarcerated.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 51-12, 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, Hoover, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Macedo, Sanchez, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Essayli, Flora, Irwin, Lackey, Papan, Patterson, Ramos, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Solache, Ta, Wallis

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
6/30/25 10:55:25

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 287
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 287
Author: Lackey (R), et al.
Introduced: 1/22/25
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Cervantes, Choi, Allen, Limón, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 4/7/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Elections: polling places and vote centers

SOURCE: County of Los Angeles

DIGEST: This bill specifies that when a public entity provides use of one of its buildings for a polling place or vote center, it must also provide accessible parking, curbside parking, and storage at the location.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Allows a local governmental agency, the University of California (UC), the California State University (CSU), or a community college district to provide the use of its buildings as polling places or vote centers as well as for the storage, at no cost, of voting machines and other vote tabulating devices.

2) Requires, when a local elections official asks to use a specific public building as a polling place or vote center, that the local agency, CSU, or community college district allow for the building's use as a polling place or vote center. The UC is encouraged to do so.

3) Requires a public building, including a school building, that is used as a polling place or voter center to comply with applicable federal and state accessibility requirements and if requested, to make parking available at no charge.

4) Permits a voter with a disability to vote by regular ballot outside any polling place, also known as curbside voting.

This bill requires that when an agency provides a public building for use as a vote center or polling place that it also provides:

a) Space for voting operations and storage of associated supplies; and

b) Accessible parking spaces and curbside parking where voters with disabilities can be assisted, when requested to by the local elections official.

Comments

1) *Author's Statement.* It is imperative that Californians with disabilities can fully and equally participate in the electoral process. That means making sure they have accessible parking at polling places and vote centers for curbside voting if they need it. This bill is a simple clarifying bill to help guarantee that everyone has an equal opportunity to vote.

2) *School District Concerns.* The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), while not taking a position on this bill, notes that it, and likely many other school districts, may not be able to meet the requirements of this bill. It reports that over 80% of LAUSD schools have insufficient parking and therefore struggle to provide sufficient parking for teachers. Requiring districts to make accessible parking available during the 10-day window would further result in the displacement of students and employees who require accessible spaces during that period. Similarly, the storage of voting materials could also be an issue if the school site does not have usable space readily available.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 545 (Pellerin, Chapter 658, Statutes of 2023) authorized curbside voting, which permits a voter with a disability to vote by regular ballot outside any polling place.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

County of Los Angeles (source)
Asian Law Caucus
California Association of Clerks & Election Officials
California State Association of Counties

Disability Rights California
Election Integrity Project California, Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

The County of Los Angeles, the bill's sponsor, states that by clarifying requirements for accessible parking, curbside voting spaces, and adequate storage for voting materials, the bill will enhance accessibility at voting centers for individuals with disabilities. The county further notes that last year it reached a settlement with the U.S. Department of Justice resolving an Americans with Disabilities Act lawsuit that requires the county to improve its vote center site selection policies and increase the number of vote centers in the county. This bill helps the county comply with that settlement.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 4/7/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Castillo, Jeff Gonzalez, Lee, Sanchez, Ta, Wallis

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
7/2/25 16:24:51

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 301
Author: Schiavo (D) and Rivas (D), et al.
Amended: 6/19/25 in Senate
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 8-0, 6/17/25
AYES: Wahab, Seyarto, Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Grayson, Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, Padilla

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Planning and zoning: housing development projects: postentitlement phase permits: state agencies

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill establishes specific timeframes for state agencies involved in postentitlement reviews and approvals for housing developments

ANALYSIS:

Existing State Law:

1) Defines "postentitlement phase permit" as follows:

   a) All nondiscretionary permits required by a local agency after the entitlement process to begin construction of a development that is intended to be at least two-thirds residential, excluding specified planning permits, entitlements, and other permits. These permits include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

      i. Building permits, and all inter-departmental review required for the issuance of a building permit;

ii. Permits for minor or standard off-site improvements;
iii. Permits for demolition; and,
iv. Permits for minor or standard excavation and grading.

b) Allows a local agency to identify by ordinance a threshold for determining whether a permit constitutes a "minor" or "standard" permit if supported by written findings; and,
c) Excludes a permit required and issued by the California Coastal Commission (Commission), a special district, or a utility that is not owned and operated by a local agency, or any other entity that is not a city or county.

2) Requires a local agency to determine whether an application for a postentitlement phase permit is complete and provide written notice of this determination to the applicant within 15 business days after the local agency received the application, as follows:

a) If the local agency determines an application is incomplete, the local agency must provide the applicant with a list of incomplete items and a description of how the application can be made complete, but the local agency can't request new information that wasn't on the original list of needed information;
b) After receiving a notice that the application was incomplete, an applicant may cure and address the items that are deemed to be incomplete by the local agency. Upon receipt of a corrected application, the local agency must notify the applicant whether the additional application has remedied all incomplete items within 15 business days; and,
c) If a local agency does not meet the timelines required for determining an application complete, and the application or resubmitted application states that it is for a postentitlement phase permit.

3) Specifies a process for approving postentitlement permits, as follows:

a) Requires local agencies to complete review, either return in writing a full set of comments to the applicant with a comprehensive request for revisions or return the approved permit application, and electronically notify the applicant of its determination within:

i. Thirty business days of the application being complete for housing development projects with 25 units or fewer; or,
ii. Sixty business days of the application being complete for housing development projects with 26 units or more.

iii. Provides that these time limits do not apply if the local agency makes written findings within the applicable time limit that the proposed postentitlement phase permit might have a specific, adverse impact, as defined, on public health or safety and that additional time is necessary to process the application;
iv. Tolls the time limits for approval if the local agency requires review of the application by an outside entity, as specified;
v. If a local agency finds that a complete application is noncompliant, the local agency must provide the applicant with a list of items that are noncompliant and a description of how the application can be remedied by the applicant within the applicable time limit, as provided, and must allow the applicant to correct the application.

This bill:

1) Extends the requirements that local agencies must comply with regarding the review and approval of postentitlement phase permits for a housing development project to state agencies.

2) Declares that the bill is urgency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, as specified, and therefore it is necessary that the bill take effect immediately.

Background

The Permit Streamlining Act (PSA). The PSA requires public agencies (both state and local agencies) to act fairly and promptly on applications for development proposals, including housing developments. Under the PSA, public agencies have 30 days to determine whether applications for development projects are complete and request additional information; failure to act results in an application being "deemed complete." The PSA applies to the discretionary approval phase of a development review process; this is the phase where the agency, in its discretion, decides whether it approves of the concept outlined in the development proposal.

Postentitlement permits. A development proposal that is approved and entitled is still required to obtain approval for a range of non-discretionary permits. This includes building permits and other permits related to the physical construction of the development proposal. The timelines established in the PSA do not apply to these non-discretionary permits. The postentitlement phase of the review process typically involves the review of permits that are objective in nature. Generally, once an agency invests the time and effort to approve and entitle a development

proposal, there is an incentive for the agency to process the postentitlement permits in a timely fashion.

In order to expedite this stage of the development approval process, AB 2234 (Robert Rivas, Chapter 651, Statutes of 2022), required local agencies (but not public agencies) to process post entitlement phase permits within 30 days for small housing development projects and 60 days for large housing development projects.

Comments

Author's Statement. "AB 301 is an exciting step forward in ensuring that state agencies move with the same urgency as local governments to address the housing shortage. By applying firm review deadlines to all state-level approvals, this bill would cut unnecessary delays and help get housing projects off the ground faster. With streamlined processes and increased predictability, California can take a big step toward meeting its housing needs, making homes more accessible and affordable for residents across the state."

Timelines for postentitlement permits. AB 2234 (Rivas, Chapter 651, Statutes of 2022) requires cities and counties to process non-discretionary permits in an expedited manner. First, the city or county must determine whether an application is complete, and notify the applicant within 15 days after receiving the application. If the local agency determines an application is incomplete, the local agency must provide the applicant with a list of incomplete items and a description of how the application can be made complete. After receiving a notice the application was incomplete, an applicant may cure and address the items that are deemed to be incomplete by the local agency. Upon receipt of a corrected application, the local agency must notify the applicant within 15 business days whether the additional application has remedied all incomplete items. If a local agency does not meet the timelines required for determining whether an application is complete, and the application or resubmitted application is deemed complete.

Cities and counties must then complete a review of the application within 30 days for projects with 25 units or less, and 60 days for projects 26 units or more, to determine if the complete application is compliant with the postentitlement permit requirements. Local agencies can extend the timeline if they make a finding the permit might have a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety, within the applicable time limit. Finally, local agencies must also establish an appeals process. If an applicant appeals, the local agency must make a final determination within specified timelines.

This bill will extend the requirements that local agencies must comply with when they receive and review a postentitlement phase permit application to state agencies involved in in governmental reviews or approvals associated with a housing development project.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

AARP
Abundant Housing LA
Bay Area Council
California Apartment Association
California Building Industry Association
California Housing Partnership
California Yimby
Circulate San Diego
City of Alameda
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Habitat for Humanity California
Housing Action Coalition
Housing California
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Midpen Housing Corporation
Monterey Bay Economic Partnership
San Diego Housing Commission
SPUR
Supportive Housing Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Bay Area Council writes in support, "We support AB 301 since it would ensure that all state agencies involved in post-entitlement housing development reviews will be subject to the timelines contained in AB 2234 (R. Rivas). Failure to complete any state-level reviews or issue permits within those statutory timelines would result in the permit being deemed approved, or the review period being deemed complete."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Essayli, 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, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Boerner, Davies, Wicks

Prepared by: Hank Brady / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124
7/8/25 16:38:46

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 310
Author: Alanis (R), et al.
Amended: 7/7/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 11-0, 7/2/25
AYES: Menjivar, Valladares, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grove, Limón, Padilla, Richardson, Rubio, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-0, 3/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Nevaeh Youth Sports Safety Act

SOURCE: Eric Paredes Save a Life Foundation

DIGEST: This bill (1) delays the implementation of a requirement, from January 1, 2027 to January 1, 2028, that youth sports organizations ensure their athletes have access to an automated external defibrillator (AED) during any official practice or match. (2) Requires youth sports organizations to ensure their coaches are certified to perform CPR and operate an AED, and have a written cardiac emergency response plan, beginning January 1, 2027.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines a "youth sports organization" as an organization, business, nonprofit entity, or a local governmental agency that sponsors or conducts amateur sports competitions, training, camps, or clubs in which persons 17 years of age or younger participate. [Health & Safety Code (HSC) §124235 (b)(4)]

2) Requires each coach, administrator, and referee, umpire, or other game official of the youth sports organization to successfully complete concussion and head injury and sudden cardiac arrest prevention education at least once, either

online or in person, before supervising an athlete in an activity of the youth sports organization. [HSC §124235(a)(5)]

3) Requires "sudden cardiac arrest prevention education and educational materials" and a "sudden cardiac arrest information sheet" to include, at a minimum, information relating to cardiac conditions and their potential consequences, the signs and symptoms of sudden cardiac arrest, best practices for removal of an athlete from an athletic activity after fainting or a suspected cardiac condition is observed, steps for returning an athlete to activity, and what to do in the event of a cardiac emergency, which includes calling 911, performing hands-only CPR, and using an AED if available. [HSC §124235(b)(3)]

4) Establishes the California Youth Football Act, which establishes additional requirements on youth sports organizations that conduct a tackle football program, including requiring a minimum of one certified emergency medical technician, state-licensed paramedic, or higher-level medical professional to be present during all games, and requiring coaches to annually receive first aid, CPR, and AED certification. [HSC §124240 et seq. and §124241(h) and (i)]

5) Requires, as part of the California Youth Football Act, that at least one independent nonrostered individual, appointed by the youth sports organization, to be present at all practice locations, and requires the individual to hold current certifications in first aid, CPR, AED, and concussion protocols. [HSC §124241(j)]

6) Requires a school district or charter school that offers any interscholastic athletic program to acquire at least one AED for each school that participates in the program, and encourages the school district or charter school to ensure that the AED is available for the purpose of rendering emergency care or treatment within a recommended three to five minutes of sudden cardiac arrest to pupils, spectators, and any other individuals in attendance at the program's on-campus activities or events, and to ensure that the AED is available to athletic trainers and coaches and authorized persons at these activities or events. [EDC §35179.6]

7) Requires a person or entity that acquires an AED to comply with all regulations governing its placement, notify an agent of the local emergency medical services agency of the existence, location, and type of AED acquired, ensure that the AED is maintained and tested according to the operation and maintenance guidelines of the manufacturer, ensure that it is tested at least biannually and after each use, ensure that an inspection is made of all AEDs on

the premises at least every 90 days for potential issues related to operability, and ensure that maintenance and testing records are maintained. [HSC §1797.196]

8) Exempts a person or entity that acquires an AED for emergency use from liability for any civil damages resulting from the use of the AED if the person or entity has complied with the requirements in 8) above. [Civil Code (CIV) §1714.21(d)]

9) Exempts any person who, in good faith and not for compensation, renders emergency care or treatment by use of an AED at the scene of an emergency from liability for any civil damages resulting from any acts or omissions in rendering the emergency care. [CIV §1714.21(b)]

This bill:

1) Delays, from January 1, 2027 to January 1, 2028, a requirement that a youth sports organization that elects to offer an athletic program to ensure that its athletes have access to an AED during any official practice or match.

2) Deletes a requirement, for purposes of youth sports organizations ensuring access to an AED, that the AED be administered by a medical professional, coach, or other person designated by the youth sports organization who holds AED certification.

3) Requires a youth sports organization, beginning January 1, 2027, to ensure that its coaches are certified, and recertified at least every two years, to perform CPR and operate an AED and that there is a written cardiac emergency response plan. Permits certified training to be conducted in-person or online and to be offered by an accredited organization, consistent with national evidence-based cardiovascular care guidelines.

4) Requires the written cardiac emergency response plan to be reviewed annually with coaches and staff, to be consistent with nationally recognized, evidence-based standards, and to detail:

   a) The location of any AEDs and procedures to be followed in the event of sudden cardiac arrest;
   b) The responsibilities of the coach, administration, and athletes during the event;
   c) How the coach, administration, and athletes will be notified and trained on the emergency response plan; and,

d) An annual electronic communication to the parents or guardians of enrolled participants that includes the cardiac emergency response plan or an internet link to the plan, the location or locations of any AEDs, and identifies the staff members designated to be notified in the event of a sudden cardiac event.

5) Requires a youth sports organization, beginning January 1, 2028, to ensure that its AED is maintained and tested according to the operation and maintenance guidelines established by the manufacturer and the applicable rules and regulations of the federal Food and Drug Administration or any other applicable state or federal authority.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

> This bill strengthens the Nevaeh Youth Sports Safety Act from 2023 to further California's commitment to providing safe and fun access to youth sports programs. Sudden cardiac arrest is the number one cause of death among student athletes. When sudden cardiac events take place, timely intervention is critical. This bill will require youth sports organizations to have a written emergency response plan in place that includes the location of an AED and outlines standard procedures for responding to a cardiac emergency. The bill would also require that youth sports organizations properly maintain and test their AED(s) and that coaches are trained to use an AED. This bill aims to provide more clarity on the Nevaeh Youth Sports Safety Act by enhancing protections and offering families a greater sense of safety and confidence in the programs that their children participate in.

Background

Background on sudden cardiac arrest. According to the National Heart, Blood, and Lung Institute, sudden cardiac arrest (SCA) is a condition in which the heart suddenly and unexpectedly stops beating, and usually causes death if it's not treated within minutes. SCA is not the same as a heart attack. A heart attack is when blood flow to the heart is blocked, and SCA is when the heart malfunctions and suddenly stops beating unexpectedly. A heart attack is a "circulation" problem and sudden cardiac arrest is an "electrical" problem. However, SCA can happen after or during recovery from a heart attack. Ventricular fibrillation (v-fib), a type of arrhythmia, causes most SCAs. During v-fib, the heart's lower chambers don't beat normally, and instead quiver very rapidly and irregularly and little or no blood is pumped to the body. Other problems with the heart's electrical system can also

cause SCA. For example, SCA can occur if the rate of the heart's electrical signals becomes very slow and stops. SCA also can occur if the heart muscle doesn't respond to the heart's electrical signals. Coronary heart disease; severe physical stress; certain inherited disorders; and structural changes in the heart can also cause SCA.

According to the American College of Cardiology (ACC), when playing sports, an athlete's heart is working faster and pumping harder. Adrenaline is pumped throughout the body, and the heart needs more oxygen than normal. Dehydration, fever, or changes in electrolytes can also play a part. In people whose hearts are not normal to begin with, these extra stresses can sometimes trigger the electrical system of the heart and cause SCA. While rare, SCA is the leading medical cause of death in young athletes. ACC states that warning signs during exercise include passing out, dizziness, chest pain, shortness of breath, and seizures. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that every year in the U.S., approximately 2,000 patients younger than 25 years will die of SCA. The likelihood of child and young adult SCA for those with underlying cardiovascular disease is increased by athletic participation. According to a study published in December 2017, a loss of consciousness in athletes during sports activity is usually not immediately recognized as SCA and time is wasted by checking breathing and body movement. Immediate CPR and defibrillation with an AED should be initiated if an athlete is experiencing SCA. Without defibrillation, the probability of surviving declines by 10% per minute.

Background on AEDs. According to the American Heart Association (AHA), an AED is a lightweight, portable device that delivers an electric shock through the chest to the heart. The shock can stop an irregular rhythm and allow a normal rhythm to resume in a heart in sudden cardiac arrest. The AED has a built-in computer, which assesses the patient's heart rhythm, determines whether the person is in cardiac arrest, and signals whether to administer the shock. Inside the AED box are pads and a diagram that shows where to place them on the bare skin. Once the device is turned on, a voice tells the person using it exactly what to do. The AHA states that more than 15% of out-of-hospital cardiac arrests occur in a public location, and therefore public access AEDs and community training have a large role to play in early defibrillation. However, the number of patients who have an AED applied by a bystander remains low, occurring after only 10.2% of public cardiac arrests. According to the AHA, nine in ten cardiac arrest victims who receive a shock from an AED in the first minute live. The AHA states that children over age eight can be treated with a standard AED, and for children ages one through eight, the AHA recommends the pediatric attenuated pads that are purchased separately.

CPR and AED certification training. There are many organizations that offer certification classes in CPR and AED use, and most classes combine CPR and AED training into one class. The American Red Cross offers combination CPR/AED online-only classes for $37, though the Red Cross notes that this class is not Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) workplace compliant, which requires an additional instructor-led skill session within 90 days of completing the online course. The Red Cross also offers Adult and Pediatric CPR/AED courses that combine both online and classroom instruction, or classroom only, and that meet OSHA workplace requirements. Costs vary, with local prices in Sacramento ranging from $59 to more than $100. Other organizations offer much less expensive options, though they are generally online only: the National CPR Foundation offers online certification classes for $14.95, while NFHS offers an online CPR and AED training program for $10 that it developed in partnership with the Vanderbilt Youth Sports Health Center to specifically help school programs.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

Eric Paredes Save a Life Foundation (source)
American Heart Association
American Youth Soccer Organization
Avive Solutions, Inc.
California Alliance for Golf
California Athletic Trainers Association
California Chapter American College of Cardiology
California Coalition for Children's Safety and Health
California State PTA
City SC Carlsbad
Grossmont Healthcare District
Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake
Heartfelt Help Foundation
Heartshield Project
Just1Mike
Kyle J. Taylor Foundation
National School District
Parent Heart Watch
Sudden Arrhythmia Death Syndromes Foundation
Sudden Cardiac Arrest Foundation
Via Heart Project

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

(This list of opposition was to a prior version of this bill)
California Youth Soccer Association – North (unless amended)
Corning Youth Soccer (unless amended)
Davis American Youth Soccer Organization- Region 218 (unless amended)
Elk Grove Youth Baseball (unless amended)
Elk Grove Youth Soccer League (unless amended)
Hanford Youth Soccer League (unless amended)
Laguna Youth Baseball (unless amended)
NorCal Premier Soccer League (unless amended)
Oroville Youth Soccer Club (unless amended)
Rancho FC (unless amended)
Rohnert Park Soccer Club (unless amended)
Salinas Soccer Femenil (unless amended)
San Juan Bautista Soccer Club (unless amended)
Stockton Youth Soccer (unless amended)
Sunnyvale Alliance Soccer Club (unless amended)
Trinity Youth Soccer League (unless amended)
West Contra Costa Youth Soccer League (unless amended)

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is sponsored by the Eric Paredes Save a Life Foundation, which states that this bill corrects a conflict from the Nevaeh Youth Sports Safety Act where the language suggests that only certified individuals are allowed to administer an AED. The sponsor points out that existing law does not limit who can use an AED in a sudden cardiac arrest emergency. Additionally, this bill would require a youth sports organization to have a written emergency response plan that identifies the location of the AED, requires the plan to be reviewed annually, and requires coaches to be CPR/AED certified every two years. The sponsors state that research continues to show a critical lack of awareness about AEDs, which, when used within minutes of collapse, could flip the outcome for a sudden cardiac arrest victim to a near 90% survival rate. Numerous organizations support this bill. The California Coalition for Children's Safety and Health states in support that it recommends, just like the legislature has done to address sports related concussions, that coaches, assistant coaches, parents, and athletes should have knowledge about sports related cardiac arrest, CPR and AED knowledge, and this bill is a step in the right direction. The California Chapter of the American College of Cardiology states that by supporting the use of CPR and AEDs, cardiologists aim to improve survival rates and outcomes for sudden cardiac arrest victims.

The American Youth Soccer Organization (AYSO) states that it supports this version of this bill, along with a related bill, AB 387 (described in related legislation above). AYSO states that the amended versions of this bill and AB 387 represent a thoughtful, practical approach to improving athlete safety without placing undue burdens on the volunteer-driven programs that form the backbone of youth sports. AYSO states that these measures provide critical safeguards while allowing organizations like ours to continue delivering safe, inclusive, and accessible opportunities for children to play, grow, and thrive.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A number of youth sports organizations, including California Youth Soccer Association – North (Cal North), Elk Grove Youth Baseball, and many others, submitted oppose unless amended letters to a prior version of this bill. These organizations pointed out that this bill is building on previous legislation, AB 1467 from 2023, which required all youth sports organizations to ensure AED access during practices and matches. It is unclear whether recent amendments, which in part delayed the implementation of the AED requirement in AB 1467 to 2028, have addressed these concerns. Opponents stated that while they appreciate the intent of these bills, fulfilling these obligations imposes significant financial challenges on youth sports organizations. Opponents argued that the combined costs of this bill and AB 1467 is substantial, and will likely require organizations to double or triple their per-player fees, potentially pricing many families out of youth sports. These organizations requested amendments to require cities, counties, and park districts to provide AEDs at public parks. These organizations stated that it is reasonable to require local governments to make AEDs available at their facilities, and that AEDs can be securely stored and accessed with a code provided during emergencies, significantly reducing costs for sports organizations.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-0, 3/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, 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: Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Boerner, Chen, DeMaio, Essayli, Flora, Gabriel, Lee, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Rogers, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Ward, Zbur

Prepared by: Vincent D. Marchand / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
7/8/25 16:45:18

****** 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 330
Author: Rogers (D)
Introduced: 1/27/25
Vote: 21

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 4-0, 6/25/25
AYES: McNerney, Ashby, Grayson, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-2, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act

SOURCE: MuniServices

DIGEST: This bill extends the sunset date of the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2031.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes local agencies to impose utility users' taxes (UUTs), which are excise taxes imposed on the consumption of utility services, including electricity, gas, water, sewer, telephone, sanitation, and cable television.

2) Requires a wireless telephone services carrier to remit UUT charges collected from a customer to the local jurisdiction where the customer primarily uses the phone.

3) Enacts the Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Surcharge Collections Act, which requires sellers of prepaid wireless telecommunications services to collect a fee measured as a percentage of the sales price, known as the Mobile

Telephony Services (MTS) fee (AB 1717 (Perea, Chapter 885, Statutes of 2014)), comprised of two parts:

a) The prepaid MTS surcharge, which adds together state fees charged by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to fund the state's universal services fund among other CPUC charges, plus surcharges on telecommunications services determined by the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to fund the state's 911 emergency response system.

b) The Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act, which created the second part of the MTS fee – the local charge – which adds together local UUTs and any charges to fund local 911 emergency fees that apply in the jurisdiction where the customer purchases the prepaid MTS services.

4) Directs OES and CPUC to calculate the appropriate fee rate or rates for prepaid services, send the rate or rates appropriate for its purposes to the State Board of Equalization, now the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA), which then calculates the overall prepaid MTS surcharge rate.

5) Allows sellers of prepaid wireless services to choose to pay the actual local UUT rate, or the one set by the Act.

6) Provides that the MTS fee was the exclusive method for collecting UUTs, local 911 charges, or any other charge on prepaid wireless, and defines the scope of any tax or charge.

7) Commenced collection of the MTS fee on January 1, 2016, directing sellers of prepaid wireless services to remit funds to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA), which in turn distributes fee proceeds to the appropriate state or local agency.

8) Exempts sellers with less than $15,000 in sales in the previous calendar year from the requirement to collect the MTS fee, and directs CDTFA to adjust the $15,000 threshold for inflation annually.

9) Provides vendor compensation for indirect sellers, or those retailers who sell prepaid services but are not mobile telephony service or Voice over Internet Protocol providers, equal to 2% of the fees collected.

10) Replaces the previous state 911 surcharge with a new monthly charge to fund the state's 911 emergency response system (SB 96 (Committee on Budget and

Fiscal Review, Chapter 54, Statutes of 2019)), effective on January 1, 2020, which:

a) Maintained OES's role determining the amount of the charge.

b) Changes the measure of the charge to up to $0.80 per access line per month, instead of the previous cap of 1% of charges for services.

c) Applies to sellers of prepaid MTS at the rate of up to $0.80 per retail transaction in California, paid by the consumer at the time of purchase.

11) Extended the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act until January 1, 2021 (SB 344 (McGuire, Chapter 642, Statutes of 2019)), with some modifications.

12) Extended the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act until January 1, 2026 (SB 1441 (McGuire, Chapter 179, Statutes of 2020)) and imports into the Act several administrative provisions previously part of the Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Surcharge Collections Act, with some modifications:

This bill extends the sunset date of the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act from January 1, 2026, to January 1, 2031.

Background

Wireless telecommunications consumers who have contracts with carriers to provide wireless telephony services pay UUTs as part of their monthly bills, and the carrier remits these funds to the local jurisdiction where the consumer primarily uses the phone, if that jurisdiction imposes a UUT. However, prepaid wireless customers who purchase services from carriers in the form of prepaid cards do not have a similar ongoing contractual relationship with a carrier. Prior to 2014, collecting UUTs from prepaid customers was challenging. Customers typically purchased prepaid services from third-party retail outlets and paid in full before using the service, so no mechanism existed to collect ongoing charges from these prepaid customers.

MetroPCS v. Picker. On November 15, 2018, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California ruled that the Prepaid MTS Act, and the CPUC resolutions implementing the calculation of the Act's fee, were preempted by federal law and unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause (*MetroPCS California, LLC v. Michael Picker et al*, 348, F. Supp. 3d. 948). On August 14,

2020, the Ninth Circuit Court reversed the district court's facial preemption ruling and remanded the case for further proceedings as applied to MetroPCS (*MetroPCS California, LLC v. Picker et al*, 970 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir. 2020)). On remand, the lower court permanently enjoined the CPUC from enforcing the Act's fee against MetroPCS. (*MetroPCS California, LLC v. Marybel Batjer*, et al., No. 17-CV-05959-SI, N.D. Cal. Sept. 22, 2021; *MetroPCS California, LLC v. Reynolds*, No. 3:17-CV-05959-JD, N.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2023). The Local Prepaid MTS charge was not challenged in this case.

Direct revenue. In jurisdictions that impose a UUT, a utility company generally collects the tax through the bills it sends to utility customers and remits the revenues to the local government that imposed the tax. Although a city or county can impose a UUT as a special tax, nearly all UUTs are imposed as general taxes. 156 cities, three counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, and Sacramento), and the City and County of San Francisco impose a UUT, which results in annual revenues of approximately $2.4 billion statewide.

As of 2025, 104 cities in 29 counties impose a Prepaid MTS Local charge, with most rates ranging from 1.5% to 9%, and San Francisco imposing a rate of 16.02%. In 2024, CDTFA distributed $1,277,264.20 to local agencies and incurred $637,616.33 in administrative costs. Year-over-year trends show a downward decline in revenues raised under the Local Act. For example, in 2016, the Local Act raised $10,109,145.68 but in 2023 only raised $1,253,374.33. The decline in revenue is strongly correlated with consumers shifting away from prepaid plans to postpaid plans, although other relevant factors may also be at play.

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

Senate Rule 28.8

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/725)

MuniServices (Source)
California Contract Cities Association
Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association
City of Burbank/Burbank Redevelopment Agency
City of Chula Vista
City of El Cerrito Mayor Carolyn Wysinger
City of Glendale
City of Inglewood
City of Norwalk
City of Pico Rivera

City of Redwood City
County of Alameda
League of California Cities

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the Author, "AB 330 will extend the sunset date of the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act (or MTS) to January 1, 2031. In Assembly District 2, Arcata (Humboldt County), Cloverdale (Sonoma County), and Sebastopol (Sonoma County) levy the Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Surcharge. This extension allows local governments to continue collecting critical revenues from prepaid MTS. Without an extension, local governments would face a loss of these important funds, exacerbating existing financial pressures. AB 330 is vital to maintain financial stability for local governments and continue funding the services that support California's communities."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-2, 6/2/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, 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: DeMaio, Ellis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

Prepared by: Haley Summers / REV. & TAX. / (916) 651-4117
7/8/25 16:38:47

****** 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 373
Author: Blanca Rubio (D)
Amended: 3/11/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 10-1, 6/17/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby, Valladares

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 4-1, 7/7/25
AYES: Arreguín, Becker, Durazo, Limón
NOES: Ochoa Bogh

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/7/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Dependency proceedings: counsel

SOURCE: California Youth Connection
Children's Law Center

DIGEST: This bill requires counsel appointed to represent a nonminor dependent (NMD) in a dependency proceeding to represent the wishes of the NMD, without exception.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the juvenile court, which has jurisdiction over minors who are suffering or at substantial risk of suffering harm or abuse and may adjudge the minor to be a dependent of the court. (Welfare and Institutions Code (Welf. & Inst. Code), § 300.)

2) Provides that the purpose of the juvenile court dependency system is the maximum safety and protection for children who are currently being abused, neglected, or exploited. Provides that the focus is on the preservation of the family, as well as the safety, protection, and physical and emotional well-being of the child. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 300.2.)

3) Provides that the juvenile court has jurisdiction over:

   a) A child who is subject to abuse or neglect. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 300.)

   b) A child, when that child has committed acts that trigger delinquency jurisdiction rendering the child a ward. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 601, 602.)

   c) Any NMD; an NMD under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court retains their legal decision-making authority as an adult, except as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 303.)

4) Defines "NMD" as a current foster youth or a nonminor under the transition jurisdiction of the court who: is between 18 and 21 years old; turned 18 years old while under an order of foster care placement; is in foster care under the responsibility of the county welfare department, county probation department, or Indian Tribe; and is participating in a transitional independent living plan, as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 11400(v).)

5) Requires the court to appoint counsel for a minor or NMD in a dependency proceeding if they are not already represented by counsel, unless the court specifically finds that the minor or NMD would not benefit from the appointment of counsel. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317(c)(1).)

6) Provides that a primary responsibility of counsel appointed to represent a minor or NMD shall be to advocate for the protection, safety, and physical and emotional well-being of the minor or NMD. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317.(c)(2).)

7) Provides that court-appointed counsel for a child or NMD is charged with the following:

   a) For a minor, court-appointed counsel is charged in general with the representation of the minor's interests.

   b) For an NMD, court-appointed counsel is charged with representing the wishes of the NMD except when advocating for those wishes conflicts with the protection or safety of the NMD. (Welf & Inst. Code, § 317(e)(1).)

8) Provides that, if a court finds that an NMD is not competent to direct counsel, the court shall appoint a guardian ad litem for the NMD. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317.(e)(1).)

This bill:

1) Removes the provision allowing court-appointed counsel for an NMD to disregard the NMD's wishes if the counsel determines that the wishes conflict with the protection or safety of the NMD.

2) Makes nonsubstantive technical and conforming changes.

Comments

Current law permits an NMD to remain in extended foster care until they reach 21 years of age. As a legal adult, an NMD generally retains the legal authority to make their own decisions, except where specified. One such exception arises with respect to the NMD's court-appointed counsel, which must be provided unless the court specifically finds that counsel would not benefit the NMD. While attorneys are generally required to represent their client's wishes, an NMD's attorney is required to represent the NMD's wishes unless the attorney determines that advocating for those wishes conflicts with the protection or safety of the NMD.

This bill eliminates the provisions permitting an NMD's counsel to override their client's wishes on the basis of the NMD's protection or safety, thereby bringing representation of an NMD in line with the representation of all other competent clients. The NMD's social worker and the attorney representing the county in the NMD's case will still be able to argue against the NMD's wishes if they believe the NMD's protection or safety are implicated, giving the court the ability to decide the issue. The intent of this bill is to prevent NMDs' attorneys from substituting their judgment for the NMD's own preferences regarding their lives.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

California Youth Connection (Source)
Children's Law Center of California (Source)
All of Us or None Orange County
California Alliance of Caregivers
California Alliance of Child and Family Services
Children Now
Children's Legal Services

Dependency Advocacy Services
Dependency Legal Services
East Bay Children's Law Offices
Families Inspiring Reentry & Reunification for Everyone
FLEXCOM
John Burton Advocates for Youth
National Association of Social Workers – California Chapter
Public Counsel
Starting Over Strong
Starting Over, Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the Children's Law Center of California:

> Currently, existing law requires appointed counsel to represent the best interests of children and nonminor dependents in dependency proceedings. However, this standard is often inappropriately applied to nonminor dependents, who, as legal adults, deserve the right to direct their own representation. The current framework can result in legal counsel overriding the wishes of nonminor dependents (legal adults) in favor of what an attorney perceives to be in their best interest, effectively limiting the nonminor dependents' decision-making power.
>
> AB 373 directly addresses this issue by:
>
> - **Clarifying the role of counsel** by requiring that appointed attorneys for nonminor dependents advocate for their expressed wishes rather than substituting their judgment.
> - **Upholding nonminor autonomy** by affirming their right to actively participate in legal decisions regarding housing, education, and employment.
> - **Distinguishing minors from nonminor dependents** by ensuring counsel can continue to advocate for a minor's best interests while nonminor dependents receive legal representation aligned with their stated interests.

CLC urges the Committee to support AB 373 as it strengthens the rights of nonminor dependents and ensures that counsel is given the mandate to appropriately advocate for them, recognizing their autonomy and needs. This bill represents a crucial step forward in making California's juvenile dependency system more responsive, just, and respectful of nonminor dependents' voices.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/7/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, 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, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Castillo, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Lee, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

Prepared by: Allison Whitt Meredith / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/9/25 16:03:24

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 379
Author: Schultz (D) and Nguyen (D), et al.
Amended: 5/8/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/10/25
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 6-0, 7/7/25
AYES: Caballero, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/15/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Crimes: prostitution

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill (1) increases the penalty for solicitation of a minor in specified circumstances; (2) makes it a misdemeanor for any person to loiter in any public place with the intent to purchase commercial sex, as specified; (3) creates the Survivor Support Fund to fund grant programs to community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide direct services and outreach to victims of sex trafficking and exploitation; (4) creates the human trafficking vertical prosecution grant program; and (5) increases civil penalties for specified human trafficking-related violations by businesses.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Makes it a misdemeanor to solicit anyone to engage in, or engage in, lewd or dissolute conduct in any public place or in any place open to the public or exposed to public view. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 647, subd. (a).)

2) Makes it a misdemeanor, except as specified, to solicit, agree to engage in, or engage in any act of prostitution with the intent to receive compensation, money, or anything of value from another person. (Pen. Code, § 647, subd. (b)(1).)

3) Makes it a misdemeanor, except as specified, to solicit, agree to engage in, or engage in, any act of prostitution with another person who is 18 years of age or older in exchange for the individual providing compensation, money, or anything of value to the other person. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (b)(2).)

4) Makes it a misdemeanor, except as specified, to solicit, or agree to engage in, or engage in, any act of prostitution with another person who is a minor in exchange for the individual providing compensation, money, or anything of value to the minor. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (b)(3).)

5) Makes the aforementioned prostitution offenses inapplicable to a child under 18 years of age who is alleged to have engaged in conduct to receive money or other consideration that would, if committed by an adult, be a violation of these provisions. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (b)(5).)

6) Provides that if the crime of solicitation of a minor is committed and the defendant is 18 years of age or older and knew or should have known that the person solicited was a minor at the time of the offense, the violation is a misdemeanor, except as specified, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for not less than two days and not more than one year, or by a fine not exceeding $10,000, or by both that fine and imprisonment. Allows the court, in unusual cases, when the interests of justice are best served, to reduce or eliminate the mandatory two days of imprisonment in a county jail. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (l)(1).)

7) Makes solicitation of a minor by an adult an alternate felony-misdemeanor ("wobbler") in the following circumstances:

   a) The minor solicited was under 16 years old at the time of the offense; or,

   b) The solicited minor was under 18 years of age at the time of the offense and was a victim of human trafficking. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (l)(2).)

8) Makes a defendant's first violation of solicitation of a minor by an adult punishable as either a misdemeanor by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year and a fine not exceeding $10,000 or as a felony by

imprisonment in the county jail for 16 months, two years, or three years. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (l)(2)(A).)

9) Makes a second or subsequent violation punishable as a straight felony by imprisonment in the county jail for 16 months, two years, or three years. (Pen. Code § 647, subd. (l)(2)(B).)

Former law:

1) Made it a misdemeanor to loiter in a public place with the intent to commit prostitution. (Former Pen. Code § 653.22 [repealed] and Pen. Code, § 653.26.)

2) Stated that among the circumstances that may be considered in determining whether a person loiters with intent to commit prostitution are that the person:

   a) Repeatedly beckons to, stops, engages in conversations with, or attempts to stop or engage in conversations with passersby, indicative of soliciting for prostitution;

   b) Repeatedly stops or attempts to stop motor vehicles by hailing the drivers, waving arms, or making any other bodily gestures, or engages or attempts to engage the drivers or passengers of the motor vehicles in conversation, indicative of soliciting for prostitution;

   c) Has been convicted of loitering in a public place with the intent to commit prostitution, or other offenses related or involving prostitution, within five years of the current arrest;

   d) Circles an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckons to, contacts, or attempts to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, indicative of soliciting for prostitution;

   e) Has engaged, within six months prior to the current arrest, in any behavior described in this subdivision or any other behavior indicative of prostitution activity. (Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (b), repealed.)

3) Stated that the circumstances set forth above are not exclusive. These circumstances should be considered particularly salient if they occur in an area that is known for prostitution activity. Any other relevant circumstances may be considered in determining whether a person has the requisite intent. Moreover, no one circumstance or combination of circumstances is in itself determinative of intent. Intent must be determined based on an evaluation of the particular circumstances of each case. (Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (c), repealed.)

This bill:

1) Expands the aforementioned circumstances to make solicitation of a minor by an adult punishable as an alternate felony-misdemeanor ("wobbler") where the solicited minor was more than three years younger than the defendant at the time of the offense.

2) Provides that if a defendant is granted probation for the above wobbler offense, the court is required to order the defendant to successfully complete an education program on human trafficking and the exploitation of children, and prohibits imposition of a fee for the program.

3) Makes it misdemeanor for any person to loiter in a public place with the intent to purchase commercial sex.

4) Specifies that the intent to purchase commercial sex is evidenced by acting in a manner and under circumstances that openly demonstrate the purpose of inducing, enticing, or soliciting prostitution, or procuring another to commit prostitution such as circling an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, making unauthorized stops along known prostitution tracks, or engaging in other conduct indicative of soliciting to procure another to engage in commercial sex.

5) Requires CalVCB to establish a grant program to provide grants to community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide direct services and outreach to victims of sex trafficking and exploitation.

6) States that CalVCB shall, in a manner determined by the board, award grants to CBOs that are led by survivors of sex trafficking or that are guided by substantial survivor input and that provide direct services to vulnerable individuals in areas with a high concentration of sex trafficking.

7) Creates the Survivor Support Fund within the State Treasury. Moneys in the Survivor Support Fund shall, upon appropriation by the Legislature, be available for the grant program.

8) Mandates an additional $1,000 fine on top of any other punishment imposed on a person who violates the laws prohibiting solicitation or prostitution where the person provides compensation for the act and requires the collected fines to be deposited in the Survivors Support Fund.

9) Mandates an additional fine of $1,000, to be deposited in the Survivor Support Fund, in addition to any other punishment for loitering in a public place with the intent to purchase commercial sex.

10) Creates within the CalOES a program of financial and technical assistance for county district attorney offices for the prosecution of human trafficking crimes.

11) Requires CalOES, to the extent funds are available, to allocate and award funds ("vertical prosecution grants") to up to 11 district attorney offices that employ vertical prosecution methodology for human trafficking crimes and meet other minimum criteria, as specified.

12) Requires CalOES to submit, on or before January 1, 2028, a report to the Legislature and the Governor's office that describes the counties that received vertical prosecution grants, the number of prosecutions for human trafficking cases filed by the counties, the number of human trafficking convictions obtained, and the sentences imposed for human trafficking crimes.

13) Requires CalOES to retain no more than 10% of funds appropriated for the vertical prosecution grant program for its administrative costs, including technical assistance, training, and the cost of producing the report.

14) Increases existing civil penalties for a business or establishment, as specified, which fails to comply with requirements to post public notices and conduct employee trainings regarding human trafficking, from $500 to $1,000 for a first offense, and from $1,000 to $2,000 for each subsequent offense.

15) Authorizes the Attorney General (AG) to enforce violations of the notice and employee training requirements. Requires any fines collected for violations of the requirements to be deposited into the Survivors Support Fund.

16) Increases existing civil penalties, as specified, for a hotel in which sex trafficking activity occurred and a supervisor failed to inform law enforcement or an appropriate victim service organization within 24 hours, or an employee of the hotel knowingly benefited by participating in a venture that the employee knew or acted in reckless disregard of the activity constituting sex trafficking within the hotel.

17) Authorizes the AG to enforce the aforementioned hotel sex trafficking violations. Requires any fines collected for violations to be deposited into the Survivors Support Fund.

18) Expresses legislative intent to include adopting the strongest laws to protect 16- and 17-year old victims and strengthen protections in support of survivors of human trafficking.

Comments

Solicitation of a Minor. In California, acts of prostitution and solicitation for prostitution are crimes. Prostitution is engaging in sexual intercourse or a lewd act in exchange for money or other compensation. Solicitation for prostitution is communicating or accepting a request for sexual intercourse or a lewd act in exchange for money or other compensation. (Pen. Code, § 647, subdivision (b).) However, a minor cannot legally consent to sex and is not criminally liable for participating in a commercial sex transaction. (Pen. Code, § 647, subd. (b)(5).)

Currently, a prosecutor may charge a defendant with solicitation of a minor, as follows:

- Solicitation of a minor who was under 16 years of age at the time of the offense is a wobbler.

- Solicitation of a minor who was 16 or 17 years old at the time of the offense and was a victim of human trafficking is a wobbler.

- Solicitation of a minor who was 16 or 17 years old at the time of the offense, where the solicited minor was not a victim of human trafficking, is a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 647, subds. (b) & (l).)

A wobbler is an offense that may be charged as a misdemeanor or a felony at the discretion of a prosecutor. This bill additionally makes solicitation of a minor a wobbler if the solicited minor was more than three years younger than the defendant at the time of the offense.

A number of other crimes, including crimes with felony penalties, already exist relating to solicitation of a minor. Soliciting (arranging a meeting with) a minor for lewd purposes is punishable as a misdemeanor, or as a state prison felony under some circumstances (if the defendant goes to the arranged meeting or is required to register as a sex offender). (Pen. Code, § 288.4.) Contacting or communicating with a minor with the intent to commit a specified sex offense is punishable in state prison. (Pen. Code, § 288.3.) To be guilty of this offense, the defendant must have known or should have known the person is a minor. (*Ibid*.) "Sexting" a minor is a wobbler punishable as a misdemeanor or state prison felony. (Pen. Code, § 288.2.)

To be guilty of this offense, the defendant must have known, or should have known, or believed that the person is a minor. (*Ibid*.) Luring or attempting to lure a minor under the age of 14 is punishable as an infraction or misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 272, subd. (b)(1).) To be guilty of this offense, the defendant must have known or reasonably should have known that the minor is under 14 years of age. (*Ibid*.)

Offenses involving sexual contact with a minor are distinct from solicitation. Under current law, sexual intercourse with a minor is criminalized under California's statutory rape law. Depending on the difference in age between the defendant and the victim, statutory rape is punishable as a misdemeanor or a county jail felony. (Pen. Code, § 261.5.) Lewd acts with a minor 14 or 15 years of age and under is usually punished as a felony. The sentence, which can be up to life in state prison, depends on the age of the child and the circumstances of the offense. (Pen. Code, § 288.)

Loitering Offense. Until 2022, it was a misdemeanor offense to loiter in a public place for the purpose of engaging in prostitution, meaning loitering with the intent to participate in a commercial sex transaction as a sex buyer or a sex worker. (See former Pen. Code, § 653.22.) The law specified non-exclusive circumstances that could be considered in determining whether a person was loitering with intent to commit prostitution (former Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (b)):

- Repeatedly beckons to, stops, engages in conversations with, or attempts to stop or engage in conversations with passersby, indicative of soliciting for prostitution;

- Repeatedly stops, or attempts to stop, motor vehicles by hailing the drivers, waving arms, or making any other bodily gestures, or engages or attempts to engage the drivers or passengers of the motor vehicles in conversation, indicative of soliciting for prostitution;

- Has been convicted of violating this section, or other offenses related or involving prostitution, within five years of the arrest under this section;

- Circles an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckons to, contacts, or attempts to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, indicative of soliciting for prostitution; and,

- Has engaged, within six months prior to the arrest for loitering, in loitering behavior, or any other behavior indicative of prostitution activity.

A study conducted in 2019 through the Los Angeles County Public Defender's office compiled data from all of the charges of violations of Penal Code section 653.22 reported from the Compton Branch of the Public Defender's office. During a one-week period of time, a total of 48 cases were reported. (**https://www.zefflawfirm.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Sex-Work-in-Compton-Report-Derek-Demeri.pdf** ("Sex Work in Compton") [as of May 28, 2025].)

The study found that the majority of arrests were made up of young Black women. 42.6% of arrests were for people aged 21-24 with the next highest rate being 23.4% for people aged 18-20. As for race, 72.3 percent were Black with the next highest rate being 17% for Hispanic. (Sex Work in Compton, *supra*, at pp. 2-4.)

Probable cause was most commonly established by the arrestee's presence in an area known for sex work, their clothing, and motioning in a flirtatious manner to vehicles. (Sex Work in Compton, *supra*, at p. 14.) In 26.1 percent of the arrests for loitering, the person arrested had no prior sex work-related convictions. (*Id*. at p. 11.) In 76.7 percent of cases, alleged suspects were characterized as wearing revealing clothing as evidence in support of intent to solicit a sex act. (*Id*. at p. 12.) Finally, in 45 out of 48 cases, the suspect's state of dress was the stated basis for probable cause to arrest. Other stated reasons for establishing probable cause for the arrest include possession of a cellphone, possession of cash, reacting to presence of police, giving conflicting information about activities, among many other stated reasons. (*Id*. at p. 14.)

According to the Yale Global Health Partnership in June 2020, arrest and conviction records for prostitution-related crimes make it harder for sex workers, and those cited for unlawful sex work, to find alternative employment - holding them in street economies and economic hardships -- "exacerbating ongoing race and gender discrimination." (**https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/area/center/ghjp/documents/consequences_of_criminalization_v2.pdf** [as of May 28, 2025].) "Criminalization exacerbates the barriers to housing, public benefits, and other social supports especially needed by street-based sex workers." (*Ibid*.) "Criminalization of sex work disproportionately affects women, trans and gender nonconforming people, people of color, and immigrant communities." (*Ibid*.)

Three years ago, the Legislature passed and Governor Newsom signed SB 357 (Wiener), Chapter 86, Statutes of 2022, which repealed the loitering offense.

This bill reestablishes the crime of loitering with intent to purchase commercial sex. The crime is punishable as a misdemeanor with up to 6 month imprisonment and a fine of up to $1,000. (Pen. Code, §§ 19, 653.26.)

This bill also largely reenacts the circumstances that can be used to prove a person's intent, including being in a public place known for prostitution (former Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (c)), circling an area in a motor vehicle (former Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (b)(4)) and repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists or making unauthorized stops (former Pen. Code, § 653.22, subd. (b)(1)-(2)). However, this bill is unlike the repealed loitering law in a significant manner.

The former loitering law stated that the requisite "intent is evidenced by acting in a manner and under circumstances that openly demonstrate the purpose of inducing, enticing, or soliciting prostitution or procuring another to commit prostitution" and included the above as circumstances the jury "may" consider in determining whether a person was loitering with the intent to commit prostitution. The former loitering law also provided that "[i]ntent must be determined based on an evaluation of the particular circumstances of each case.

This bill, on the other hand, states: "*This intent is evidenced* by acting in a manner and under circumstances that openly demonstrate the purpose of inducing, enticing, or soliciting prostitution, or procuring another to commit prostitution *such as* circling an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, making unauthorized stops along known prostitution tracks, or engaging in other conduct indicative of soliciting to procure another to engage in commercial sex." (Italics added.)

Unlike the former loitering statute, this bill appears to state that the presence of any of the aforementioned circumstances necessarily evidences an intent to commit prostitution, rather than providing these as circumstances for the jurors' consideration in determining whether a person loitered with the requisite intent (as the former loitering law did). As such, the language of this bill may be unconstitutionally overbroad. For example, in a given case, an individual could be repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists because they are having car trouble. They could be circling an area looking for a friend or a parking spot. They could be present in an area known for prostitution simply because they live there, work there, are meeting a friend, etc. (*Zwickler v. Koota* (1967) 389 U.S. 241, 249-250 [A statute is overbroad if it attempts to achieve a governmental purpose to control

or prevent activities constitutionally subject to state regulation by means which sweep unnecessarily broadly and thereby invade the area of protected freedoms.]; *Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville* (1972) 405 U.S. 156, 164-66 [the right to walk, stroll, or wander aimlessly is a liberty within "the sensitive First Amendment area" that is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment]; see also *Kolender v. Lawson* (1983) 461 U.S. 352, 358 [loitering statute implicates First Amendment liberties and "constitutional right to freedom of movement"].)

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- **Office of Emergency Services (CalOES)**: CalOES indicates, based on historical data from similar victim services grant programs, cost pressures associated with the Human Trafficking Prevention Vertical Prosecution Program established by this bill, likely in the millions of dollars (General Fund) to fund eleven projects annually. CalOES notes that it typically sets aside 5% for administrative costs for awarding grants, including data collection, production of the proposed report, etc. According to CalOES, the bill, as written, allows CalOES to retain up to 10% for administrative costs. CalOES will also incur workload cost pressures associated with submitting a report to the Legislature.

- **California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB)**: CalVCB indicates a range of potential administrative costs from $155,000 to $799,000 per year (General Fund) to establish and administer the Survivor Support Fund grant programs. According to CalVCB, it is unknown how many organizations will apply, qualify, and ultimately receive grant awards. If five service providers concurrently receive grant funding, CalVCB estimates it would need one additional AGPA position at a total cost of $155,000 per year. If 20 service providers concurrently receive grant funding, CalVCB estimates it would need four additional AGPA positions at a total cost of $620,000 per year and one additional SSM I position at a cost of $179,000 per year. The total of these positions would be $799,000 per year.

- **State Controller's Office (SCO)**: Unknown, likely minor and absorbable administrative costs (General Fund) to create and manage the newly created Survivor Support Fund account within the State Treasury.

- **Trial Courts**: Unknown, potentially significant costs to the state funded trial court system (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) to adjudicate the increased civil and criminal penalties in this bill. Defendants are constitutionally guaranteed certain rights during criminal proceedings, including the right to a jury trial and the right to counsel (at public expense if the defendants are unable to afford the costs of representation). Increasing penalties leads to lengthier and more complex court proceedings with attendant workload and resource costs to the court. An eight-hour court day costs approximately $10,500 in staff in workload. This is a conservative estimate, based on the hourly rate of court personnel including at minimum the judge, clerk, bailiff, court reporter, jury administrator, administrative staff, and jury per-diems. The fiscal impact of this bill to the courts will depend on many unknowns, including the numbers of people charged with an offense and the factors unique to each case.

  By way of example, the number of criminal charges for the loitering offense reenacted by this bill easily could be somewhere in the thousands annually.[1] If each case takes only one court day, it would cost the courts at minimum tens of millions dollars. This estimate does not include the additional court costs resulting from the increased punishment for solicitation and the civil penalties for businesses and hotels. Further, as discussed in more detail below, this bill may result in additional trial court costs to the extent that cases are brought to litigate its constitutionality.

  While the courts are not funded on a workload basis, an increase in workload could result in delayed court services and would put pressure on the General Fund to fund additional staff and resources and to increase the amount appropriated to backfill for trial court operations.

- **County Probation Departments**: Unknown, potentially significant cost pressures (local funds, General Fund) to county probation departments if individuals convicted under this bill are supervised locally in the community in

[1] See, Senate Appropriations Committee Analysis of SB 357 (Weiner), Chapter 86, Statutes of 2022 ["the number of convictions for loitering with the intent to commit prostitution easily could be somewhere in the thousands"]; Californians for Privacy, *County Fact Sheet*, available at: **https://ca4privacy.org/s/County-Fact-Sheet-Summary-1.pdf** [32 of 58 counties reported 3,805 arrests for loitering with the intent to commit prostitution during the period of January 1, 2020, to February 28, 2022]; D. Demeri, *Policing of People in the Sex Trades in Compton: Analysis of Section 653.22 Clients*, Law Offices of the Los Angeles County Public Defender (2019), available at: **https://www.zefflawfirm.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Sex-Work-in-Compton-Report-Derek-Demeri.pdf** [A study conducted in 2019 through the Los Angeles County Public Defender's office compiled data from all of the charges of loitering for purposes of prostitution reported from the Compton Branch of the Public Defender's office. During a one-week period of time, a total of 48 cases were reported.]

lieu of or in addition to incarceration. Actual supervision costs will vary by each county probation department and how many individuals sentenced to probation, mandatory supervision, or post release community supervision as a result of this bill. County probation agencies will incur additional cost pressures because this bill requires, if the defendant is granted probation for a solicitation conviction, the court to order the defendant to successfully complete an education program on human trafficking and the exploitation of children, at no cost to the defendant. It is not clear whether the county probation duties imposed by this bill constitute a reimbursable state mandate or whether they may be subject to Proposition 30 (2012). Proposition 30 provides that legislation enacted after September 30, 2012, that has an overall effect of increasing the costs already borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by realignment applies to local agencies only to the extent the state provides annual funding for the cost increase.

- **County Jails**: Unknown, potentially significant costs (local funds) to the counties to incarcerate people arrested for the crimes in this bill. The average annual cost to incarcerate one person in county jail varies by county, but likely ranges from $70,000 to $90,000 per year. For example, in 2021, Los Angeles County budgeted $1.3 billion for jail spending, including $89,580 per incarcerated person. Actual incarceration costs to counties will depend on the number of convictions and the length of each sentence. This bill provides for imprisonment in a county jail for up to one year for soliciting sex, as specified, and reenacts the offense of loitering to purchase sex, which is also punishable by imprisonment in county jail.

  To illustrate, Los Angeles County made over 2,000 arrests loitering to commit prostitution during the period of January 1, 2020, to February 28, 2022.[2] Assuming people are incarcerated for only two days in jail under this bill, it would cost the Los Angeles County at least $245,000 annually. Generally, county incarceration costs are not reimbursable state mandates pursuant to Proposition 30 (2012).

- **California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)**: Unknown, potentially significant costs (General Fund) to CDCR to incarcerate people for the increased penalties in this bill. While most individuals incarcerated under this bill will serve their sentences in county jail, this bill specifies that violations are punishable "pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 1170." Under subdivision (h) of Section 1170 of the Penal Code, if the

[2] Californians for Privacy, *supra* note 1.

defendant has specified prior felony convictions, the sentence for a felony shall be served in the state prison. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) estimates the average annual cost to incarcerate one person in state prison is $133,000. The annual cost of operating a mental health crisis bed at CDCR is around $400,000. As part of the ongoing Coleman court case, CDCR has been incurring fines monthly since April 2023 for failing to reduce vacancy rates of mental health staff. The state has paid over $200 million in fines to date, and is still accruing fines. Thus, if even if just one person is sentenced to state prison under this bill, it will add significant costs pressures to CDCR.

- **Department of State Hospitals (DSH)**: Unknown, potential cost pressures (General Fund) to DSH, in order to adequately house, treat, and care for persons committed to DSH that otherwise would not be. Cost pressures to DSH are connected with an increase in state prison sentences. Creating new crimes will increase the number of defendants declared incompetent to stand trial (IST) or committed to DSH due to their being not guilty by reason of insanity. DSH's proposed budget for fiscal year 2025-26 totals $3.4 billion – an increase of $3.4 million from the 2024 Budget Act. An increase the DSH population would result in the need for additional funding.

- **Department of Justice (DOJ)**: DOJ indicates no significant fiscal impact associated with this bill. The DOJ notes however, numerous bills this session may result in no significant impact to the DOJ, should an aggregate of these bills chapter, the DOJ would submit a workload BCP for additional resources to process the increase to the DOJ workload.

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/2025)

City of San Diego (Sponsor)
Mayor Todd Gloria, City of San Diego (Sponsor)
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis (Co-Sponsor)
Sacramento County Sheriff Jim Cooper (Co-Sponsor)
San Diego County District Attorney's Office (Co-Sponsor)
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Bilateral Safety Corridor Coalition
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Baptist for Biblical Values
California Catholic Conference
California Civil Liberties Advocacy

California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
City of Carlsbad
City of Riverside
City of Salinas
City of Stanton
Claremont Police Officers Association
Compton; City of
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
League of California Cities
Lifeline Community Services
Lighthouse Baptist Church
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
North San Diego County Human Trafficking Collaborative
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Assocation
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Rights4girls
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Sacramento County Young Democrats
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Santa Ana Police Officers Association
Special Operations Finding Kids
Stanton; City of
Stockton; City of
Survivor Leader Network of San Diego
Women's Liberation Front

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/2025)

ACLU California Action
Artists Revolt
Bay Area Workers Support
Black Women for Wellness Action Project
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Californians for Safety and Justice
California Public Defenders Association
California Women's Law Center
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice At Berkeley Law
Choose Your Path Foundation
Co. Dionysus LLC
Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking
Cruise Los Angeles
Debt Free Justice California
Decrimsexworkca
Drug Policy Alliance
East Bay Community Law Center
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Equality New York
Erotic Service Providers Legal, Education, and Research Project
Harvey Milk Lgbtq Democratic Club
Immigrant Legal Resource Center
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action
Justice At Last
LA Defensa
Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union
San Francisco Public Defender
Sex Worker's Outreach Project Los Angeles
Silicon Valley De-Bug
Smart Justice California, a Project of Tides Advocacy
Stripper Worker Center
Survivor Policy Coalition
Swop Behind Bars
The Sidewalk Project
Unique Woman's Coalition
Universidad Popular
Woodhull Freedom Foundation

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the San Diego District Attorney's Office, a co-sponsor of this bill:

> Human trafficking is a $150 billion global industry and is one of the fastest growing criminal enterprises in the world. California has the highest number of human trafficking incidents reported by the National Human Trafficking Hotline. Point Loma Nazarene University and the University of San Diego released a joint study that estimates more than 3,500 victims are trafficked each year in San Diego County, earning their traffickers an estimated 810 million dollars. The study also found that 16 years was the average age of adolescents entering into a life of prostitution. In addition, each of the high schools studied had evidence of recruitment on their campuses, and 90 percent of those high schools had documented cases of human trafficking.
>
> The data indicates that our youth are being exploited, with even more at risk of becoming victims. Our cases show that child victims are often so closely tied to their traffickers that they struggle to recognize the abuse they are enduring. Traffickers take advantage of the emotional vulnerability of children, particularly those who are runaways, in foster care, or have experienced previous abuse. The trafficker manipulates the victim into believing they are part of a family and that they will always be together. Vulnerable children deeply desire this sense of belonging, leading them to remain loyal to their trafficker even in the face of violence and exploitation.
>
> In 2022, California lawmakers passed Senate Bill 357, which repealed the crime of loitering with intent to commit prostitution. Shortly after the passage of SB 357, the illicit sex trade became increasingly visible on our public streets, where transactions are openly occurring in front of law enforcement. As a result, more exploitation of trafficked women and girls is happening in our communities. Several news outlets have shared accounts of concerned community members seeing brazen acts of pimping on public roads and even near school grounds. The people who profit from the human trafficking trade feel emboldened to commit these acts and not only recruit more victims and dehumanize them, but also further control those already in the industry.

As District Attorney for San Diego County, the second largest county in California, I have devoted my life to protecting the most vulnerable and leading the fight against human trafficking. AB 379 will protect the most vulnerable among us. AB 379 would allow police officers to, once again, contact individuals loitering for prostitution in public places near children. As a result, officers can identify, intervene, and offer resources to victims who need them and prevent further exploitation by enforcing laws violated by traffickers and illicit sex purchasers. When Governor Gavin Newsom signed SB 357 into law, he did so with clear trepidation – promising to monitor for unintended consequences and pledged to act if he saw them. We have seen the devastating consequences of SB 357 – the proliferation of commercial sex transactions occurring openly on our public streets, schools, and parks near our children. Now is the time to act. This bill will fight to protect victims, strengthen prevention, and increase the prosecution of those who buy and sell human beings.

This bill focuses on two crucial areas to combat human trafficking: 1) it enables law enforcement to intervene and prevent buyers from purchasing individuals for sex, and 2) it allocates essential resources, at no cost to taxpayers, to offer shelter and mental health support for victims of human trafficking.

Our laws must unequivocally assert that human beings are not commodities. We must equip law enforcement with the necessary tools to protect victims from traffickers and exploitative buyers, while also expanding resources to aid victims in their recovery. I am honored to co-sponsor Assembly Bill 379, an essential piece of legislation designed to enhance our human trafficking laws. By strengthening these laws, we can safeguard our most vulnerable citizens and prevent devastating harm to their lives.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to Survivor Policy Coalition:

By criminalizing loitering with intent to purchase sex, these bills would put sex workers, including those who are trafficked, at greater risk of harm, create opportunities for racial profiling, anti-2SLGBTQIA+ biased enforcement, increase the risk of arrest for queer teenagers in consensual relationships, and ignore best practices for funding services for trafficking

survivors. While we support meaningful efforts to combat human trafficking and provide resources to survivors, this bill relies on ineffective, harmful, and historically discriminatory approaches that undermine the rights and safety of the very individuals it claims to protect.

Criminalizing the Purchase of Sex Endangers People Who Sell Sex

AB-379 and AB-63 perpetuate the racist "end demand" approach built on the White Slave Trafficking Act of 1910 around the known myth of white sex slaves, which has consistently resulted in the criminalization of vulnerable people, including trafficking survivors, rather than addressing the systemic conditions that lead to exploitation. The bill acknowledges the harms of criminalizing survivors, while advancing the same failed law enforcement-centered tactics that have historically led to their arrests. California was one of the first states in the nation to authorize Vacatur laws to overturn biased convictions where a victim of trafficking was arrested for these very crimes being reimposed. No place in the US tracks any information on the vacatur cases and how many victims of trafficking have successfully overturned their convictions, so there is no data available as to how many victims of trafficking are arrested, charged, and convicted under loitering with intent. Beth Jacobs spent her life advocating for vacature laws to overturn her 83 convictions obtained whilst being trafficked, she died before she was able to remove those convictions fully from her record. She alone had 27 loitering with intent charges as part of her conviction record. That is one survivor unidentified 27 times under these very laws being reintroduced in the state of California.

When buyers are criminalized, persons who sell sex have less time to screen clients for risks or negotiate safety.[3] Amnesty International reported on sex workers "feeling pressured to visit customers' homes so that buyers can avoid the police – meaning sex workers have less control and may have to compromise their safety."[4] The University of Southern California's International Human Rights Clinic found that public health approaches to

[3] Charlotte Alter, *Catching Johns: Inside the National Push to Arrest Men Who Buy Sex*, Time Magazine, available at http://time.com/sex-buyers-why-cops-across-the-u-s-target-men-who-buy-prostitutes/.
[4] Amnesty International, *Q&A: Policy to Protect the Human Rights of Sex Workers, available at* https://www.amnesty.org/en/qa-policy-to-protect-the-human-rights-of-sex-workers/.

trafficking in commercial sex are far more effective than law enforcement operations.[5] The recent police killing of a transgender trafficking victim who called law enforcement for help shows the perils in relying on a criminal justice response to trafficking.[6]

California's Shameful History of Anti-Loitering Laws & Selective Use of Solicitation Laws

Anti-loitering and solicitation statutes, like the one at issue in AB-379, have been used disproportionately against people of color, 2SLGBTQIA+ individuals, and those experiencing poverty, under the pretext of public safety. California's initial loitering law, enacted by the first California Legislature in 1850, was written to arrest and indenture Indigenous people.[7] Loitering with intent was officially codified into California law in 1871. Vague and discriminatory laws like AB 379 that broadly criminalize a wide range of otherwise lawful behaviors have led to arbitrary and biased policing, where individuals—particularly Black and Brown women, transgender people, and those perceived to be engaging in sex work—are stopped, harassed, and arrested based on profiling rather than evidence of any criminal activity.

Solicitation laws have also been used for decades to police gay men's sexual activity, from Comptons Cafeteria raids in 1966, the New Year's Eve of 1964 raids on the drag ball at California Hall, and many other raids by police along Polk and the Tenderloin districts.[8] Raids on the gay community are still happening in the US today, on May 6th 2025 a raid was

---

[5] International Human Rights Clinic, USC Gould School of Law, *Over-Policing Sex Trafficking: How U.S. Law Enforcement Should Reform Operations* (2021) at 52.

[6] Libor Janey, *A trans sex worker called 911 to ireported being kidnapped. LAPD officers shot and killed her* Los Angeles Times (Mar. 9, 2025).

[7] Kimberly Johnson-Dodds, *Early California Laws and Policies Related to California Indians* (California Research Bureau: 2002) 8 at https://www.csus.edu/college/education/engagement/_internal/_documents/indian_early_california_laws_and_policies_related_to_california_indians.pdf.

[8] Brief of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California, et al as Amicus Curiae In Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants, Erotic Service Provider Legal, et al. v. George Gascon, No. 4:15-cv-01007 (9th Cir. October 7, 2016) at 17-20.

held in Pittsburgh at P-Town a well known gay bar in the US.[9] Even after *Lawrence v. Texas* (the U.S. Supreme Court case finding unconstitutional a Texas law that banned homosexual adults from engaging in consensual sexual acts), police departments in California continue to regularly target and arrest gay men on charges of solicitation and other offenses such as lewdness.[10] 2SLGBTQIA+ people in many communities are also simply more frequently stopped by police than non-2SLGBTQIA+ people.[11] Disproportionate enforcement is often fueled by purposeful or implicit bias on the part of law enforcement.[12] AB-379 will only exacerbate this issue. Existing on a street in a community historically overpoliced and knowing your community to engage in conversations with your own community can be perceived, by law enforcement, as the intention to commit this crime. Having a previous conviction for existing within your own community—or an unidentified victim of trafficking is a crime as defined. Being lost in an area and seeking assistance from people to find your way is a potential indication of intent to solicit. Policing the thoughts and intentions of someone on the streets has for 175-years of Californian history been directly imposed upon those communities most marginalized and most in need of services. This coupled with the corrected language in AB-63 where being 2SLGBTQIA+ attempting poorly to ensure this community is not "perceived" to be soliciting within the community, is to attempt to offer services, and is to attempt to document their "efforts" to not incarcerate people for existing. The intention of the authors of these bills to create language to be "inclusive" of communities affected by over policing is fascinating when we have such a long and sorted history within the implementation of these laws. Intent-based criminalization has historically

---

[9] PinkNews: *Pittsburgh police raid LGBTQ+ bar during Amanda Lepore show*
[10] *Id.*
[11] Dustin Gardiner, *Police Much More Likely to Stop Transgender People in California for 'Reasonable Suspicion'*, San Francisco Chronicle (July 31, 2022), available at https://www.sfchronicle.com/politics/article/Transgender-California-police-LGBTQ-stop-report-17337333.php; Winston Luhur et al., *Policing LGBQ People*, UCLA School of Law Williams Institute (May 2021), https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Policing-LGBQ-People-May-2021.pdf.
[12] Brief of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California, et al as Amicus Curiae In Support of Plaintiffs-Appellants, Erotic Service Provider Legal, et al. v. George Gascon, No. 4:15-cv-01007 (9th Cir. October 7, 2016) at 20.

been enabling law enforcement to read minds to know the intention of a person on the streets, without the luxury of legislatures writing their intentions into law publicly to be known.

Similarly, data collected by the ACLU in California shows that police and prosecutors are far more likely to arrest or prosecute Black and Hispanic men for purchasing sex.

By relying on vague definitions of "intent," these laws opens the door for biased policing that will ultimately harm survivors rather than support them. These types of laws have been widely criticized for enabling racial profiling, increasing incarceration rates, and diverting resources away from community-based solutions. Endorsing ineffective and harmful legal tools under the guise of trafficking prevention is a step backward in California's fight for justice and human rights.

Unjust and Unreliable Funding Streams For Vitally Needed Services

AB-379 seeks to create new funding streams for services for survivors of trafficking in commercial sex, but it does so without adequate planning or engagement with current funding mechanisms within California. It ignores the act that the Global Slavery Index report shows seventy-seven percent of trafficking is labor trafficking, this intentional exclusion of labor trafficking and sex trafficking only legislation intentionally ignores over half the known trafficking problem to prioritise the White Slave Traffick Myths of the 1900s as codified into US law with the White Slave Traffic Act of 1910.[13] We support funding for services for sex workers and trafficking survivors – housing, jobs, training, record clearances – but it should be funded in a serious and sustained way, from state or local general funds. Fines are unreliable, as they have to be extracted from low-income defendants. From year to year, public dollars would be spent on debt collection, and each year, programs would be unable to plan their budgets. Furthermore, criminal debt is a burden on the convicted person's family, robbing them of money for housing, food and other necessities.

Arrest-driven funding structures are fiscally ineffective and unstable sources for critical services. True survivor support requires long-term

[13] Walk Free Global Slave Index Report: *Global findings | Walk Free*

investments in housing, economic opportunities, and voluntary, trauma-informed services—not an increase in policing and court involvement.

Ignoring Best Practices for Funding Organizations That Serve Survivors

California already has a process for funding organizations that provide services to survivors of trafficking through the Office of Emergency Services (OES). OES has developed guidelines to ensure that funding goes to organizations that provide effective, evidence-based services. AB-379 would create a new "Survivor Support Fund" under the California Victim Compensation Board, which would create redundancy and ignore OES funding criteria.

Attempts to Override Recent and Carefully Balanced Provisions Related to Minors

The inclusion of provisions related to minors in AB-379 disregards legislation enacted just last year and considerations on this issue. Specifically, AB-379 attempts to undo key amendments made to SB-1414 (Grove - 2024), which ensured that young people would not be subjected to felony prosecutions and punishments for engaging in consensual relationships with other young people. The Legislature passed SB-1414, as amended, in recognition of concerns raised by youth advocates about how parents have used the criminal legal system to target relationships based on racism or anti-2SLGBTQIA+ discrimination. At the same time, the law passed last year recognizes that any case involving an exploited minor aged 16 or 17 should be subject to more serious consequences. This law has been in effect for only six months.

AB-379 removes the careful balance struck by SB-1414, reinstating a broad criminalization approach that will only punish more young people. This is deeply problematic, as we know from public health models that punishment is not an effective strategy for behavior modification of young people. Rather than re-investing in failed criminalization tactics, California should prioritize comprehensive, survivor-centered solutions that address the root causes of trafficking. This includes expanding economic opportunities, increasing access to permanent supportive housing, and ensuring the availability of voluntary, low-barrier services that empower individuals rather than entrenching them in the criminal justice system.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/15/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, 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, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bonta, Castillo, Quirk-Silva, Stefani

Prepared by: Cheryl Anderson / PUB. S. /
7/9/25 17:52:29

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 391
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 391
Author: Michelle Rodriguez (D)
Amended: 7/8/25 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 specified notices required by the Mobilehome Residency Law to mobilehome residents and owners by electronic mail with the resident or owner's affirmative, written consent.

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/8/25 make technical amendments and specify that the provisions for delivering notices by electronic mail apply to notices required by specified Civil Code sections.

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 by Civil Code sections 798.15(c) and (i) and 798.43.1 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 7/9/25)

Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association (Source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

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
7/9/25 16:03:25

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 414
Author: Pellerin (D)
Amended: 7/8/25 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 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 amends the process by which the remaining deposit and required itemized statement of deductions is delivered to the tenant or tenants, as specified.

Senate floor amendments of 7/8/25 add an exception to the requirement that when multiple adult tenants reside in the residential rental property, the landlord must return the remainder of any security deposit by check payable to all adult tenants and furnish the itemized statement to any one of the adult tenants, as specified, for when no written mutual agreement has been entered into by the landlord and the adult tenants, and the tenancy is terminated by a tenant pursuant to a specified statute related to instances of domestic violence, and the tenant who terminated the lease requests that the security be disbursed in a manner other than by check made payable to all adult tenants.

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.

8) Exempts, from the requirement in (6), above, when there is no mutual agreement pursuant to (7), and a tenant terminates the lease pursuant to Civil Code section 1946.7 and requests that the security be disbursed in a manner other than by check made payable to all tenants, and permits in such a circumstance that a landlord disburse the security in a manner other than by check made payable to all adult tenants.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/26/2025)

California Apartment Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/26/2025)

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
7/9/25 16:03:26

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

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 454
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Amended: 6/16/25 in Senate
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 5-2, 6/10/25
AYES: Limón, Allen, Hurtado, Laird, Stern
NOES: Seyarto, Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-12, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Migratory birds: California Migratory Bird Protection Act

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill indefinitely, makes unlawful the taking or possessing of any migratory bird, as designated in the federal act before January 1, 2025, any additional migratory birds that may be designated in the federal act after that date, or any part of those migratory birds, except as provided.

ANALYSIS: Existing federal law, under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), provides for the protection of migratory birds. The MBTA authorizes states and territories of the United States to make and enforce laws or regulations that give further protection to migratory birds, their nests, and eggs [Title 16, United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 703–712].

Existing state law:

1) Prohibits the taking or possession of any migratory nongame bird, or part of any migratory nongame bird, as designated in the MBTA, except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the United States Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the act (Fish and Game Code (FGC) § 3513).

2) Allows the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to annually adopt regulations pertaining to migratory birds to conform with or to further restrict the rules and regulations prescribed pursuant to the MBTA (FGC § 355).

3) Defines nongame birds as all birds occurring naturally in California that are not resident game birds, migratory game birds, or fully protected birds (FGC § 3800).

4) States that it is unlawful to take any nongame bird except as provided in the FGC or in accordance with regulations of the Commission or, when relating to mining operations, a mitigation plan approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (FGC § 3800).

5) Makes it unlawful to take a bird, mammal, fish, reptile, or amphibian, expect as provided in the FGC and its regulations (FGC § 2000).

6) Defines "take" as hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill (FGC § 86).

This bill:

1) Specifies that it is unlawful to take or possess:

   a) Any migratory bird designated in the federal MBTA before January 1, 2025; and

   b) Any additional migratory bird designated in that federal act after that date, or any part of a migratory bird.

2) Provides exceptions to this prohibition where:

   a) Rules and regulations are otherwise adopted by the United States Secretary of the Interior under the MBTA before January 1, 2025, or

   b) Subsequent rules or regulations are adopted pursuant to that federal act, unless those rules or regulations are inconsistent with the Fish and Game Code.

3) Repeals section 3513 of the Fish and Game Code, as added by Section 3 of Chapter 349 of the Statutes of 2019 which 1) and 2) replace.

   a) This section of code specifies that the state shall enforce the MBTA as the MBTA protected migratory birds on January 1, 2017, or any birds added to the MBTA after that date.

b) This section of code became non-operative on January 20, 2025, and will be repealed as of January 1, 2026.

4) Establishes this bill as an urgency statute, as provided.

Comments

Trump Administration Relaxed Rules Protecting Migratory Birds. On December 22, 2017, Department of the Interior's opinion M-37050 concluded that the prohibition on take under the MBTA applies only to direct and affirmative purposeful actions that reduce migratory birds, their eggs, or their nests, by killing or capturing. Thus, incidental take was no longer prohibited under the MBTA. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service told industry and conservation groups that the agency no longer engaged to enforce on incidences of incidental take.

In September 2018, the state of California joined seven other states in filing a separate lawsuit in the Southern District of New York to challenge the Trump Administration's MBTA interpretation and actions. The suit asserts that the Administration's revised opinion and planned pullback of the MBTA is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and in violation of the law [see *State of New York, et al. vs. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, et al.*, U.S. Dist. Court, Case No. 1:18-cv-08084]. The Southern District ruled that the Administration's 2017 Solicitor's Opinion did not align with the intent and language of the 100-year-old law, and overturned the policy.

However, in the final days of the first Trump Administration, the Department of the Interior finalized regulations that codified the policy into law. In October 2021, the Biden Administration repealed the regulations and restored incidental take protections for migratory birds.

Protecting California's Birds. FGC §3513 codifies the MBTA in state law. In 2018, this section of code stated: It is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the Migratory Treaty Act.

AB 454 (Kalra, Chapter 340, Statutes of 2019) recasts the codification of the MBTA in state law to the list of migratory nongame birds designated in the MBTA as of January 1, 2017, and any additions thereafter. That bill changed the implementation of exemptions to the take or possession prohibition by

requiring take or possession exemptions in California to be consistent with, or more protective than, rules and regulations adopted by the United States Secretary of the Interior under the federal MBTA. AB 454 (2019) contained a sunset provision to this requirement of January 20, 2025 and would repeal the language on January 1, 2026.

Providing certainty for California's birds. This bill establishes certainty for California's migratory birds: under the state's Fish and Game Code, they remain protected from incidental take.

What is "take?" Take is defined in the FGC as hunting, pursuing, catching, capturing, or killing, or attempting to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill. This is different than the definition under the federal Endangered Species Act, where take is defined as harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting, or attempting to engage in any such conduct. California does not have a state equivalent for harassing or harming. Incidental take describes the take of an animal that results from, but is not the purpose of, an activity.

CDFW Enforcement. Although CDFW does not issue citations under the federal MBTA, they do issue citations pursuant to regulation or FGC § 2000 and § 3513. CDFW reports that the vast majority of these citations are for illegal take of waterfowl, which may result in an estimated fine of $100–$1,000 per violation, depending on the case and court.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

Audubon California (Sponsor)
Alianza Coachella Valley
Alta Peak Chapter, California Native Plant Society
American River Conservancy
California Environmental Votes
California Institute for Biodiversity
Center for Biological Diversity
Defenders of Wildlife
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Protection Information Center
Friends of the Inyo
Karmic Action Redistribution Management Agency

Natural Resources Defense Council
Planning and Conservation League
Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Sierra Club California
Sierra State Parks Foundation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author: "California is home to a rich and critical diversity of migratory birds, many of which fulfill important ecological, cultural, and economic functions. In 2019, the California Migratory Bird Protection Act was enacted to continue enforcing effective migratory bird protections in the face of potential federal rollbacks. Unfortunately, the bill has since been sunset. Without it, the people of California could lose access to the hundreds of species of migratory birds that bring biodiversity to residential areas and urban centers and generate millions of dollars for the bird-watching industry. AB 454 will make the California Migratory Bird Protection Act permanent, ensuring that California will continue to preserve important migratory bird populations for generations to come."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: None received.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-12, 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, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Ellis, Gallagher, Hadwick, Lackey, Macedo, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dixon, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hoover, Papan, Patterson, Blanca Rubio, Soria

Prepared by: Edith Hannigan / N.R. & W. / (916) 651-4116
7/1/25 16:18:59

****** 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 AB 484
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 484
Author: Dixon (R)
Amended: 7/3/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 4/21/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California bar examination

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires the Committee of Bar Examiners to provide a report on whether adopting a uniform bar examination, including, but not limited to, the National Conference of Bar Examiners' Uniform Bar Examination, would be more efficient to administer and lower the cost of administration for the State Bar and examinees, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires all attorneys who practice law in California to be licensed by the State Bar and establishes the State Bar, within the judicial branch of state government, for the purpose of regulating the legal profession. (California Constitution, art. VI, § 9; Business & Professions (Bus. & Prof.) Code §§ 6000 et seq.):

   a) The Legislature sets the annual fees. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6140, 6141.)

b) The State Bar is governed by the Board of Trustees of the State Bar (Board). (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6010 et seq.; § 6016.)
c) Establishes the State Bar Act as the statutory requirements regulating the practice of law in this state. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6000 et seq.)

2) Establishes that protection of the public, which includes support for greater access to, and inclusion in, the legal system, is the highest priority for the State Bar in exercising their licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public is to be paramount. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6001.1.)

3) Authorizes the Board to establish an examining committee (hereafter the Committee of Bar Examiners or CBE) having the power to:

a) Examine all applicants for admission to practice law;
b) Administer the requirements for admission to practice law; and
c) Certify to the Supreme Court for admission those applicants who fulfill the requirements provided in Chapter 4 of the State Bar Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6046.)

4) Provides various requirements a person must meet to be certified to the California Supreme Court for admission to practice law in this state, including passing the general bar examination given by the Committee of Bar Examiners. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6060(g).) The Supreme Court admits persons to practice law in this state.

5) Prohibits the Committee of Bar Examiners from altering the bar exam in a manner that requires the substantial modification of the training or preparation required for passage of the examination, except after giving two years' notice of that change. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6046.6.)

This bill:

1) Requires the Committee of Bar Examiners to provide a report to the Board, the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, and to the Assembly and Senate Committees on Judiciary on whether adopting a uniform bar examination, including, but not limited to, the National Conference of Bar Examiners' Uniform Bar Examination or any successor or replacement of that exam, would

be more efficient to administer and lower the cost of administration for the State Bar and examinees.

2) Requires the report to be submitted no later than November 30, 2026, and repeals these provisions on January 1, 2030.

Comments

The bar exam is comprised of three components: five one-hour essay questions, one 90-minute performance test, and 200 multiple-choice questions. The State Bar used a new exam format and platform for the first time in decades for the February 2025 exam that allowed for both in-person and remote test taking.[1] The State Bar stated that the new exam platform and format "will enable the State Bar to utilize multiple-choice questions developed by Kaplan Exam Services, LLC (Kaplan) rather than purchase the MBE from the [NCBE] and to engage ProctorU, Inc. d/b/a/ Meazure Learning (Meazure Learning) to administer the examination remotely or at Meazure Learning's test centers."[2] Prior to 2025, the bar exam was always administered in-person at various locations throughout the state by the State Bar with the exception of during the COVID-19 pandemic. The State Bar's rationale for moving to the new exam platform and format was predominantly a cost saving measure.

According to widespread reports outlined in news articles, a letter signed by California's law school deans, and numerous phone calls and emails received by the Committee and author of this bill, the February administration of the State Bar Exam was an utter failure. Reports of difficulties included: inability to log in or access the test, unstable servers, issues with proctors, lost time, delayed prompts, factual errors in questions, and the inability to start or finish exam components. Of the 5,600 people registered for the exam, more than 964 withdrew before the day of the exam, after the bar offered unprecedented refunds in the face of technological problems that rose during pre-mock exams and issues with scheduling locations to take the exam. As noted by Dean Erwin Chemerinsky of the UC Berkeley School of Law this 2025 bar exam was "stunning incompetence from an entity that exists to measure competence."[3] In conversations with the State

---

[1] Olivia Hebert, SF Gate, *California's new bar exam launch was a 'disaster.' Now test takers are suing*. (Feb. 28, 2025), available at https://www.sfgate.com/california/article/california-bar-exam-march-retakes-20192958.php.

[2] *Renewed Request that the Supreme Court Approve Proposed Modifications to the California Bar Examination,* (Cal. Supreme Court (Oct. 2024) S287231) at p. 4, available at https://www.calbar.ca.gov/portals/0/documents/admissions/examinations/Renewed-Request-to-Approve-Proposed-Modifications-to-the-CA-Bar-Examination.pdf.

[3] Malcolm Maclachlan, Daily Journal, *California Bar exam failure sparks lawsuit, legislative inquiry*, (mar. 3, 2025), *available at* https://www.dailyjournal.com/articles/383949-california-bar-exam-failure-sparks-lawsuit-

Bar and Committee staff, it was indicated that virtually every examinee experienced some issue on the bar exam.
The California Supreme Court released a statement following the bar exam debacle:

> The court is deeply concerned by the troubling reports of technical failures, delays, and other irregularities in last week's administration of the February 2025 California Bar Examination. The court regrets this situation and apologizes for the disappointment, stress, and frustration experienced by some applicants. At present, the complete scope and causes of the problems are still being determined. Last week, the court asked the State Bar, in conjunction with the vendor responsible for administering the exam, to provide an expedited, detailed report regarding the problems encountered by applicants. This information is crucial in informing how the court will provide appropriate remedies for affected applicants who deserved and expected better. In the interim, the court directs the State Bar to plan on administering the July 2025 California Bar Examination in the traditional in-person format.[4]

After the first day of the February Bar Exam, the State Bar released a statement to all examinees, stating that "[i]n advance of the exam, the State Bar took measures to ensure that a makeup opportunity would be available, if needed, for applicants who experienced significant technical issues. As such, we had already planned to offer a makeup opportunity[…]"[5] However, the State Bar criteria for a makeup exam was so limited that only about 91 examinees were eligible for the makeup exam. Two class action lawsuits have been filed against Meazure Learning in the wake of this fiasco.[6]

The State Bar approved a proposal to allow test takers who withdraw from the February 2025 exam or fail the exam to take a bar exam within the next year for free.[7] The Board approved $3.1 million in the budget to support these fee waivers.[8]

---

legislative-inquiry?utm_source=ActiveCampaign&utm_medium=email&utm_content=Legal%20battle%20over%20Point%20Reyes%20ranching%20deal%20escalates&utm_campaign=Legal%20News%203%2F3&vgo_ee=cUekTHCZPyLa0dLz%2FgoXbTrxWqEMTgXT%2BgyPjC3Mn6xwO1644QLwGw%3D%3D%3ATT7IZwFcfYgN%2B46NDnKPDsLFczdr1him.

[4] *California Supreme Court Issues Statement on February Bar Exam*, Cal. Sup. Court, (Mar. 4, 2025), available at https://newsroom.courts.ca.gov/news/california-supreme-court-issues-statement-february-bar-exam.

[5] *Olivia Hebert*, DF Gate, *California's new bar exam launch was a 'disaster.' Now test takers are suing.* (Feb. 28, 2025), available at https://www.sfgate.com/california/article/california-bar-exam-march-retakes-20192958.php.

[6] *Ibid*.

[7] *Board Offers Free July Bar Exam to Applicants Who Withdraw or Fail February Bar Exam*, Cal. State Bar,(Feb. 21, 2025), available at https://www.calbar.ca.gov/About-Us/News/News-Releases/board-offers-free-july-bar-exam-to-applicants-who-withdraw-or-fail-february-bar-exam.

Additionally, the State Bar:

- Offered reimbursement of nonreimburseable travel expenses for out-of-state, in-person test takers who moved to more local sites in the Central and Eastern time zones;
- Extended similar reimbursement offers to those who have had their location changed after registering, or those who changed sites because of the late opening of new locations;
- Offered stipends for applicants with testing accommodations (TA) who were moved at the last minute to the State Bar's Los Angeles office or to other TA testing locations; and
- Offered full refunds to applicants affected by the Los Angeles wildfires if they chose to withdraw, and on February 13, extended the offer of full refunds to any applicant who decided to withdraw before the exam.[9]

The Board has initiated an independent investigation of the 2025 bar exam. The cost of the February 2025 exam fiasco could cost the State Bar an additional $5.6 million.[10]

The Uniform Bar Exam (UBE) is coordinated and created by the National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE). It is composed of a multistate essay examination, a multistate performance test, and the multistate bar examination (MBE). Forty states and the District of Columbia have adopted the UBE, as well as the U.S. Virgin Islands.[11] According to the NCBE, "the UBE is designed to test knowledge and skills that every lawyer should be able to demonstrate prior to becoming licensed to practice law," is "uniformly administered, graded, and scored," and "results in a portable score that can be used to apply for admission in other UBE jurisdictions."[12] A candidate must sit for all portions of the UBE in the same UBE jurisdiction and in the same administration in order to earn a portable UBE score.[13]

---

[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] Jenny Jarvie, *After AI bar exam fiasco, State Bar of California faces deeper financial crisis*, (update May 8, 2025), available at https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-05-07/after-botched-exams-california-state-bar-faces-deeper-financial-crisis#:~:text=The%20State%20Bar%20of%20California's,it%20an%20additional%20%245.6%20million.
[11] UBE, NCBE, available at https://www.ncbex.org/exams/ube/about-ube.
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] *Ibid.*

The administering jurisdiction retains control over all of the following:

- who may sit for the bar exam and who will be admitted to practice;
- underlying educational requirements to sit for the exam;
- all character and fitness decisions;
- policies regarding the number of times applicants may retake the bar examination;
- any ADA decisions;
- grading of the essay and performance test portion of the exam;
- assessment of candidate knowledge of jurisdiction-specific content through a separate test, course, or some combination of the two if the jurisdiction chooses;
- acceptance of MBE scores earned in a previous examination or concurrently in another jurisdiction for purposes of making local admission decisions if they wish; and
- determinations regarding how long incoming UBE scores will be accepted.

The NCBE is in the process of launching the NextGen bar exam, which would replace the UBE through a phase out process with the last administration of the UBE occurring in February 2028.[14] According to the NCBE, the NextGen bar exam is "guided by the results of a comprehensive, empirical three-year study and consistent with testing industry professional standards."[15]

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

> AB 484 is a first step in addressing significant shortcomings and critical errors that have been encountered during the administration of recent State Bar examinations in California. AB 484 will assist in increasing transparency by

[14] *Implementation* Timeline, NextGen UBE, available at https://www.ncbex.org/exams/nextgen-july-2026/about/implementation-timeline.
[15] *Ibid.*

requiring the Committee of Bar Examiners to provide a report to the board of trustees, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and to the Assembly and Senate Committees on Judiciary pursuant 9795 of the Government Code by November 30th, 2026. The report will be on whether adopting a uniform bar examination, including, but not limited to, the National Conference of Bar Examiners' (NCBE) Uniform Bar Examination, would be more efficient to administer and lower the cost of administration for the State bar and Examinees. This will provide the California Legislature and the Supreme Court with vital information to make decisions on test implementation moving forward as well as the feasibility of adopting the NCBE's Uniform Bar Examination.

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: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/10/25 9:41:28

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 492
Author: Valencia (D), et al.
Introduced: 2/10/25
Vote: 21

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

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

SUBJECT: Alcohol and drug programs: licensing

SOURCE: League of California Cities

DIGEST: This bill requires the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to provide specified notification to a city or county concurrently whenever it issues a license to a residential alcohol or other drug recovery or treatment facility.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Grants sole authority in the state to the DHCS to license adult residential alcohol or other drug recovery or treatment facilities (RTFs). [Health & Safety Code (HSC) §11834.01]

2) Requires DHCS to conduct onsite program compliance visits for RTFs at least once during the licensure period. Permits DHCS to conduct announced or unannounced site visits to review for compliance. [HSC §11834.01]

3) Permits DHCS to issue a single license to operate RTF upon receipt of a completed written application, fire clearance, and licensing fee subject to

DHCS's review and determination that the applicant can comply with RTF laws. [HCS §11834.09]

4) Requires initial licenses for new RTFs to be provisional for one year. Permits DHCS to revoke the provisional license for good cause, and prohibits a licensee from reapplying for an initial license for five years following a revocation of a provisional license. Defines "good cause" to mean failure to operate in compliance with RTF statutes and regulations.
[HSC §11834.09(d)]

5) Authorizes DHCS to assess civil penalties on facilities that provide recovery, treatment, or detoxification services without a license. [HSC §11834.15]

6) Prohibits a person, firm, partnership, association, corporation, or local governmental entity from operating, establishing, managing, conducting, or maintaining a RTF to provide recovery, treatment, or detoxification services within this state without first obtaining a license. [HSC §11834.30]

7) Requires DHCS to conduct a site visit to investigate an allegation of an entity operating without a valid RTF license. Requires DHCS to take the following actions if evidence substantiates that the entity is providing RTF services without a license:

   a) Submit the findings of the investigation;
   b) Issue a written notice to the entity stating that it is operating in violation DHCS's licensing law and inform them of the date by which it ceases providing services and notice that DHCS will assess a civil penalty of $2,000 per day for every day they continue to provide services beyond the date specified in the notice;
   c) Notice that the case will be referred for civil proceedings in the event the entity continues to provide services beyond the date specified in the notice; and,
   d) Inform the entity of the licensing requirements. [HSC §11834.31]

8) Prohibits an entity found to be in violation of DHCS's licensing laws from applying for initial RTF licensure for a period of five years from the date of the notice specified.
[HSC §11834.31]

This bill requires DHCS to provide written notification to the city, or the county if the facility is located within an unincorporated area, concurrently whenever it issues a license to a RTF to include the name and mailing address of the licensee and the location of the RTF.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

> This bill will ensure that our communities are well-informed and prepared to support recovery and treatment initiatives. By providing local agencies with timely information, we can foster greater collaboration, improve public safety, and ensure that these facilities operate in a manner that best serves the needs of our residents.

Background

RTFs. Licensure is required when at least one of the following services is provided: detoxification; group sessions; individual sessions; educational sessions; or, alcoholism or other drug abuse recovery or treatment planning. As part of their licensing function, DHCS conducts reviews of RTFs every two years, or as necessary. DHCS's substance use disorder (SUD) Compliance Division checks for compliance with statutes and regulations to ensure the health and safety of RTF residents and investigates all complaints related to RTFs, including deaths, complaints against staff, and allegations of operating without a license. DHCS has the authority to suspend or revoke a license for conduct in the operation of an RTF that is contrary to the health, morals, welfare, or safety of either RTF residents or to the people of the State of California. According to DHCS, 123 RTF initial licenses were issued in 2023 and 172 in 2024.

California State Auditor (CSA) report. Issued in October 2024, the CSA Drug and Alcohol Treatment Facilities report (or "RTF report") stated complaints about the roughly 1,000 licensed RTFs to DHCS may arise from various sources, including RTF residents, neighbors, staff members, or government agencies. According to internal guidelines, DHCS prioritizes death investigations over investigations into all other types of complaints. The RTF report stated, in fact, DHCS aims to assign death investigations to a staff member on the day it receives the report of a death. In the course of a death investigation, it directs its staff to perform a complete review of the facility where the death occurred to determine whether the resident's death was related to deficiencies in the facility's operation. DHCS also receives and investigates complaints about facilities that operate without a license—for which generally DHCS does not have oversight. If an investigation finds, however,

that an unlicensed facility is providing or advertising services that require a license, DHCS notifies the facility that it has been violating the law. If it obtains sufficient evidence the facility has not stopped providing the services in question, DHCS is authorized in current law to bring a civil action against the facility. For a licensed RTF, if during a complaint investigation or compliance inspection, DHCS finds a facility poses serious risks to the health and safety of residents, it may initiate a license suspension or revocation. Current law authorizes DHCS to immediately suspend a license when these concerns are present. A suspension stays in effect until DHCS makes a final determination, which may include revocation, following a hearing and a proposed decision by an Administrative Law Judge.

The RTF report made a series of recommendations to help DHCS improve its complaints processes—mostly through administrative means:

a) Provide management with information about the timeliness of compliance inspections;
b) Implement a mechanism in its licensing database that notifies staff of the dates for upcoming compliance inspections for their caseload so they can plan accordingly;
c) Fill its vacant positions;
d) Update its policies and staff training by April 2025 to ensure it assigns complaints to analysts for investigation within 10 days, as currently required by its regulations;
e) Implement guidelines by October 2025 that specify the length of time analysts should take to complete key steps in the investigation process for different types of investigations;
f) Conduct site visits beginning December 2024 in all instances in which there is an allegation that an unlicensed facility is advertising or providing treatment services without a license; and,
g) Develop and implement, by April 2025, a follow-up procedure, such as performing another site visit, to confirm unlicensed facilities have ceased providing services unlawfully.

The argument surrounding "overconcentration." The CSA's RTF report contained an additional focus of interest popular with some jurisdictions over the years concerning the concentration of RTFs, and concluded state law allows treatment facilities serving six or fewer residents to operate anywhere that a single family home would also be permitted to exist. Local governments may not impose on these facilities any additional zoning requirements or fees that they would not impose on a single-family home. Accordingly, state law prohibits local

governments from imposing distance requirements on small facilities that they can impose on commercial establishments. The report further states that, in addition, state law regarding the licensing of RTFs does not prevent those with individual licenses from operating near one another, including when those facilities share the same owner. However, the facilities may not share residents or treatment services among separately licensed facilities. State law does not limit the number of RTF licenses—regardless of facility capacity—that a single owner may possess.

Attorney General (AG) Brown opinion. No. 07-601, from December 18, 2007, similarly concluded that the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (now DHCS) is not authorized to deny an application for licensure or suspend or revoke the license of RTFs because the particular community already has more than a sufficient number of them to meet the local need, and that a city may not limit the establishment of RTFs serving six or fewer persons using the same argument. In his opinion, AG Brown argued that while DHCS's RTF licensing law makes a declaration concerning the policy of the state that "counties and cities encourage development of sufficient numbers and types of RTFs as are commensurate with local need," the matter concerning treatment for those with SUDs and available treatment options are of statewide concern. Therefore, local governments cannot argue additional RTFs would result in overconcentration in their jurisdictions based solely on the belief those jurisdictions have sufficient numbers to meet local need if the state as a whole has not met its need; and AG Brown cited case law to support that opinion.

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

Senate Rule 28.8

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

League of California Cities (source)
Advocates for Responsible Treatment
Association of California Cities – Orange County
California Police Chiefs Association
City of Beverly Hills
City of Buena Park
City of Camarillo
City of Carlsbad
City of Clovis
City of Cypress
City of Encinitas

City of Garden Grove
City of Glendale
City of Huntington Beach
City of Irvine
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Lathrop
City of Los Alamitos
City of Manteca
City of Mission Viejo
City of Newport Beach
City of Oceanside
City of San Marcos
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Villa Park
County of Orange
Five individuals

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The League of California Cities, as sponsor, and other supporters of this bill, largely local governments, argue California has 2,043 alcohol and drug treatment facilities, nearly 70% of which are in Southern California. DHCS is not currently required to notify local governments when approving licenses, leaving cities in the dark about the operation of new RTFs within their jurisdictions. This lack of communication can make it difficult to address community concerns, maintain public safety, and ensure that RTFs are effectively integrated into local communities. Similar notification requirements are already in place for liquor licenses, cannabis businesses, and syringe exchange programs. Supporters further argue the RTF report confirmed what cities across California have been saying for years: there is an overconcentration of recovery housing in residential neighborhoods, specifically in Orange County. This bill takes a critical step forward by keeping cities informed and enhancing their collaboration with the state to more effectively address SUD treatment needs.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza,

Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, 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, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Ellis, Garcia

Prepared by: Reyes Diaz / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
7/1/25 16:18:59

****** 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 519
Author: Berman (D), et al.
Amended: 7/2/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/5/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pet broker sales

SOURCE: American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, San Diego Humane Society

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a pet broker, as defined, from selling, offering for sale, or adopting out a dog one year or younger, cat or rabbit, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Prohibits a pet store operator from selling a live dog, cat, or rabbit in a pet store unless the animal was obtained from a public animal control agency or shelter, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals shelter, humane society shelter, or rescue group that is in a cooperative agreement with at least one private or public shelter, as specified. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 122354.5)

2) Prohibits an online pet retailer, as defined, from offering, brokering or making a referral for a loan or other financing for the adoption or sale of a dog, cat, or rabbit. (HSC § 122191).

3) Defines " pet dealer" under the provisions of law pertaining to the retail sale of dogs or cats to mean a person engaging in the business of selling dogs or cats,

or both, at retail, and by virtue of the sales of dogs or cats is required to possess a permit pursuant to Section 6066 of the Revenue and Taxation Code. (HSC § 122125(b))

4) Requires every dog dealer, as defined in HSC § 122300 that sells registered dogs or that claims that the dogs being sold are registered or are registerable with a dog pedigree registry shall post conspicuously within close proximity to the dogs offered for sale, a notice containing the following language in at least 100-point type: "Pedigree registration does not assure proper breeding conditions, health, quality, or claims to lineage." (HSC § 122305)

This bill:

1) Prohibits a "broker" as defined, from making available for sale, adoption or offering to sell a dog under one year of age, a cat, or rabbit.

2) Defines the following for purposes of this bill:

   a) "Animal rescue group" to mean any not-for-profit organization that has tax exempt status under 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, whose mission and practice is, in whole or part, the rescue and placement of animals into permanent homes and meets both of the following:

   b) Does not breed animals, and,

   c) Does not obtain animals in exchange for compensation from any person that breed or broker animals.

   d) "Broker" to mean a person or business that sells, arranges, negotiates, or, processes either in person or online, the sale of dogs, cats, or rabbits bred by another for profit. This includes facilitating the transfer of a dog, cat, or rabbit for profit.

   e) "public animal control agency or shelter" to mean any facility operated by or under contract with any governmental entity for the purpose of impounding or harboring seized, stray, homeless, abandoned, or unwanted dogs, cats, rabbits, or other animals.

3) Exempts the following from the provisions of this bill:

a) The sale, transfer, or adoption of an animal by a governmental agency.

b) The transfer of ownership of a guide, signal, or service dog.

c) Public animal control agency or shelter, or animal rescue group.

d) Nonprofit organizations engaged in youth education related to animal care and rearing.

e) A sale or transfer of an animal conducted on or behalf of the bona fide owner to a new owner, so long as there is no more than three occurrences annually.

Background

Pet Brokers. According to the ASPCA, a "dog broker or 'puppy dealer" is a middleman distributor who obtains puppies in bulk from commercial breeders and re-sells them to retailers." Currently, there are no prohibitions preventing a broker from purchasing a puppy or kitty from a "puppy mill or kitten factory" and selling that animal to a consumer in California. Pet brokers are required to hold a Class-B license from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

California already prohibits the retail sale of live cats, dogs, or rabbits at pet stores unless the animal is sourced from an animal control agency, shelter or animal rescue group. With the enactment of AB 485 (O'Donnell, Chapter 740, Statutes of 2017), California became one of the first states in the nation to ban the sale of certain live animals in pet stores and instead promote the rehoming of animals through shelter and rescue organization partnerships with pet supply retailers. AB 485 specifically prohibits the sale of dogs, cats, or rabbits in a retail pet store unless the animal was obtained from a public animal control agency or shelter or rescue group as defined. While AB 485 addressed retail sales in this state at traditional retail pet stores, it did not address the online retail animal marketplace.

Generally, California regulates the sale of animals through the Polanco-Lockyer Pet Breeder Warranty Act (Warranty Act) and the Lockyer-Polanco-Farr Pet Protection Act (Protection Act). The Warranty Act is applicable to California breeders and the Protection Act applies to retail sales in stores. California's breeder and pet retail sales laws are intended to ensure the consumer has recourse should any problems arise with respect to the health of the animal after the animal is purchased. The Protection Act also includes specific requirements to ensure consumers have information about the pet's origins and the health and safety of the

animals prior to purchase and while in the care of the pet retailer. California does not license dog breeders in this state. Instead, dog breeders are authorized to operate if they meet the definition of breeder and comply with the requirements specified in the Warranty Act. Pet dealers are regulated and defined under the Protection Act, and those laws ensure that when selling a pet to a consumer, pet dealers must provide purchasers with written information about the animal's health, including any known illnesses or conditions. Additionally, under the Protection Act, before any dog or cat is sold, the dog or cat must be examined by a licensed veterinarian to ensure it is free from contagious diseases and fit for sale. The Protection Act also outlines consumer remedies in the event a purchased animal is found to be ill or affected by a congenital or hereditary condition within 15 days of sale, in which case the consumer may be entitled to a refund, an exchange, or reimbursement for veterinary costs. The law also imposes recordkeeping requirements, obligating dealers to retain documentation regarding the source of animals, veterinary treatments, and sales transactions for a specified period.

Pet brokers may not be defined as a pet retailer in the Protection Act or defined as a breeder in the Warranty Act and therefore are not subject to the same requirements under either act. This bill defines a pet broker as a person or business that sells, arranges, negotiates, or processes, either in person or online, the sale of dogs, cats, or rabbits bred by another for profit. This includes facilitating the transfer of a dog, cat, or rabbit for profit.

Federal Animal Welfare Laws. The federal Animal Welfare Act, passed by Congress in 1966, establishes minimum standards for the care and treatment of animals bred for commercial sale, exhibited to the public, used in biomedical research or commercial transport. According to information from the USDA, businesses that buy or sell warm-blooded animals, exhibit to the public, transport animals commercially, or use the animals for research, teaching, testing, or experiments must be licensed and/or registered under the jurisdiction of the USDA. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), under the USDA is responsible for overseeing the commercial dog breeding industry. Breeders who sell to a pet store or consumers over the Internet are required to hold a license. There are exemptions to the USDA/APHIS licensure requirements including pet retail stores, working dog dealers (unless wholesale), direct sales, hobby breeders, among a few specified others. Licenses issued by the USDA/APHIS are valid for three-years and license holders may increase the number of animals under that license in increments of 50 at any time during the three-year license period without obtaining permission or a new license. As noted by various animal welfare organizations, federal laws provide a minimal level of specificity for animal care

and violations are routinely found in many commercial breeding organizations, while others operate underground making enforcement of the laws difficult and challenging.

LA Times Investigative Report. A 2024 investigative report by the *Los Angeles Times* titled "Inside California's Brutal Underground Market for Puppies" exposed loopholes being exploited by some breeders and pet sellers that allow them to serve as brokers, reselling or arranging the sale of dogs bred in "puppy mills". Through analysis of more than 88,000 certificates of veterinary inspection—or "travel certificates"—from states throughout the country, the *Times* identifies more than 71,000 were imported into California. Individual pet dealers and businesses then rebrand and resell these imported dogs as "California-bred" to unknowing consumers. According to the report, many of these pets develop future health problems and consumers have little knowledge as to the original source of their pet, nor recourse for the fraudulent sale.

The article noted that often time buyers purchase animals online from what they believe to be a breeder in California, when in reality the animal is from another state, and offered for sale through a broker with little knowledge from the prospective buyer, that the dog was not actually bred in California.

This bill contains exceptions for dog over a year, procurement by government agencies, such as police dogs, as well as the transfer of a guide, signal or service dog. This bill exempts private or publicly operated animal shelters, human societies, and rescue organizations, and those that acquire animals for educational purposes. In addition, this bill makes it clear that a bona fide owner can sell to another so long as there are no more than three occurrences per year.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (co-source)
San Diego Humane Society (co-source)
Best Friends Animal Society
CalAnimals
Michelson Center for Public Policy
San Francisco SPCA
Social Compassion in Legislation
Valley Humane Society

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

Backcountry Hunters & Anglers
Black Brant Group
Bluffton Decatur Waynedale
California Bowmen Hunters/State Archery Association
California Cattlemen's Association
California Houndsmen for Conservation
California Rifle and Pistol Association
California Waterfowl Association
Cumback Veterinary Service
Delta Waterfowl
Ducks Unlimited
East Holmes Veterinary Clinic
Girard Animal Hospital
Hoosier Hills Veterinary Services
King Veterinary Clinic
Pet Advocacy Network
Pratt Veterinary Services
Safari Club International
San Diego County Wildlife Federation
San Francisco Bay Area Chapter - Safari Club International
Sparta Road Veterinary Clinic
Sugar Creel Veterinary Clinic
Thompson's Veterinary Center
Walnut Creek Veterinary Clinic
Mzuri Safari Club
Puppyspot Group, LLC
Riverside County Sheriff's Office
Tulare Basin Wetlands Association
Numerous Individuals

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The sponsors and a coalition of supporters note, "Despite California's existing laws prohibiting retail pet store sales of dogs, cats, and rabbits unless sourced from shelters or rescues, investigative reporting has revealed that a significant number of animals continue to enter the state through unregulated online sales conducted by predatory third-party sellers. These brokers act as middlemen for large-scale commercial breeding operations, commonly referred to as puppy and kitten mills, where animals often endure inhumane conditions, including overbreeding, lack of veterinary care, and poor living environments that result in severe health and behavioral issues."

"AB 519 provides a solution by defining brokers within California's pet laws and explicitly prohibiting them from selling or transferring-for-profit a dog, cat, or rabbit bred by another entity. Importantly, this bill does not impact consumers' ability to obtain pets from responsible breeders, shelters, or breed-specific rescues. Rather, it closes a predatory loophole that enables consumer fraud and perpetuates animal cruelty"

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, Black Brant Group, California Bowmen Hunters/State Archery Association, California Houndsmen for Conservation, California Rifle and Pistol Association, California Waterfowl Association, Delta Waterfowl, Ducks Unlimited, Safari Club International, San Diego County Wildlife Federation, San Francisco Bay Area Chapter - Safari Club International, Mzuri Safari Club, Tulare Basin Wetlands Association write in opposition and note, "We oppose this measure because it would unnecessarily limit the availability of hunting and other working dogs used by our members. While many hunters acquire their dogs (which include both puppies and started adult dogs) directly from a breeder, others may opt for assistance from third parties such as dog trainers, including through the use of a broker. Reasons for this would include, but are not limited to, the buyer not having sufficient connections, familiarity, or education regarding reputable breeders or adoption agencies - especially those from outside of California."

PuppySpot Group LLC, is opposed unless amended and notes, "AB 519, as written, threatens to dismantle this process and disrupt access to healthy, well-bred puppies for California families—particularly those seeking specific breed traits for allergy concerns, service animal needs, or personal preferences. We believe this bill penalizes responsible, transparent operations while doing little to prevent the underground or unregulated sales that put animal health and consumer trust at risk."

Pet Advocacy Network writes in opposition and notes, "Like you, we are committed to ending irresponsible breeding and improving animal welfare outcomes. However, rather than curbing unethical, unlicensed, and unregulated breeding, AB 519 would punish responsible, licensed brokers—many of whom are the most transparent and accountable actors in the pet marketplace—while doing little to stop the very sellers this bill seeks to address."

Numerous out-of-state veterinary clinics write in opposition and note, "In my capacity, I have examined, vaccinated, and cleared puppies for transport, ensuring their health and wellness prior to travel. Brokers that I have worked with operate

under strict animal welfare protocols and demonstrate a strong commitment to the safety and wellbeing of the animals in their care. Their services help breeders reach families throughout the state and the country, while maintaining high standards of health verification, transportation logistics, and placement integrity."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, 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, 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, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Ellis, Macedo, Ta, Tangipa

Prepared by: Elissa Silva / B., P. & E.D. / 916-651-4104
7/3/25 16:02:54

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 540
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 540
Author: Connolly (D)
Introduced: 2/11/25
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Motions: filing and service requirements

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill removes the two-day extension to procedural timelines where service is effectuated by electronic service.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines the following relevant terms:

   a) "Electronic service" means service of a document, on a person, by either electronic transmission of electronic notification; electronic service may be performed directly by a person, including a party or a person's attorney, or through an electronic service provider, and by a court.
   b) "Electronic transmission" means the transmission of a document by electronic means to the electronic service address at or through which a person receives electronic service.
   c) "Electronic notification" means the notification of the person that a document is served by sending an electronic message to the electronic address at or through which the person receives electronic service,

specifying the exact name of the document served, and providing a hyperlink at which the served document may be viewed and downloaded. (Code of Civil Procedure (Code Civ. Proc.) § 1010.6(a)(1).)

2) Permits electronic service of documents in a civil action, consistent with specified requirements, except that a document is required to be served by certified or registered mail, electronic service of the document is not authorized. (Code Civ. Proc.) § 1010.6(a).)

3) Provides for mandatory electronic service in a civil action as follows:

   a) The court may order electronic service on a person represented by counsel who has appeared in an action or proceeding.
   b) A person represented by counsel, who has appeared in an action or proceeding, shall accept electronic service of a notice or document that may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission.
   c) Before first serving a represented person electronically, the person effecting service shall confirm the appropriate electronic service address for the counsel being served.
   d) A person represented by counsel shall, upon request of any person who has appeared in an action or proceeding and who provides an electronic service address, electronically serve the requesting person with any notice or document that may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b).)

4) Provides that an unrepresented person may consent to electronic service in a civil action, provided that the person gave express consent; the unrepresented person may withdraw consent at any time by filing the appropriate Judicial Council form with the court. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(c).)

5) Provides that, on or after July 1, 2025, in any action in which a party or other person is subject to mandatory electronic service or has consented to electronic service, the court shall electronically transmit to such persons any document issued by the court that the court is required to transmit, deliver, or serve. This service shall have the same legal effect as service by mail except as provided. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(d).)

6) Provides that if a document may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission, electronic service of that document is deemed complete at the time of the electronic transmission of the document or

at the time that the electronic notification of service of the document is sent. Any period of notice, or any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended after service by electronic means by two court days, but the extension shall not apply to extend the time for filing any of the following:

a) A notice of intention to move for new trial.
b) A notice of intention to move to vacate judgment under Section 663a.
c) A notice of appeal.

7) Provides that notice and a motion for summary judgment must be served on all parties at least 81 days before the scheduled hearing, and that if the notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or another method of delivery providing for overnight delivery the required 81-day notice period is increased by two court days. (Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)(2).)

8) Provides that all moving and supporting papers for certain motions must be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing, and that if the notice of motion is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or another method of delivery providing for overnight delivery the required 16-day notice period is increased by two court days. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b).)

This bill removes the two-day extension to procedural timelines where service is effectuated by electronic service.

Background

The Code of Civil Procedure establishes various timelines for serving and filing notices and motions and supporting or responsive documentation. The relevant statutes extend these timelines in certain situations. For instance, if the notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or another method of delivery providing for overnight delivery, the relevant period is generally extended by two days.

Current law establishes rules and procedures for the electronic service of documents in civil cases, including providing which parties must make and accept, and which parties may elect to make and accept, service through electronic means. The relevant statute provides that any period of notice, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended after service by electronic means by two court days, except as specified. This bill clarifies that these two-day

extensions do not apply to electronic service. This bill is supported by the Child Support Directors Association of California. No timely opposition has been received.

Comments

Electronic service—which can be service by email or through an electronic filing service[1]—has come a long way in the past quarter of a century. Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6 (Section 1010.6), which governs electronic service in civil actions, was enacted in 1999 as a modest provision allowing trial courts to adopt local rules for electronic filing and service of documents and giving the Judicial Council until January 1, 2003, to adopt uniform rules of electronic filing and service.[2] As the internet became more ubiquitous and electronically transmitting documents became easier to do, Section 1010.6 grew to accommodate an increasing interest in electronic service.
Most of Section 1010.6 is directed at when parties may serve each other electronically. As a general rule, represented parties must accept electronic service, and serve any party electronically who requests it, whereas unrepresented parties cannot be served electronically unless they affirmatively consent to such service.[3]

Until 2021, Section 1010.6 stated only that courts may elect to electronically serve parties who had consented, or were required, to accept electronic service; there was no requirement that courts electronically serve anyone. Then in 2021, the Legislature enacted SB 241 (Umberg, Ch. 214, Stats. 2021) which, among other things, set a deadline for the courts to transmit documents electronically to parties who are required or have requested to accept electronic service. Specifically, SB 241 required courts to begin electronically transmitting, to parties required or consenting to accept electronic service, documents that the court is required to transmit, deliver, or serve, beginning July 1, 2024.[4] AB 2283 (Pacheco, Ch. 151, Stats. 2024) later extended this timeline by a year to July 1, 2025, and changed "transmit" to "serve."

Section 1010.6 further provides that any period of notice, or any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended after service by electronic means by two court days, except as specified.

---

[1] Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a).
[2] SB 367 (Dunn, Ch. 514, Stats. 1999).
[3] Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b), (c).)
[4] *See id.*, § 1010.6(d).

This bill removes this two-day extension.

Procedural timelines for service in civil actions. After the filing of a lawsuit, either party to an action may move for summary judgment by contending that the action has no merit or that there is no defense thereto. Essentially, the party filing the motion is claiming that all necessary factual issues are resolved and need not be tried by the court because they are so one-sided. A motion for summary judgment must be supported or opposed by admissible evidence such as affidavits, declarations, admissions, answers to interrogatories, depositions, and requests for judicial notice, as appropriate.

The law sets out specific timelines for filing and responding to motions for summary judgment. Currently, the motion may be filed anytime after 60 days have elapsed since the general appearance of the responding party. The motion must be served with supporting papers at least 81 days before the hearing. This timeline is increased by two court days if the notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or another method of delivery providing for overnight delivery.

This bill clarifies that this two-day extension does not apply to electronic service.

Existing law governing civil procedure establishes various timelines for serving and filing other notices and motions and supporting or responsive documentation. The relevant statutes extend these timelines in certain situations. Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. If the notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or another method of delivery providing for overnight delivery, that period is extended by two calendar days.

This bill clarifies that this two-day extension does not apply to electronic service.

According to the author:

> The purpose of AB 540 is to eliminate inconsistencies in civil procedure laws regarding electronic service deadlines. By explicitly stating that electronic service does not require an extension of the notice period, AB 540 streamlines litigation procedures, reduces confusion, and ensures fairness among parties using different service methods. The bill amends the Code of Civil Procedure to make these clarifications and conform procedural rules accordingly.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

Child Support Directors Association of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Child Support Directors Association of California writes:

[This] bill removes ambiguity by confirming that electronic service of motions does not trigger additional notice periods—an update that not only reflects current practice but also reduces unnecessary delays in proceedings that deeply impact the families we serve.

By authoring AB 540, you have helped ensure that child support cases can move forward without the risk of procedural confusion over filing timelines. This bill will make a real and positive difference in the lives of parents and children across the state.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/1/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Essayli, 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, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bennett, Davies, Wicks

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/7/25 15:50:02

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 574
Author: Mark González (D), et al.
Amended: 6/16/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/11/25
AYES: Menjivar, Durazo, Grove, Limón, Padilla, Richardson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares, Gonzalez, Rubio, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-1, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SUBJECT: Prior authorization: physical therapy

SOURCE: California Physical Therapy Association

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a health plan or insurer that provides coverage for physical therapy from requiring prior authorization for the initial 12 physical therapy treatments for a new condition.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) to regulate health plans under the Knox-Keene Health Care Services Plan Act of 1975; the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to regulate health and other insurers; the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to administer the Medi-Cal program. [Healthy and Safety Code (HSC) §1340, et seq., Insurance Code (INS) §106, et seq., and Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC) §14000, et seq.]

2) Requires the criteria or guidelines used by health plans and insurers, or any entities with which plans or insurers contract for utilization review or

utilization management functions, to determine whether to authorize, modify, or deny health care services to:

a) Be developed with involvement from actively practicing health care providers;
b) Be consistent with sound clinical principles and processes;
c) Be evaluated, and updated if necessary, at least annually;
d) If used as the basis of a decision to modify, delay, or deny services in a specified case under review, be disclosed to the provider and the enrollee or insured in that specified case; and,
e) Be available to the public upon request. [HSC §1363.5 and INS §10123.135]

3) Requires health plans and insurers, and any contracted entity that performs utilization review or utilization management functions, prospectively, retrospectively, or concurrently, based on medical necessity requests to comply with specified requirements, including a decision within five business days of receiving reasonable information to make a decision, conducting retrospective review within 30 days and decisions associated with imminent and serious threat within 72 hours or sooner. [HSC §1367.01 and INS §10123.135]

4) Prohibits any individual, other than a licensed physician or a licensed health care professional who is competent to evaluate the specific clinical issues involved in the health care services requested by the provider, from denying or modifying requests for authorization of services for an enrollee or insured for reasons of medical necessity. Requires the decision to be communicated to the provider within 24 hours of the decision, and the enrollee or insured (in writing) within two business days of the decision. In the case of concurrent review, prohibits discontinuance of care until the treating provider has been notified and has agreed to a care plan that is appropriate for the medical needs of the patient. [HSC §1367.01 and INS §10123.135]

5) Establishes requirements for health plans and insurers that use an artificial intelligence (AI), algorithm, or other software tool for utilization review or utilization management functions, and prohibits the AI, algorithm, or other software tool from denying, delaying, or modifying health care services based in whole or in part on medical necessity. [HSC §1367.01 and INS §10123.135]

6) Requires a health plan contract or health insurance policy to require that, when an enrollee or insured receives covered services from a contracting health facility, at which, or as a result of which, the enrollee or insured receives

covered services provided by a noncontracting health professional, the enrollee or insured to pay the same cost sharing required if the services were provided by a contracting health professional. Permits, if an enrollee or insured has coverage for out-of-network benefits, a noncontracting health professional to bill or collect from the enrollee or insured the out-of-network cost-sharing, if applicable, only when the enrollee or insured consents in writing and the written consent demonstrates satisfaction of specified criteria, such as:

a) At least 24 hours in advance of care, the enrollee or insured consents in writing to receive services from the identified noncontracting individual health professional;
b) The consent is obtained in a document that is separate from the document used to obtain the consent for any other part of the care or procedure, not be obtained by the facility or any representative of the facility, and not obtained at the time of admission or at any time when the enrollee or insured is being prepared for surgery or any other procedure;
c) At the time consent is provided, the noncontracting individual health professional gives the enrollee or insured a written estimate of the total out-of-pocket cost of care, based on the professional's billed charges for the service to be provided. The noncontracting individual health professional cannot attempt to collect more than the estimated amount without receiving separate written consent unless circumstances arise during delivery of services that were unforeseeable at the time the estimate was given that would require the provider to change the estimate;
d) The consent to advise the enrollee or insured that he or she may elect to seek care from a contracted provider or may contact the health plan or insurer to arrange to receive the health service from a contracted provider for lower out-of-pocket costs;
e) The consent and estimate is provided to the enrollee or insured in the language spoken by the enrollee, if the language is a Medi-Cal threshold language, as defined; and,
f) The consent to also advise the enrollee or insured that any costs incurred as a result of the enrollee's or insured's use of the out-of-network benefit are in addition to in-network cost-sharing amounts and may not count toward the annual out-of-pocket maximum on in-network benefits or a deductible, if any, for in-network benefits. [HSC §1371.9 and INS §10112.8]

7) Protects the enrollee and subscriber from liability to the provider for any sums owed by the plan for covered services. [HSC §1379]

8) Defines "Medi-Cal threshold languages" to mean primary languages spoken by limited-English-proficient (LEP) population groups meeting a numeric threshold of 3,000, eligible LEP Medi-Cal enrollees residing in a county, 1,000 Medi-Cal eligible LEP enrollees residing in a single ZIP Code, or 1,500 LEP Medi-Cal enrollees residing in two contiguous ZIP Codes. [HSC §128552]

9) Permits a person to initiate physical therapy treatment directly from a licensed physical therapist, within the physical therapists' scope of practice, if specified conditions are met, including:

    a) Requires the physical therapist to refer to other specified health professionals if there is reason to believe the patient has a condition that is beyond their scope of practice or not progressing, as specified;
    b) Requires disclosure of financial interests, as specified;
    c) Requires notification of the patient's physician and surgeon, with patient authorization; and,
    d) Prohibits the physical therapist from continuing treatment beyond 45 calendar days or 12 visits, whichever occurs first, without a signature on plan of care from specified physicians. [BPC §2620.1]

10) States nothing in 9) above requires a health plan, insurer, workers' compensation insurance plan, employer, or state program to provide coverage for direct access to treatment by a physical therapist, and requires specified disclosures to the patient. [BPC §2620.1]

This bill:

1) Prohibits a health care plan contract or health insurance policy issued, amended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2027, that provides coverage for physical therapy from requiring prior authorization for the initial 12 physical therapy treatment visits for a new condition.

2) Authorizes, for a recurring condition, the plan or insurer to impose prior authorization if the individual seeks care within 180 days of their last physical therapy intervention for that condition.

3) Requires, prior to treatment, a physical therapy provider to verify the coverage and disclose the cost-sharing, including the maximum out-of-pocket expense that may be charged per visit if the plan or insurer denies coverage for services rendered. Requires the disclosure to encourage the enrollee or insured to contact the plan or insurer for coverage information and indicate that by signing the separate written consent, an enrollee or insured does not give up

any rights otherwise applicable under the law. Requires the physical therapy provider to also disclose if the physical therapy provider is not in the network of the enrollee's health plan or health insurer.

4) Requires the provider, for costs that may not be covered by the plan contract or insurance policy, to obtain separate written consent that includes a written estimate of the cost of care for which the enrollee or insured is responsible if coverage is denied or otherwise not applicable. Requires the consent document and cost estimate to be provided in the language spoken by the enrollee or insured if the language is a Medi-Cal threshold language.

5) Indicates a noncontracting individual health professional providing services at a contracting health facility is not exempt from the requirements of existing law regarding payment for covered services at a contracted facility provided by a noncontracting provider.

6) Exempts a Medi-Cal managed care plan that contracts with DHCS.

Comments

Author's statement. According to the author, barriers to medically necessary physical therapy present significant challenges for patients seeking to recover. Such barriers can negatively impact patient outcomes and hinder the effective delivery of health care. For example, patients in chronic pain may be forced to rely on painkillers while waiting for authorization to proceed with prescribed therapy. Some insurers base prior authorization and utilization review decisions on provider profiles or computer algorithms rather than the patient's specific medical needs. Currently, there is no practical accountability for insurers or third-party utilization management companies when a denied or delayed physical therapy treatment results in negative patient outcomes. These delays and denials frequently lead to reductions in the frequency and duration of prescribed treatments. Additionally, the appeals process is often lengthy, making it untimely for patients in need of care.

Background

Physical Therapy. According to the Physical Therapy Board of California (PTBC) a physical therapist is a licensed health care professional who evaluates a patient's physical status, establishes a plan of care and goals, then administers treatments to promote optimal health. Physical therapists seek to relieve pain, improve the body's movement and function, maintain cardiopulmonary function, and limit disabilities resulting from injury or disease. Physical

therapists, as part of the evaluation, will among other things, take a patient's health history, observe a patient's posture and movement or any limitations a patient may have, and use their hands to palpate and evaluate problem areas. From this evaluation, the physical therapist then establishes a plan of care with goals and an estimated time to expect these goals to be achieved. Physical therapists practice in a wide variety of settings, including hospitals, rehabilitation clinics, private practices, home care, and schools. Treatment may include, but is not limited to: therapeutic use of hands, exercise programs, application of therapeutic modalities such as ultrasound and electrical stimulation, training in daily living activities, and patient education.

Delays and cost. This bill's sponsor, the California Physical Therapy Association (CPTA), submitted two studies that suggest delays in access to physical therapy increase health care costs to the system. One study by Horn and Fritz (2018) published in BMC Health Services Research indicated there was an association with the timing of physical therapy consultation on healthcare utilization and costs, where later consultation was associated with increased costs and healthcare utilization. Specifically the increased utilization and costs were related to opioid prescription, MRI and CT Scans. Another study by Childs, et al. (2015) in BMC Health Services Research showed that early referral to guideline adherent physical therapy was associated with significantly lower utilization for all outcomes and 60% lower total lower back pain-related costs.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 931 (Irwin of 2023) was substantially similar to this bill. AB 931 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, who wrote in the veto message:

> Beginning January 1, 2025, this bill would prohibit a health plan or insurer from requiring prior authorization for the initial 12 physical therapy treatment visits for a new episode of care. The bill would also require that, prior to treatment, the provider verify an enrollee's coverage and disclose the enrollee's cost sharing, maximum out-of-pocket expense per visit, and whether the provider is in-network for the enrollee.
>
> I appreciate the author's intent to increase access to physical therapy treatment. However, prior authorization, when applied appropriately, can be an important tool to contain health care costs, protect patients from unanticipated billing, and ensure medically necessary care. Further, existing law requires health plans to provide appointments within a timely access minimum standard, even when prior authorization is required.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

California Physical Therapy Association (source)
Benicia Bay Physical Therapy
California Chronic Care Coalition
National Multiple Sclerosis Society
U.S. Pain Foundation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

Association of Life and Health Insurance Companies
California Association of Health Plans

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Source, CPTA writes this bill prevents unnecessary reviews and administrative burden and allows prompt access to medically necessary physical therapy treatment by allowing patients to receive up to 12 visits before being interrupted in the treatment by authorization requirements that often delay access to vital care. CPTA believes filing a complaint with DMHC is ineffective remedy because it results in the delays and stoppages in care that produce poor outcomes. CPTA says 12 visits is a number consistent with research and studies indicating that most conditions resolve within this treatment range. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society writes that physical therapists play an integral role in the management of multiple sclerosis throughout the disease course, and, this bill will help patients more efficiently access physical therapy in a timely manner and contribute significantly to their quality of life. The California Advocacy Team of the U.S. Pain Foundation writes this bill addresses one of the most significant barriers to recovery for individuals living with chronic pain and other disabling conditions: delays in care caused by unnecessary prior authorization processes. They also indicate that timely access to physical therapy is critical for improving outcomes, minimizing opioid reliance, and reducing overall health care costs.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Association of Health Plans and the Association of Life and Health Insurance Companies believe this bill would undermine the prior authorization process by allowing up to 12 visits without oversight or review by the health plan or physician. The opposition writes that this would grant unfettered access to physical therapy, restricting the plan or insurer's ability to determine medical necessity or follow standard clinical guidelines. The opposition is concerned patients may receive unnecessary and/or inappropriate treatment not tailored to the patient's needs.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-1, 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, 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, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Ta, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gabriel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Stefani, Tangipa

Prepared by: Teri Boughton / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
7/1/25 16:32:12

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 583
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 583
Author: Pellerin (D)
Amended: 4/7/25 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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/8/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Death certificates

SOURCE: California Association for Nurse Practitioners

DIGEST: This bill adds nurse practitioners (NPs) to the list of health care practitioners last in attendance who are required to complete and attest to the medical and health section and time of death on a death certificate in specified facilities, and imposes the same requirements on NPs that are currently placed on physicians and physician assistants for the purpose of reporting deaths. Requires NPs to notify the coroner when they have knowledge of a death under certain specified circumstances.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires each death to be registered with the local registrar of births and deaths in the district in which the death was officially pronounced or the body was found, within eight calendar days after death and prior to any disposition of the human remains. Requires the California Department of Public Health (CDPH)

to implement an internet-based electronic death registration system for the creation, storage, and transfer of death registration information. [Health &Safety Code (HSC) §102775 and §102778]

2) Requires the medical and health section data and the time of death to be completed and attested to by the physician last in attendance, or in the case of a patient in a skilled nursing facility (SNF) or intermediate care facility (ICF), by the physician last in attendance or by a physician assistant (PA) under the supervision of the physician last in attendance if the physician or licensed physician assistant is legally authorized to certify and attest to these facts, and if the physician assistant has visited the patient within 72 hours of the patient's death. [HSC §102795]

3) Requires the medical and health section data and the physician's or coroner's certification to be completed by the attending physician within 15 hours after the death, or by the coroner within three days after examination of the body. Requires the physician to, within 15 hours after the death, deposit the certificate at the place of death, or deliver it to the attending funeral director at his or her place of business or at the office of the physician. [HSC §102800]

4) Requires the physician last in attendance, or in the case of a patient in a SNF or ICF at the time of death, the physician last in attendance or a PA under the supervision of the physician last in attendance, on a deceased person to state on the certificate of death the disease or condition directly leading to death, antecedent causes, other significant conditions contributing to death and any other medical and health section data as may be required on the certificate. Requires he or she to specify the time in attendance, the last time he or she saw the deceased person alive, and the hour and day on which the death occurred, except in death required to be investigated by the coroner. [HSC §102825]

5) Requires a physician, PA, funeral director, or other person to immediately notify the coroner when he or she has knowledge of a death that occurred or has charge of a body in which death occurred under any of the following circumstances:

    a) Without medical attendance;
    b) During continued absence of the attending physician;
    c) Where the attending physician or the PA is unable to state the cause of death;
    d) Where suicide is suspected;

e) Following an injury or an accident; and,
f) Under circumstances as to afford a reasonable ground to suspect that the death was caused by the criminal act of another. [HSC §102850]

This bill:

1) Adds NPs to the list of health care practitioners last in attendance who are required to complete and attest to the medical and health section and time of death on a death certificate in specified facilities, and imposes the same requirements on NPs that are currently placed on physicians and PAs for the purpose of reporting deaths.

2) Requires NPs to notify the coroner when they have the knowledge of a death under certain specified circumstances.

Comments

According to the author of this bill:

> This bill is personal. My family and I were unable to have a proper funeral for my father when he passed because of the delay in obtaining his death certificate. As such, we had a celebration of life, without his body, without his ashes. A death certificate is required for various legal purposes. This includes filing life insurance claims, closing bank accounts, and transferring property ownership. Further, a grieving family is unable to plan a funeral without a death certificate. California is one of a handful of states that bars nurse practitioners from being able to sign the death certificate of a patient they have cared for until their passing. Current law only allows physicians to sign death certificates, even though they may have *never* cared for or seen the patient. This bill will allow an NP to carry out the duties related to death registration and death certificate signatures.

Background

Licensed NPs. According to the California Board of Registered Nursing (Board), an NP is an advanced practice registered nurse who meets Board education and certification requirements and possesses additional advanced practice educational preparation and skills in physical diagnosis, psycho-social assessment, and management of health-illness needs in primary care, and/or acute care. AB 890 (Wood, Chapter 265, Statutes of 2020) created two new categories of NPs that can function within a defined scope of practice without standardized procedures. These new categories of NPs are "103 NP" and "104 NP." 103 NPs must work in a group

setting with at least one physician and surgeon, while 104 NPs may work independently within the population focus of their National Certification.

Death certificates. California death certificates are a legal document that contains information about the deceased person, their family, and the circumstances of their death. These certificates are not only a means of documenting the death but also serve important functions in legal and personal affairs. CA.gov states that a certified copy of a death certificate can typically be used to obtain death benefits, claim insurance proceeds, notify social security, and other legal purposes.

Death registration process. The death registration process begins via an internet-based EDRS, with the physician last in attendance completing the medical and health section data portion of the certificate, except in deaths required to be investigated by the coroner. The funeral director then obtains the required information other than the medical and health data to prepare the death certificate and register it with the local registrar. The local registrar examines each death certificate before acceptance of registration upon receipt and, if the certificate is properly completed, then may issue a burial permit. CDPH then examines the certificates received from the local registrar. Individuals can request a certified copy of death certificates from CPDH – Vital Records.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1108 (Hart, 2025) prohibits, in any county in which the offices of the sheriff and the coroner are combined, the sheriff-coroner from determining the circumstances, manner, and cause of death for an in-custody death. Instead requires the sheriff-coroner to contract with another county that has a coroner's office that operates independently from the office of the sheriff, another county that has established an office of medical examiner, or a third-party medical examination provider that is separate and independent from the office of the sheriff-coroner to determine the circumstances, manner, and cause of death. AB 1108 is set for hearing on July 1, 2025 in the Senate Public Safety Committee.

AB 890 (Wood, Chapter 265, Statutes of 2020) authorizes NPs who meet certain education, experience, and certification requirements to perform, in certain settings or organizations, specified functions without standardized procedures, including ordering, performing, and interpreting diagnostic procedures, certifying disability, and prescribing, administering dispensing, and furnishing controlled substances. Authorizes NPs to perform those foundations without standardized procedures outside of specified settings or organizations in accordance with specified conditions and requirements.

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

Senate Rule 28.8

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

California Association for Nurse Practitioners (source)
AARP
American Association of Nurse Practitioners
American Nurses Association
Board of Registered Nursing
California Association of Health Facilities
California Association of Long Term Care Medicine
California Association of Nurse Anesthesiology
California Funeral Directors' Association
California Long Term Care Ombudsman Association
Northern California Chapter of the Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association
Eight individuals

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The sponsor of this bill, the California Association for Nurse Practitioners, along with supporters write that in many settings, NPs are the primary providers that care for a patient prior to their death, yet they do not have authority to sign off on death certificates or perform duties related to death registration. These duties are often left to physicians, who oftentimes have never cared for or seen the patient prior to their death. In cases where an NP was the primary provider caring for the patient prior to their passing, a physician would have to spend potentially hours reviewing a patient's records to carry out these duties related to death registration. The necessary forms thereby sit on the physicians' desk until they are able to step away from direct patient care and focus on administrative tasks. Obtaining a physician's signature can take weeks, compounding the grief families are navigating and delaying the opportunity to make funeral arrangements and handle other legal matters such as filing insurance claims, closing bank accounts, or accessing federal veteran benefits. AARP states that if passed, California would join 40 other states in allowing NPs to perform this task. California Long-Term Care Ombudsman Association highlights that in long-term care facilities, it is often the NP who is more involved in the residents' care

and therefore has the most information about the resident's death because there are typically more NPs working in the facility than physicians.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/8/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, 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, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Boerner, Ellis, Garcia, Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Margarita Niemann / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
7/3/25 15:21:18

****** 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 627
Author: Stefani (D), et al.
Amended: 7/3/25 in Senate
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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Health Facilities Financing Authority Act

SOURCE: California State Treasurer Fiona Ma

DIGEST: This bill repeals the requirement that working capital loans made by the California Health Facilities Financing Authority to health facilities be repaid within two years.

Senate Floor Amendments make technical changes and adds a co-author.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the California Health Facilities Financing Authority (CHFFA), consisting of nine members, led by the State Treasurer who serves as the chair, and the executive director, who is appointed by the State Treasurer. States the intent of the Legislature to provide financing to health institutions that can demonstrate the financial feasibility of their projects, and that any savings experienced by the health institution be passed on to the consuming public

through lower charges or containment of the rate of increase in hospital rates. [Government Code (GOV) §15430, et seq.]

2) Permits CHFFA, among other powers, to make secured or unsecured loans to any participating health institution in connection with the financing of a project or working capital. Requires CHFFA to establish financial eligibility standards by studying creditworthiness and earning capacity of each project, together with the amount of pledged revenues, debt service coverage, and basic security. [GOV §15437 and §15438]

3) Defines "participating health institution," for purposes of being able to participate in CHFFA financing mechanisms, as a city or county, a district hospital, or a nonprofit corporation that operates a health facility (which is broadly defined to include clinics, community care facilities, adult day health centers, and other types of settings), and that undertakes the financing of the construction, renovation, furnishing, or equipping of, or financing or refinancing the acquisition of, a health facility. [GOV §15432(e) and (f)]

4) Defines "working capital" as moneys to be used by, or on behalf of, a participating health institution to pay or prepay maintenance or operation expenses or any other costs that would be treated as an expense item, under generally accepted accounting principles, in connection with the ownership or operation of a health facility, including, but not limited to, reserves for maintenance or operation expenses, and interest not to exceed two years on any loan for working capital. [GOV §15432(h)]

5) Requires a participating health institution that is a private nonprofit corporation or association and that borrows money to finance working capital, other than as part of the cost of a project, to repay and discharge the loan within 24 months of the loan date. [GOV §15451.5]

6) Prohibits revenue bonds issued under CHFFA from being deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the state, or a pledge of the faith and credit of the state. Requires bonds issued by CHFFA to contain a statement to the effect that neither the State of California nor CHFFA shall be obligated to pay the principal, or the interest, except from the revenues of CHFFA. [GOV §15443]

This bill:

1) Repeals the limitation that working capital loans offered by CHFFA be only two years in length.

2) Requires CHFFA to establish financial eligibility standards for working capital loans by studying the creditworthiness of a participating health institution, together with the amount of pledged revenues, debt service coverage, and basic security.

3) Prohibits a participating health institution that is determined by CHFFA to be in financial distress from being deemed financially eligible for working capital loans.

4) Makes a legislative finding and declaration that the purpose of this bill is to provide creditworthy nonprofit participating health institutions, cost-effective, future financing tools at their disposal.

Comments

Author's statement. According to the author, this bill will allow CHFFA to provide long-term working capital financings for private, nonprofit health institutions. CHFFA is a conduit issuer of tax-exempt and taxable bonds to nonprofit participating health institutions. The CHFFA Act authorizes the financing of a broad range of project expenditures, including construction, acquisition, and working capital. Working capital expenses cover costs such as salaries and benefits, operating lease payments, debt service payments, and other essential operational expenses. However, working capital financings under CHFFA's Act are limited to a 24-month term. This restriction means that creditworthy health institutions with longer-term working capital needs cannot utilize this type of financing to address their ongoing requirements through CHFFA. This limitation does not apply to other financing entities under the State Treasurer's Office. This bill would provide an important financing tool to ensure that private, nonprofit health institutions in California have the resources necessary, at a time when it is uncertain how federal policies will impact California's health system, to reconfigure income streams and adjust practices and to navigate short-term changes in revenue.

Background

Background on existing CHFFA programs. CHFFA was created to be the state's vehicle for providing financial assistance to public and nonprofit health care providers primarily through loans funded by the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. To this end, CHFFA administers the Bond Financing Program and the Tax-Exempt Equipment Financing Program. CHFFA also provides direct loans to small and

rural health facilities through the Healthcare Expansion Loan Program (HELP) II Financing Program. In September of 2021, the Governor signed into law the Nondesignated Public Hospital Bridge Loan Program to enable CHFFA to issue up to $40 million in interest-free, working capital loans to certain hospitals that were affected by financial delays associated with the transition to the Quality Incentive Program. An additional $40 million was allocated as part of the Budget Act of 2022 for a second round of the bridge loans. These Nondesignated Public Hospital Bridge Loans are required to be paid back in two years, and are secured by Medi-Cal reimbursements. Additionally, CHFFA administers several grant programs, including the Children's Hospital Programs, the Community Services Infrastructure Grant Program, and the Investment in Mental Health Wellness Grant Program. Under the Mental Health Wellness grant program, counties can apply for funding to develop a continuum of crisis services to children and youth up to 21 years of age in four categories: crisis residential treatment, crisis stabilization, mobile crisis support teams, and family respite care. There was an initial allocation of about $40 million for this Mental Health Wellness grant program.

By borrowing through CHFFA's tax-exempt bond financing program, health facilities can generally obtain lower interest rates than they would through conventional bonds. The types of facilities eligible for CHFFA financing are government-run or non-profit, licensed health facilities in California, including adult day health centers, community clinics, skilled nursing facilities, developmentally disabled centers, hospitals, and drug and alcohol rehabilitation centers. Proceeds from CHFFA financing may be used for project-related costs, including: construction; remodeling and renovation; land acquisition (as part of the proposed project); acquisition of existing health facilities; purchase or lease of equipment; refinancing or refunding of prior debt; working capital for start-up facilities; costs of bond issuance; feasibility studies; and reimbursement of prior expenses. Under statute, savings resulting from issuance of tax-exempt bonds for borrowers must be transferred to the consuming public through lower or contained costs for delivery of health services. Since its first bond issuance in 1981, CHFFA's bond financing program has issued 639 bonds for an aggregate total of approximately $46 billion, with 275 health facilities availing themselves of this financing.

Background provided by CHFFA. According to CHFFA, working capital financings secured through CHFFA have the potential to provide support to hospitals that need additional financial breathing room to pay for salaries, benefits, debt service payments, lease payments, and other essential operating expenses at a time when it is uncertain how federal policies will impact California's health

system. Working capital financing can help hospitals reconfigure income streams and adjust practices and to navigate short-term changes in revenue. However, a major limitation for long-term planning and flexibility is the limited term for which these financings must be repaid (24 months). Compared to financings available through the California Educational Facilities Authority and other financing entities under the State Treasurer's Office (which have no time limit on the repayment period), CHFFA is an underutilized tool due to limitations on financing terms. Applicants usually aim for multi-decade repayment timelines to spread the short-term costs across numerous years. Unfortunately, because CHFFA cannot accommodate these applications, credit worthy health facilities must turn to other lenders who typically have higher costs and are less effective and less transparent, leading to larger overall costs. CHFFA's stakeholders' most requested financing tool was long-term working capital financing.

Related/Prior legislation

AB 2098 (Garcia of 2024) would have extended the repayment period for specified bridge loans for district hospitals, made through CHFFA under authorization and funding from the 2022 Budget Act and which are required to be repaid within two years of the date of the loan, to instead require hospitals to make monthly payments within 24 months of the date of the loan, and for the loan to be repaid within 72 months of the date of the loan. AB 2098 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, who stated, "Hospitals are critical to the health and safety of our communities, and it is a priority of my Administration to assist hospitals that are struggling financially. For this reason, together with the Legislature, we funded the Public Hospital Bridge Loan Program II with $40 million, and we authorized $300 million for the Distressed Hospital Loan Program (DHLP). Many of the hospitals affected by this bill received both. While I support efforts to ensure loan repayment requirements are feasible, this bill would advantage one set of hospital loans above others that did not receive such an extension. Extending the timeline for the repayment will affect our budget structure in the out years, and would be better discussed as part of the annual budget process."

AB 2637 (Schiavo of 2024) was substantially similar to this bill. AB 2637 was vetoed by Governor Newsom, who stated, "Hospitals are critical to the health and safety of our communities, and it is a priority of my Administration to assist hospitals that are struggling financially. For this reason, together with the Legislature, we authorized $300 million for the DHLP to offer zero-interest loans to eligible financially distressed hospitals. While I support efforts to ensure loan repayment requirements are feasible, this bill would result in an open-ended

timeframe without any required end date that loans must be repaid. Extending the timeline for the recoupment of CHFFA loans would be better discussed as a part of the annual budget process."

AB 112 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 6, Statutes of 2023), established the DHLP to provide interest free cash-flow loans to not-for-profit hospitals and public hospitals, as defined, in significant financial distress, or to governmental entities representing closed hospitals. Requires HCAI to administer the DHLP and to enter into an interagency agreement with CHFFA to implement the DHLP.

SB 45 (Roth of 2023) would have established the California Acute Care Psychiatric Hospital Loan Fund to provide zero-interest loans to qualifying county applicants for the purpose of constructing or renovating acute care psychiatric hospitals or psychiatric health facilities, or renovating or expanding general acute care hospitals in order to add or expand an inpatient psychiatric unit. SB 45 was held on the Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file.

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

Senate Rule 28.8

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

California State Treasurer Fiona Ma (Source)
California Children's Hospital Association
California Hospital Association
California Special Districts Association
California Primary Care Association Advocates

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is sponsored by California State Treasurer Fiona Ma, who states that under federal tax law, it is possible to issue long-term tax-exempt bonds to finance working capital, but the current CHFFA Act includes restrictions that limit bond repayment terms to 24 months for working capital. CHFFA is able to connect nonprofit health institutions with third party investors for capital/infrastructure projects, but the 24-month limit for working capital has severely limited the ability of this financial tool to support health institutions.

The California Hospital Association (CHA) states that this bill would enable CHFFA to serve more effectively as a one-stop shop for hospitals and other providers seeking both short- and long-term financing support. CPCA Advocates states that health centers and clinics operate on very thin margins, and finances are often one of the major challenges that prevent health centers from expanding care, providing salary increases to their existing workforce, and attempting to attract new workforce. This bill would give community health centers more time and flexibility to repay and discharge a loan to address operational expenses. The California Children's Hospital Association states in support that their members face periodic cash flow issues due to the timing of Medi-Cal supplemental payments, and they would greatly benefit from being able to access long-term working capital tax-exempt financing through CHFFA to help support operations.

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: Vincent D. Marchand / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
7/7/25 16:11:57

****** 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 Democratic Renters Council
California Housing Partnership
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc.
City of West Hollywood
Coalition for Economic Survival
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
6/30/25 9:12:14

****** 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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 656
Author: Schiavo (D), et al.
Amended: 6/23/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Account cancellation

SOURCE: Consumer Federation of California

DIGEST: This bill requires large social media platforms to provide users with a clear and accessible mechanism for deleting their accounts and associated personal information.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1798.100 et seq.)

2) Establishes the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 (CPRA), which amends the CCPA and creates the PPA, which is charged with implementing these privacy laws, promulgating regulations, and carrying out enforcement actions. (Civ. Code § 798.100 et seq.; Proposition 24 (2020).)

3) Provides consumers the right to request that a business delete any personal information about the consumer which the business has collected from the consumer. (Civ. Code § 1798.105(a).)

4) Defines "personal information" as information that identifies, relates to, describes, is reasonably capable of being associated with, or could reasonably be linked, directly or indirectly, with a particular consumer or household. It does not include publicly available information or lawfully obtained, truthful information that is a matter of public concern. (Civ. Code § 1798.140(v).)

5) Defines "dark pattern" as a user interface designed or manipulated with the substantial effect of subverting or impairing user autonomy, decision making, or choice, as further defined by regulation. (Civ. Code § 1798.140(l).)

6) Defines "social media platform" as a public or semipublic internet-based service or application that has users in California and that meets the following criteria:

    a) A substantial function of the service or application is to connect users in order to allow users to interact socially with each other within the service or application. A service or application that provides email or direct messaging services shall not be considered to meet this criterion on the basis of that function alone.
    b) The service or application allows users to do specified things, including constructing a profile and creating or posting content viewable by other users. (Business and Professions Code (Bus. & Prof. Code) § 22675 (f).)

7) Permits amendment of the CPRA by a majority vote of each house of the Legislature and the signature of the Governor provided such amendments are consistent with and further the purpose and intent of this act as set forth therein. (Proposition 24 § 25 (2020).)

This bill:

1) Requires a social media platform to provide a clear and conspicuous button that enables the user to delete their account that meets both of the following:

    a) Is clearly and conspicuously placed as an immediately visible option in the social media platform's settings menu with the words "Delete Account."

b) The menu containing the button is accessible in the application, on a browser, or on any other format that a user can use to access the platform.

2) Provides that, if a user clicks on the button, the platform must permit a user to complete a deletion of the user's account but may seek confirmation of the request through immediate two-factor authentication delivered by email, text message, telephone call, or message.

3) Prohibits a social media platform from using dark patterns to interfere with a user's ability to delete their account.

4) Requires the platform to treat a user's decision to delete an account while logged in to that account as a verified consumer request from a consumer to delete the consumer's personal information pursuant to the CCPA.

5) Includes a severability clause and prohibits any waiver hereof.

6) Defines the relevant terms, including:

a) "Clearly and conspicuously" has the same meaning as defined in Section 17601 of the Business and Professions Code.
b) "Dark pattern" and "personal information" have the same meaning as in the CCPA.
c) "Social media platform" means a social media platform, as defined in Section 22675 of the Business and Professions Code, that generates more than $100,000,000 per year in gross revenues.

Background

The CCPA, amended by CPRA, grants a set of rights to consumers with regard to their personal information, including the right to delete certain information collected from consumers. Given the reach of social media and the increasing role they play in many children's lives, concerns have arisen over the connection between social media usage and mental health, drug use, and other self-harming conduct.

This bill seeks to make the process of cutting ties with the largest social media platforms easier and more accessible. It requires platforms to provide users with a clear and conspicuous button that enables them to fully delete their accounts and to treat it as a verified consumer request to delete pursuant to the CCPA. Platforms are prohibited from using any dark patterns to interfere with this ability.

This bill is sponsored by the Consumer Federation of California. It is supported by several advocacy organizations, including Oakland Privacy. This bill is opposed by industry groups, including Technet.

Comments

The effects of social media on our mental health and what should and can be done about it are pressing policy and societal questions that have become increasingly urgent. Evidence shows that engagement on social media has a clear effect on our emotions and overall wellbeing. There is a staggering volume of research and reporting supporting these concerns.[1] By now this is well known to policymakers and the platforms themselves. Facebook's own internal research found "1 in 8 of its users reported compulsive social media use that interfered with their sleep, work, and relationships— what the social media platform calls 'problematic use' but is more commonly known as 'internet addiction.'"[2] The amount of time users spend on these platforms is stunning: "On average, people spend about 143 minutes (that's 2 hours and 23 minutes) on social media every day. That's almost 2.5 hours per day spent scrolling through different platforms. Teenagers are the biggest users, especially teenage girls, who spend nearly 3 hours a day on social media."[3]

Cutting the cord. Given the addictive relationship that many people have with social media, including many children, it is all the more imperative that the ability to disconnect with platforms be streamlined and easily accessible. While the CCPA currently provides the right to deletion of information collected from a user, research suggests that many platforms purposefully make it difficult to navigate account settings to actually delete accounts and the information associated with them; the report had four main findings:

---

[1] Adam D. I. Kramer et al., *Experimental Evidence of Massive-Scale Emotional Contagion through Social Networks* (June 17, 2014) Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 111, No. 24, **https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1320040111**; Zaheer Hussain and Mark D Griffiths, *Problematic Social Networking Site Use and Comorbid Psychiatric Disorders: A Systematic Review of Recent Large-Scale Studies*." (December 14, 2018) Frontiers in psychiatry vol. 9 686, **https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6302102/pdf/fpsyt-09-00686.pdf**; Jeff Horowitz & Deepa Seetharaman, *Facebook Executives Shut Down Efforts to Make the Site Less Divisive* (May 26, 2020) Wall Street Journal, **https://www.wsj.com/articles/facebook-knows-it-encourages-division-top-executives-nixed-solutions-11590507499**; Georgia Wells et al., *Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Teen Girls, Company Documents Show* (September 14, 2021) The Wall Street Journal, **https://www.wsj.com/articles/facebook-knows-instagram-is-toxic-for-teen-girls-company-documents-show-11631620739?mod=article_inline**. All internet citations are current as of June 24, 2025.

[2] Kim Lyons, *Facebook reportedly is aware of the level of 'problematic use' among its users* (November 6, 2021) The Verge, **www.theverge.com/2021/11/6/22766935/facebook-meta-aware-problematic-use-addiction-wellbeing**.

[3] Robin Geuens, *What is the average time spent on social media each day?* (Sept. 5, 2024) Soax, **https://soax.com/research/time-spent-on-social-media**.

> First, account deletion options vary considerably across platforms and the language used to describe these options is not always clear. Most platforms offer account deletion on desktop browsers but not all allow account deletion from mobile apps or browsers. Second, we found evidence of several dark patterns present in the account deletion interfaces and platform policies. Third, most participants had tried to delete at least one social media account, yet over one-third of deletion attempts were never completed. Fourth, users mostly agreed that they did not want platforms to have access to deleted account data.[4]

This bill addresses the problem by requiring social media platforms to provide users a clear and conspicuous button that enables the user to delete their account. To avoid the issues cited in the above report, this bill makes clear that the option must be accessible in any format that a user can access the platform, must be clearly and conspicuously placed in the settings menu, and platforms are prohibited from using dark patterns to interfere with a user's ability to delete the account. To ensure no accidental deletion, this bill permits a platform to confirm the request through specified means.

This bill also requires social media platforms to additionally treat a user's decision to delete as a verified consumer request to delete the user's personal information pursuant to the CCPA. This is particularly important given the vast troves of information the platforms collect on users. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recently issued a report examining the relevant data practices of "Social Media and Video Streaming Services (SMVSSs):

> These types of services let you connect with the world from the palm of your hand. At the same time, many of these services have been at the forefront of building the infrastructure for mass commercial surveillance. Some firms have unique access to information about our likes and dislikes, our relationships, our religious faiths, our medical conditions, and every other facet of our behavior, at all times and across multiple devices. This vast surveillance has come with serious costs to our privacy. It also has harmed our competitive landscape and affected the way we communicate and our well-being, especially the well-being of children and teens. Moreover, certain large SMVSSs

[4] Brennan Schaffner, Neha A. Lingareddy & Marshini Chetty, *Understanding Account Deletion and Relevant Dark Patterns on Social Media* (November 11, 2022) Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, Volume 6, Issue CSCW2, Article No.: 417, Pages 1 – 43, **https://doi.org/10.1145/3555142**.

> may enjoy significant market power and therefore face fewer competitive constraints on their privacy practices and other dimensions of quality.[5]

The report specifically highlighted the data collection, retention, and use that this bill would protect against:

> **Many Companies collected and could indefinitely retain troves of data from and about users and non-users, and they did so in ways consumers might not expect.** This included information about activities both on and off of the SMVSSs, and included things such as personal information, demographic information, interests, behaviors, and activities elsewhere on the Internet. The collection included information input by users themselves, information gathered passively or inferred, and information that some Companies purchased about users from data brokers and others, including data relating to things such as household income, location, and interests. Moreover, many Companies' data practices posed risks to users' and non-users' data privacy, and their data collection, minimization, and retention practices were woefully inadequate. For instance, minimization policies were often vague or undocumented, and many Companies lacked written retention or deletion policies. Some of the Companies' SMVSSs did not delete data in response to user requests—they just de-identified it. Even those Companies that actually deleted data would only delete some data, but not all.[6]

According to the author:

> Social media addiction is harming our youth on a daily basis. From impacts to self-esteem to even more dire consequences, California needs to ensure that those struggling to escape the cycle of addiction can do so easily. Unfortunately, because social media platform revenue relies on continued engagement of users, the steps required to delete an account are not always straightforward, leading many who begin the process to give up part way through. For those already struggling with addiction to a platform, this means returning to a

---

[5] *A Look Behind the Screens Examining the Data Practices of Social Media and Video Streaming Services* (September 2024) FTC, **https://www.ftc.gov/reports/look-behind-screens-examining-data-practices-social-media-video-streaming-services**.
[6] *Ibid*. (emphasis in original).

harmful habit. AB 656 will follow recent efforts to simplify subscription cancellation to social media platforms, making it easier for individuals to escape a harmful situation.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

Consumer Federation of California (Source)
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
Cameo Network
Consumer Attorneys of California
Elder Law & Advocacy
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates
Oakland Privacy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

California Chamber of Commerce
Computer & Communications Industry Association
Internet Works
Technet

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Oakland Privacy writes:

> There is substantial evidence that social media platforms intentionally make it difficult for users to permanently close and delete their accounts – the reason being that users being on their platforms is part of the fuel that makes their business engines run. Some estimates claim over 200 million people in the U.S. are on social media. These numbers help a company's stock, attract advertisers and are a revenue generator. Arguably, an inactive user that can still be included in user stats is better than no user at all.
>
> This helps explain why social media companies have made it so difficult for users to close their accounts. Many enlist dark patterns to make the task almost impossible, including forcing a waiting period, having alternate confusing options like deactivating an account instead of deleting it, only giving users the option to do so on certain types of devices, or having to log into your account and dig through multiple layers of settings.

We suggest an additional requirement that social media platforms provide an affirmative confirmation that the deletion of the account has been successfully completed.

Using social media is like checking into Hotel California – *you can check out any time you like, but you can never leave* – but it doesn't have to be that way.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Technet, argues:

Settings tabs on social media platforms can contain any number of options related to a user's social media profile including privacy settings, notification preferences, device permissions, accessibility, language, downloads or data archives and more. Depending on the length of the menu, some platforms group settings related to a user's account in an account management center. This grouping is to put similar settings together in one place and make it easier for consumers to find. Our proposed amendment below would allow a platform to determine the best place for the deletion mechanism, either in the full settings list or an account management center.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 71-0, 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, DeMaio, 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, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Papan, Tangipa

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/3/25 16:02:55

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 663
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 663
Author: McKinnor (D)
Amended: 5/6/25 in Assembly
Vote: 27 - Urgency

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/12/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Hydrofluorocarbon gases: sale and distribution prohibition: exemptions

SOURCE: Hudson Technologies

DIGEST: This bill eliminates a reference to one set of federal regulations and replaces it with a reference to a different federal regulation to ensure reclaimed hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) used in the state contain no more than 15% virgin HFCs.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal regulations:

1) Define, under the federal Clean Air Act, a reclaimed refrigerant based on a "level of purity" test to ensure it is free from certain contaminants, but this definition is not related to whether the refrigerant is recycled.

2) Prohibit, under the federal American Innovation and Manufacturing (AIM) Act of 2020, a person from claiming a refrigerant has been "reclaimed" or recycled if it contains more than 15%, by weight, of virgin material (Code of Federal

Regulations (CFR) Title 40: Chapter I: Subchapter C; Part 84: Subpart C: 84.112 (a)).

Existing state law:

1) Defines "hydrofluorocarbons" HFCs as fluorinated gases used primarily as refrigerants in refrigeration, air-conditioning equipment, foam expansion agents, aerosol propellants, solvents, and fire suppressants (Health & Safety Code (HSC) §39734).

2) Defines "global warming potential" (GWP) as a measure of how much energy the emissions of one ton of a gas will absorb over a given period of time, relative to the emissions of one ton of carbon dioxide (CO2) (HSC §39735).

3) Precludes a person from selling or distributing bulk HFCs or bulk blends containing HFCs that exceed a GWP of 2,200 as of January 1, 2025, a GWP or 1,500 as of January 1, 2030, and a GWP of 750 as of January 1, 2033 (HSC §39735).

4) Precludes, as of January 1, 2025, HFCs with a GWP greater than 750 that are not reclaimed from being used to replenish any leaks or to service stationary equipment owned or operated by the state (HSC §39735).

5) Exempts from the prohibition in (3) HFCs that are reclaimed (as defined by the federal Clean Air Act, not the AIM Act) and HFCs used exclusively in metered dose inhalers approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration for medical purposes (though this second exemption expires on December 27, 2030) (HSC §39735).

This bill:

1) Eliminates the exemption for "reclaimed hydrofluorocarbons" as defined under federal regulation found in the federal Clean Air Act (which relies on a purity standard) and replaces it with a new exemption for a "certified reclaimed refrigerant," which this bill defines as used refrigerant that:

    a) Has been reclaimed by a refrigerant reclaimer certified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) from a previously used appliance;

b) Meets all specifications of regulations developed under the AIM Act that are found in Appendix A to Subpart F (commencing with Section 82.150) of Part 82 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as those regulations existed as of October 1, 2024, as demonstrated by an analysis conducted to verify that it meets these specifications; and
c) Contains no more than 15% virgin HFC refrigerant by weight.

2) Defines a "virgin HFC refrigerant" as HFC refrigerant that has not been previously used.

3) Exempts "certified reclaimed refrigerant" from the current law prohibition on using unreclaimed HFCs with a GWP greater than 750 to replenish any leaks or to service stationary equipment owned or operated by the state.

Background

1) *Global Warming Potential.* Global warming potential, or GWP, is a relative measure of how much energy one ton of a California's Green House Gas (GHG) traps in the atmosphere when compared to a one ton of CO2. The GWP of CO2 is standardized to one, so any GHG will be above one and the higher the number, the worse the GHG is for the environment because it means it will likely trap that much more energy (heat) in the atmosphere over a given time frame.

   GWP is typically calculated over a specific time interval, commonly 20, 100, or 500 years and the California Air Resources Board uses GWPs calculated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that are considered over a 100-year timeframe.

   Here's an example to illustrate how GWP works: CFC-11, or trichlorofluoromethane, is a chlorofluorocarbon that was once widely used as a refrigerant, aerosol propellant, and foam-blowing agent. It has a GWP of 5,000 – meaning when comparing one ton of CFC-11 to one ton of CO2, the CFC-11 will trap 5,000 times more energy in the atmosphere than CO2 over a 100-year timeframe.

2) *Hydrofluorocarbons 101.* Hydrofluorocarbons, better known as HFCs, are used in a number of different places in our society, most notably in refrigerators and air conditioning units, and comprise approximately 10% of California's GHG emissions.

HFCs are man-made chemical organic compounds that contain fluorine and hydrogen atoms and are usually a gas at room temperature. They are short-lived pollutants with high GWP potential and when released into the atmosphere, they absorb outgoing infrared radiation which traps heat in the atmosphere and contributes to global warming. They usually have a much shorter life (on average 15 years) in the atmosphere than CO2 (100s of years) – but despite their short lifespan, one molecule of HFC will absorb significantly much more infrared energy than CO2 because of its carbon-fluorine bonds. Most HFCs have GWPs in the 1,000s – meaning that every ton of HFCs emitted is equal to releasing 1,000 tons or more of CO2 for the purposes of global warming.

According to CARB, "Fluorinated gases – especially HFCs – are the fastest-growing source of GHG emissions both in California and globally. More than three-quarters of HFC emissions in California come from the use of refrigerants in the commercial, industrial, residential, and transportation sectors."

3) *SB 1206 (Skinner, Chapter 884, Statutes of 2022 2022).* SB 1206 limited the use of HFCs in equipment owned or operated by the state by requiring reclaimed – not virgin – HFCs be used to replenish leaks in any stationary equipment using HFCs. Properly reclaimed materials can be treated and reused to help avoid the production of new HFCs while also making older units more efficient.

4) *Two Federal Definitions of "Reclaimed."* SB 1206 relied on the definition of "reclaimed" found in federal regulations created under the federal Clean Air Act and incorporated it into state law by reference. That definition states a reclaimed refrigerant is based on a "level of purity" test to ensure it is free from certain contaminants – something that is unrelated to whether the refrigerant is recycled or reclaimed.

   That is in contrast with the federal definition created by the U.S. EPA pursuant to the AIM Act of 2020 that a "reclaimed HFC" is one that contains no more than 15% virgin materials.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "Hydrofluorocarbons have been found to have a dramatic negative impact on air quality and climate change when released into the atmosphere. These gases, called 'HFCs,' are used in a variety of applications, including aerosols, refrigeration and air conditioning, among others.

"AB 663 would establish state standards for the recapturing of hydrofluorocarbon gases. Properly reclaimed gases can be treated and reused to help avoid the production of new HFCs while also restoring older units toward higher levels of efficiency. As these units reach their lifecycle end, newer technologies utilizing less-damaging materials are available, helping to move toward the state's air quality and emission reduction goals."

2) *Using The Right Definition To Promote HFC Reclamation and Recycling.* As noted in the "Background" section, state law references a definition of "reclaimed" in the federal codes that – because it is based on a level of purity, not a level of reclaimed or recycled HFCs – may or may not lead to an increase in HFC reclamation and a decrease in the use of virgin HFCs.

   This bill eliminates the reference to the federal "purity standard" regulation established under the federal Clean Air Act and replaces it with a reference to the definition of "reclaimed" found in the regulations developed under AIM as those regulations existed on October 1, 2024, which define "reclaimed" as containing no more that 15% virgin materials.

   By referring to the regulations as they existed at a certain point in time, it ensures any future changes to those regulations will have no impact in California that could – due to an increased use of reclaimed HFCs that don't meet the current 85% reclaimed/15% virgin standard – increase the level of GHG emissions in the state and undermine California's ability to meet its GHG reduction goals.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 1013 (Lara, Chapter 375, Statutes of 2018), adopted analogous HFC regulations in state law and offered financial incentives to help businesses transition to the use of reclaimed HFCs.

SB 1206 (Skinner, Chapter 884, Statutes of 2022), prohibited the sale or distribution of bulk HFCs that exceed GWP limits of 2,200 by 2025, 1,500 by 2030, and 750 by 2033. SB 1206 requires the use of reclaimed HFCs when replenishing leaks or servicing equipment with HFCs with GWP greater than 750.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

Hudson Technologies (Sponsor)
350 Humboldt: Grassroots Climate Action
California Product Stewardship Council
National Stewardship Action Council

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to this bill's sponsor, Hudson Technologies:

"Leaks from air conditioning and refrigeration units are a major source of emissions. It is estimated that an average grocery store refrigeration system leaking 25 percent of its total refrigerant charge results in an average of 1,780 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, or emissions from nearly 400 passenger cars.

"AB 663 seeks to build upon SB 1206 (Skinner) of 2022, which sought to reduce the impact and use of HFCs in California. The bill limited the use of HFCs with specified global warming potential in state facilities by requiring the use of reclaimed HFCs to replenish leaks. However, the bill did not specifically define what levels of reclaimed materials meet the standard.

"AB 663 provides a clear definition of "reclaimed" by referring to federal standards that exist in law and are well understood by all players in the sector. The federal standard calls for at least 85 percent of the HFCs to be reclaimed to be labeled as such. This bill refers to that standard, thereby giving the State of California clear direction in implementing and meeting the requirements intended by SB 1206."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 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, 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: Garcia, Stefani

Prepared by: Evan Goldberg / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108, Eric Walters / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
7/3/25 15:18:01

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 677
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

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
6/30/25 16:45:42

****** 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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 761
Author: Addis (D)
Amended: 4/30/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 11-3, 6/24/25
AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Gonzalez, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Umberg
NOES: Strickland, Dahle, Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 4-1, 7/9/25
AYES: McNerney, Ashby, Grayson, Umberg
NOES: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Monterey-Salinas Transit District: sales and special taxes

SOURCE: Monterey-Salinas Transit District

DIGEST: This bill authorizes the Monterey-Salinas Transit District (MST), upon the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of its board of directors, to submit to voters a measure proposing a retail transactions and use tax (TUT) in accordance with TUT law.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Creates MST to include all of the County of Monterey, with specified powers and duties related to public transit service.

2) Prohibits the MST from imposing sales or special taxes, but authorizes the MST, with the concurrence of a majority of the member jurisdictions

represented on the board of directors, to submit a ballot measure for the imposition of those taxes to the voters.

3) Authorizes various local governmental entities, subject to certain limitations and approval requirements, to levy a TUT, in accordance with the procedures and requirements of TUT Law, including a requirement that the combined rate of all taxes that may be imposed in accordance with that law in the county not exceed 2%.

This bill:

1) Provides that a ballot measure to impose sales or special taxes shall not be submitted to the voters of MST under its existing authority to impose sales or special taxes on or after January 1, 2026.

2) Specifies that MST, upon affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the board of directors, may submit to the voters a measure proposing a TUT in accordance with TUT law.

3) Provides that MST may impose a TUT for the support of its transportation services at a rate of no more than .25% (1/4-cent) that would, in combination with all taxes imposed, exceed the 2% cap established by law if all of the following requirements are met:

   a) MST adopts an ordinance proposing the TUT by an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the board of directors.

   b) The ordinance proposing the TUT is submitted to the electorate and is approved by the voters voting on the ordinance in accordance with constitutional requirements, as specified.

   c) The TUT conforms to TUT Law.

4) Specifies that the tax rate authorized shall not be considered for the purposes of the combined rate limit established by law.

5) Provides that if, as of January 1, 2035, an ordinance proposing a TUT is not approved pursuant to this bill, the authority shall be repealed as of that same date.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill*. According to the author, "AB 761 would provide local communities the opportunity to strengthen transportation programs that serve veterans, seniors, and individuals with disabilities while advancing sustainable transit options for the region. Improving accessible transportation is key to reducing emissions, easing traffic congestion, and driving the Central Coast's growth."

2) *Who is MST?* MST was created by AB 644 (Caballero, Chapter 460, Statutes of 2009), and was formed on July 1, 2010. According to MST, it succeeded the Monterey-Salinas Transit Joint Powers Agency formed in 1981 when the City of Salinas joined the Monterey Peninsula Transit Joint Powers Agency which was formed in 1972.

   Current members of the district are the Cities of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Salinas, Sand City, Seaside, Soledad and the County of Monterey. A board of directors with a representative from each member jurisdiction governs the agency and appoints the general manager. MST serves a population of over 400,000 and has a service area of 163 square miles and primarily provides bus services throughout Monterey County. In 2019, MST carried roughly 4.5 million riders. After the pandemic, ridership is slowly return, with 3.7 million riders in 2024.

3) *What is Transaction and Use Tax?* State law allows cities, counties, and specified special districts to increase the sales and use tax applicable in their jurisdiction, also known as district taxes or TUTs. Generally, the combined TUT tax rate imposed within a local jurisdiction cannot exceed 2%. To determine whether a county has reached this rate limitation, all countywide taxes and the highest combined rate imposed by a city within the county are counted towards the county's rate limit. For example, if a county imposes three 0.5% countywide taxes and two cities within the county each impose a 0.5% tax, the combined rate in those two cities would be 2%. In such a circumstance, the two cities could not impose another TUT, and the county could not impose another countywide TUT, absent special authority to exceed the rate limitation.

   Prior to 2003, cities lacked the ability to place TUTs before their voters without first obtaining approval by the Legislature to bring an ordinance before the city council, and, if approved at the council level, to the voters. This was remedied

by SB 566 (Scott, Chapter 709, Statutes of 2003), which imposed the uniform 2% countywide cap.

As of April 1, 2025, local agencies impose 478 district taxes for general or special purposes: 401 imposed citywide, 71 imposed countywide, and six imposed in unincorporated county areas. Generally, local agencies impose these taxes throughout the entire area of a single county, the entire unincorporated area within a single county, or a single incorporated city. However, three transportation operators in the Bay Area have regional district taxes: the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, which covers Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco; the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), which covers San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties; Sonoma-Marin Rail Transit District, which includes Sonoma and Marin counties.

4) *Measure Q needs to be extended*. In November 2014, Monterey County approved its first-ever countywide tax measure for public transit, the Monterey-Salinas Transit Local Transit Funding for Senior Citizens, Veterans and People with Disabilities sales tax (Measure Q). Measure Q, which is 1/8-cent, generates an average of $8.5 million per year, and will expire in 2030.

   Measure Q funds transit services for veterans, seniors, and persons with disabilities in Monterey County. Specifically, according to MST, five unique bus routes were designed to serve these very populations and are funded with Measure Q revenue. Additionally, a taxi voucher program for same-day trips was designed so these vulnerable individuals only pay $3 for a $20 trip, with Measure Q funding the balance of the taxi trip.

   Measure Q also helps support Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) required door-to-door paratransit service for individuals with physical and cognitive disabilities. A number of other Measure Q-funded services help veterans, seniors, and persons with disabilities maintain their independence. The measure required annual performance and financial audits as well as a citizen oversight committee.

   MST recently conducted polling of likely voters in Monterey County and found that MST services are popular, with 75% of likely voters supportive of the Measure Q's extension. Currently, in order for MST to place a TUT measure on the ballot, it must receive concurrence from a majority of the member jurisdictions represented on its board of directors.

5) *AB 761 allows MST to extend Measure Q and possibly more*. This bill revises and recasts MST's authority to impose a TUT. As noted above, currently MST

can place a TUT on the ballot if it receives concurrence from a majority of the member jurisdictions represented on its board of directors. AB 761 would sunset this authority on January 1, 2026 and, instead, MST would need a two-thirds vote of its board to propose a new tax.

Additionally, this bill also generally authorizes MST to impose a TUT for the support of countywide transportation programs and general services at a rate of no more than .25% (1/4-cent). This essentially authorizes MST to extend Measure Q at its current rate of 1/8-cent and propose an additional 1/8-cent TUT to support other transit operations and capital needs.

This bill also specifies that the increase in MST TUT would not count toward the 2% combined rate cap established in current law. Finally, this bill provides that if an ordinance proposing a TUT that would exceed the cap is not approved, the provisions in this bill will be repealed on January 1, 2035.

6) *We've done this before*. The Legislature has, on numerous occasions, granted specific statutory authority to exceed the general 2% rate limitation. Specifically, such authority has been granted to the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Monterey, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, and Ventura. This authority has also been granted to the cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Campbell, El Cerrito, Lancaster, Palmdale, Pinole, Santa Fe Springs, any cities in the County of Solano, Victorville, and to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

Monterey-Salinas Transit District (Source)
County of Monterey
Monterey-Salinas Transit
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

California Taxpayers Association
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Writing in support, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), "The mission of TAMC is to develop and maintain a multimodal transportation system that enhances mobility, safety, access,

environmental quality, and economic activities in Monterey County. On November 4, 2014, the voters of Monterey County approved the Monterey-Salinas Transit Local Transit Funding for Senior Citizens, Veterans, and People with Disabilities sales tax (Measure Q), which generates approximately $7 million per year. Measure Q will expire in 2030 unless a new measure is placed before the voters and secures the approval of two-thirds of the voters. Measure Q funds vital services for veterans, seniors, and persons with disabilities in Monterey County."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Writing in opposition, the Howard Jarvis Taxpayer Association and California Taxpayer Association note they oppose the bill for numerous reasons, including: continuing to authorize waivers makes California less affordable, increases costs of manufacturing and R&D, increases government costs, and runs counter to the purpose of the local sales tax rate limit.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/19/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, 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, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Bauer-Kahan, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Muratsuchi, Papan, Soria

Prepared by: Melissa White / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
7/10/25 15:52:54

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 847
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 847
Author: Sharp-Collins (D)
Amended: 5/22/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 7/8/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-15, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Peace officers: confidentiality of records

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill grants civilian law enforcement oversight boards access to the confidential personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers, as specified, during investigations or proceedings concerning the conduct of those officers.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the people's right to transparency in government. ("The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny...") (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), art. I, Sec. 3.)

2) Establishes the California Public Records Act (CPRA), which generally provides that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state, and requires government agencies to disclose government records to the general public upon request, unless such records are exempted from disclosure. (Government (Gov.) Code, § 7920.000 et seq.)

3) Provides that public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as provided. (Gov. Code § 7922.525.)

4) Provides that the CPRA does not require the disclosure of records of complaints to, or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, the Office of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Services and any state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local police agency, or any investigatory or security files compiled by any other state or local agency for correctional, law enforcement, or licensing purposes. (Gov. Code, § 7923.600.)

5) Provides that the CPRA does not require the disclosure of peace officer personnel files and background investigation files gathered by law enforcement agencies that are in the custody of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) in connection with the commission's authority to verify eligibility for the issuance of certification and investigate grounds for decertification of a peace officer including any and all investigative files and records relating to complaints of, and investigations of, police misconduct, and all other investigative files and materials. (Gov. Code, § 7923.601.)

6) States any department or agency that employs custodial officers, as specified, may establish a procedure to investigate complaints by members of the public against those custodial officers employed by these departments or agencies, provided, however, that any procedure so established shall comply with rules pertaining to confidentiality of personnel records for peace officers. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 832.5, subd. (a)(2).)

7) Requires any complaints and reports or findings relating to citizen complaints against law enforcement or custodial personnel, including all complaints and any reports currently in the possession of the department or agency, be retained for a period of no less than five years for records where there was not a sustained finding of misconduct and for not less than 15 years where there was a sustained finding of misconduct. (Pen. Code, § 832.5, subd. (b).)

8) Prohibits any personnel record from being destroyed while a request related to that record is being processed or any process or litigation to determine whether the record is subject to release is ongoing. All complaints retained may be maintained either in the peace or custodial officer's general personnel file or in a separate file designated by the department or agency as provided by

department or agency policy, in accordance with all applicable requirements of law. (Pen. Code, § 832.5, subd. (b).)

9) States that prior to any official determination regarding promotion, transfer, or disciplinary action by an officer's employing department or agency, the complaints deemed frivolous shall be removed from the officer's general personnel file and placed in a separate file designated by the department or agency, in accordance with all applicable requirements of law. (Pen. Code, § 832.5, subd. (b).)

10) Requires each department or agency in this state that employs peace officers to make a record of any investigations of misconduct involving a peace officer in the officer's general personnel file or a separate file designated by the department or agency. A peace officer seeking employment with a department or agency in this state that employs peace officers shall give written permission for the hiring department or agency to view the officer's general personnel file and any separate file designated by a department or agency. (Pen. Code, § 832.12.)

11) Generally provides that the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers and records maintained by a state or local agency or information obtained from these records, are confidential and shall not be disclosed in any criminal or civil proceeding except by discovery. This provision does not apply to investigations or proceedings concerning the conduct of peace officers or custodial officers, or an agency or department that employs those officers, conducted by a grand jury, a district attorney's office, the Attorney General's office, or POST. (Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (a).)

12) Specifies that notwithstanding the above provision or any other law, specified peace officer or custodial officer personnel records and records maintained by a state or local agency are not confidential and shall be made available for public inspection pursuant to the CPRA. (Pen. Code, § 832.7, subd. (b)(1).)

13) Provides that the board of supervisors shall supervise the official conduct of all county officers, and officers of all districts and other subdivisions of the county, but that in doing so, the board of supervisors shall not obstruct the investigative function of the sheriff of the county nor shall it obstruct the investigative and prosecutorial function of the district attorney of a county. (Gov. Code, § 25303.)

14) Provides that the board of supervisors may appoint commissions of citizens to study problems of general or special interest to the board, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 31000.1.)

15) Provides that a county may create a sheriff oversight board, either by action of the board of supervisors or through a vote of county residents, comprised of civilians to assist the board of supervisors with specified duties related to the county sheriff, and that the members of the oversight board shall be appointed by the board of supervisors. (Gov. Code, § 25303.7, subd. (a).)

16) Provides that the chair of the oversight board shall issue a subpoena, as specified, whenever the board deems it necessary or important to examine any of several specified individuals or documents. (Gov. Code, § 25303.7, subd. (b).)

This bill:

1) Provides that the members of a sheriff oversight board shall have access to the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers required for the performance of the commission's oversight duties, and that the oversight board shall maintain the confidentiality of these records consistent with specified provisions of existing law.

2) Provides that a sheriff oversight board may conduct closed sessions to review confidential records, as specified, if those sessions comply with applicable confidentiality laws.

3) Provides that the inspector general shall have access to the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers required for the performance of the inspector general's oversight duties, and that the inspector general shall maintain the confidentiality of these records consistent with specified provisions of existing law.

4) Specifies that provisions of existing law mandating the confidentiality and nondisclosure of certain peace officer records do not apply to a civilian oversight board or commission for a law enforcement agency, as provided.

Comments

Existing law requires the board of supervisors in every county to "supervise the official conduct of all county officers, and officers of all districts and other subdivisions of the county [and to] see that they faithfully perform their duties, direct prosecutions for delinquencies, and when necessary, require them to renew

their official bond, make reports and present their books and accounts for inspection." This same provision, however, also makes clear that it shall not be construed "to affect the independent and constitutionally and statutorily designated investigative and prosecutorial functions of the sheriff" and that the board shall not "obstruct the investigative function of the sheriff of the county." Another provision of existing law, established in 1965, authorizes a county's board of supervisors to appoint commissions or committees of citizens to study problems of general or special interest to the board, and to make reports and recommendations to the board.

In 2020, the Legislature passed AB 1185 (McCarty, Chapter 342, Statutes of 2020), and expressly granted counties the authority to create a sheriff oversight board, either by action of the board or through a vote of county residents. AB 1185 also authorized the chair of an oversight board to issue a subpoena when the board deems it necessary or important to examine a witness, an officer of the county, or a document in the possession of or under the control of a person or officer relating to the affairs of the sheriff's department. Additionally, the measure authorized counties to establish an office of the inspector general to assist the board with its statutory duties related to the sheriff's department, an office that also carries the subpoena power.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors voted in 2016 to establish the Los Angeles County Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission (COC), which was tasked with providing ongoing review, analysis and oversight of the Sheriff's Department's (LASD) policies, practices and procedures, as well as building bridges between the Department and the public, and recommending policy solutions to the Board. Los Angeles County also has an Office of the Inspector General, which serves as the investigative branch of the COC and special counsel to the Board of Supervisors. According to the Author, notwithstanding the COC's oversight function and statutory subpoena power, LASD "is not providing the necessary information to provide this oversight, claiming that Penal Code Section 832.7 precludes it."

This bill amends provisions of existing law originally enacted by AB 1185 to specify that the members of a sheriff oversight board shall have access to the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers required for the performance of the commission's oversight duties, but that the oversight board shall maintain the confidentiality of these records consistent with Section 832.7 of the Penal Code. Similarly, this bill provides that the inspector general of a county shall have access to the personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers required for the performance of their duties, subject to the same confidentiality

requirement. This bill also amends Section 832.7 of the Penal Code to specify that that provision's confidentiality requirement does not apply to a civilian oversight board established pursuant to AB 1185 or to another "duly enacted municipal or county ordinance." Finally, this bill provides that a sheriff oversight board may conduct closed sessions to review confidential records, if those sessions comply with applicable confidentiality laws and other existing limitations on closed session meetings under the Brown Act.

The issues implicated by this bill are currently the subject of pending litigation between LASD and the COC regarding what can properly be released under COC subpoenas concerning investigations that involve confidential peace officer personnel records. The lawsuit, filed in Los Angeles Superior Court by Sheriff Robert Luna on March 19, 2025, challenges subpoenas issued by the COC for personnel records related to three cases in which deputies allegedly beat, shot and used excessive force on young men. It should also be noted that although the primary purpose of this bill appears to be ensuring that county sheriff oversight boards are granted access to relevant police records in a manner consistent with that enjoyed by grand juries, a district attorney's office, the Attorney General's Office, or POST, the language of this provision also effectively authorizes such access to by any other duly established police oversight board, such as a municipal police oversight commission.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

ACLU California Action
All of Us or None
Bend the Arc: Jewish Action California
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Coalition for Sheriff Oversight
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Public Defenders Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Cancel the Contract
Care First California
Center for Juvenile Law and Policy, Loyola Law School
Center for Policing Equity
Check the Sheriff
Courage California

Debt Free Justice California
Dignity and Power Now
Ella Baker Center for Human Right
Freedom 4 Youth
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Hadsell Stormer Renick & Dai LLP
Initiate Justice
Initiate Justice Action
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
League of Women Voters of California
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union
Mid-City Community Advocacy Network
National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement
National Lawyers Guild - Los Angeles
Oakland Privacy
Peace and Justice Law Center
Rubicon Programs
San Diego Organizing Project
San Francisco Public Defender
Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission
Smart Justice California
The Translatin@Coalition
The W. Haywood Burns Institute
Trauma Informed Los Angeles
Viet Voices

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California State Sheriffs' Association
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs Association
San Diego Sheriff's Office

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 53-15, 6/2/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Connolly, DeMaio, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin,

Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Ávila Farías, Davies, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bains, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Ramos, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Ta

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
7/9/25 16:03:30

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 867
Author: Lee (D), et al.
Amended: 6/17/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 10-0, 6/23/25
AYES: Ashby, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Menjivar, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 4/28/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Veterinary medicine: cat declawing

SOURCE: Animal Legal Defense Fund, Humane World for Animals, The Paw Project

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a veterinarian from performing a declaw procedure, as defined, on any feline unless the declaw procedure is for a therapeutic purpose as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Veterinary Medical Board (VMB) under the Department of Consumer Affairs, to license and regulate veterinarians and registered veterinary technicians (RVT), issue premises permits for veterinary hospitals and Veterinary Assistant Controlled Substances Permits (VACSP). (Business and Professions Code (BPC § 4800 *et seq*.)

2) Authorizes the VMB, at any time, to inspect the premises in which veterinary medicine, veterinary dentistry, or veterinary surgery is practiced, and specifies

that the VMB's inspection authority does not extend to premises that are not registered with the VMB. (BPC § 4809.5)

3) States that a person practices veterinary medicine whenever they perform a surgical or dental operation upon an animal, as specified. (BPC § 4826)

4) Provides specific exemptions from licensure requirements, as specified. (BPC § 4827(a))

5) Prohibits a local government from prohibiting a licensed healing arts professional from engaging in any act or performing any procedure that falls within the professionally recognized scope of practice of that licensee. (BPC § 460)

6) Prohibits an individual from performing, or arranging for the performance of, surgical claw removal, declawing, onychectomy, or tendonectomy on any cat that is a member of an exotic or native wild cat species, with the exception of procedures performed solely for a therapeutic purpose. (Penal Code § 597.6)

This bill:

1) Clarifies that performing a tendonectomy, onychectomy, or any type of claw removal (declaw procedure) on a feline is the practice of veterinary medicine.

2) Requires an onychectomy, tendonectomy, surgical claw removal, or declaw on any feline or any procedure to otherwise alter a feline's toes, claws, or paws to prevent or impair the normal function of the feline's toes, claws, or paws to be performed solely for a therapeutic purpose.

3) Defines a "therapeutic purpose" for purposes of this bill to mean a, "medically necessary procedure to address an existing or recurring infection, disease, injury, or abnormal condition in the claws, nail bed, or toe bone, which jeopardizes the feline's health. "Therapeutic purpose" does not include a procedure performed for cosmetic or aesthetic purposes or to make the feline more convenient to keep or handle.

4) Excludes performing a declaw procedure from the ownership exemption, as specified.

5) Subjects a licensee or registrant of the VMB to discipline for performing a declaw procedure without a therapeutic purpose, as specified.

Background

Declawing. According to information from the American Veterinary Medical Association, "cat declawing is the surgical amputation of all or part of a cat's third phalanges (toe bones) and the attached claws. Most often, the procedure involves the front paws only, but sometimes the claws are removed from all four paws." Ethical concerns have been raised about elective cat declawing, which may be completed for non-medical reasons, as being rather cruel to the animal, painful, with little benefit to the overall health of the animal. The benefit seems to exist for the animal owner with respect to furniture saved from scratches. There are reported instances when declawing a cat is medically necessary including for the removal of cancerous nail beds, among others. This bill would prohibit a veterinarian from performing a declaw procedure on a feline, unless it is performed for a medically necessary purpose of the feline.

In 2004, AB 1857 (Koretz, Chapter 876, Statues of 2004) prohibited declawing "exotic" or "big" cats. That bill established misdemeanor penalties for a violation, which is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for up to one year, a fine of $10,000, or by both, unless the procedure was the result of a medical necessity. AB 1857 was applicable only to "exotic or native wild cat species" which may include lions, tigers, cougars, leopards, lynxes, bobcats, caracals, ocelots, margays, servals, cheetahs, snow leopards, clouded leopards, jungle cats, leopard cats and jaguars, or any hybrid thereof AB 1857, did not apply to domestic house cats.

There are a number of jurisdictions in California that had passed local ordinances restricting cat-declaw procedures (without a medical purpose) prior to that time and remain today. This bill clarifies that existing ordinances adopted before January 1, 2026, which prohibit cat declaws (many with exemptions designated for a therapeutic purpose) are not preempted by the provisions of this bill.

Veterinary Medical Board. In order to practice veterinary medicine in California, an individual must have a license issued by the VMB. The VMB protects the public from unprofessional and unlicensed practice of veterinary medicine. The VMB requires adherence to strict licensure or registration requirements for veterinarians, RVTs, and VACSP holders and ensures that each licensee or registrant has met the necessary level of competence required to perform animal health care services. The VMB investigates complaints – and if violations are confirmed, may take disciplinary actions against its licensees or those individuals that may be providing unlicensed practice. In order to obtain a license to practice

veterinary medicine an individual must meet specified education requirements and pass an examination.

According to information on the American Veterinary Medical Association's (AVMA) website, "The AVMA discourages the declawing of cats as an elective procedure and supports non-surgical alternatives to the procedure. The AVMA respects the veterinarian's right to use professional judgement when deciding how best to protect their individual patients' health and welfare."

This bill maintains a veterinarian's discretion to perform a declaw procedure if it is determined to be medically necessary. This bill makes it clear that a declaw procedure may not be performed to make the feline "more convenient" to be kept as a pet, such as to protect furniture or to address a human health condition. Should a veterinarian perform the procedure for a non-therapeutic purpose as defined in this bill, the veterinarian may be subject to discipline by the VMB. This bill exempts a declaw procedure from the ownership exemption to the practice of veterinary medicine. This bill further clarifies that a declaw procedure is considered the practice of veterinary medicine, and therefore anyone who performs such a procedure who is not a veterinarian will be subject to enforcement for unlicensed veterinary practice.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/1/25)

Animal Legal Defense Fund (co-source)
Humane World for Animals (co-source)
The Paw Project (co-source)
Alley Cat Allies
Animal Advocates Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Cat Town
City of West Hollywood
Democrats for the Protection of Animals
Humane Veterinary Medical Alliance
Kitten Rescue
Laguna Woods Cat Club
Michelson Center for Public Policy
Patricia H. Ladew Foundation, INC.
Strategic Action for Animals
West Radiologic Services

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

California Veterinary Medical Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Supporters note generally that declawing cats for non-medical reasons to protect human health is not necessary as other alternative methods exist, and there are numerous jurisdictions with prohibitions currently in place.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Veterinary Medical Association writes in opposition and notes, "…the CVMA is deeply concerned that the veterinary profession is being singled out among our fellow healing arts professionals with legislation proposing to ban specific medical and surgical procedures in statute, which is a dangerous precedent."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 4/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Krell, Macedo, Sanchez

Prepared by: Elissa Silva / B., P. & E.D. / 916-651-4104
7/1/25 16:19:00

****** 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 904
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 904
Author: Aguiar-Curry (D)
Amended: 4/22/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 4-0, 6/16/25
AYES: Arreguín, Becker, Limón, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ochoa Bogh

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-4, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Childcare services: workday

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill (1) amends the definition of "workday" to include time a parent requires child care in order to search for a job, care for oneself during pregnancy leave from work, or care for a family member during family leave from work. This bill (2) codifies the definition of "parental incapacity" and (3) specifies that a medical incapacity form shall not be required for a parent on leave to meet subsidized child care eligibility requirements.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Law:

1) Defines "childcare and development services" to mean services designed to meet a wide variety of children and families' needs while parents and guardians are working, in training, seeking employment, incapacitated, or in need of respite. (Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) 10213.5(j))

2) Defines "workday" as meaning the time that the parent requires temporary care for a child for any of the following reasons: to undertake training in preparation

for a job; to undertake or retain a job; or to undertake other activities that are essential to maintaining or improving the social and economic function of the family, are beneficial to the community, or are required because of health problems in the family. (WIC 10213.5(ah))

3) Provides that, in order to be eligible for federal and state subsidized child development services, families shall meet at least one requirement in each of the following areas:

   a) A family is either:

      i. A current aid recipient,

      ii. Income eligible,

      iii. Homeless,

      iv. One whose children are recipients of protective services, or whose children have been identified as being or at risk of being abused, neglected, or exploited, or

      v. One who has a member of its household who is certified to receive benefits from specified means-tested government programs, as determined by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

   b) A family needs the child care services:

      i. Because the child is identified as:

         1. A recipient of protective services,

         2. Being neglected, abused, or exploited, or at risk of neglect, abuse, or exploitation, or

         3. Being homeless; or

      ii. Because the parents are:

         1. Engaged in vocational training leading directly to a recognized trade, paraprofession, or profession,

2. Engaged in an educational program for English language learners to attain a high school diploma or general educational development certificate,

3. Employed or seeking employment,

4. Seeking permanent housing for family stability, or

5. Incapacitated. (WIC 10271(a))

4) Establishes priority for federal and state subsidized child development services as follows:

   a) First priority shall be given to neglected or abused children who are recipients of child protective services, or children who are at risk of being neglected or abused, as specified.

   b) Second priority shall be given equally to eligible families, regardless of the number of parents in the home, who are income eligible. Families with the lowest gross monthly income in relation to family size, as determined by a schedule adopted by CDSS, shall be admitted first. If two or more families are in the same priority in relation to income, prioritization shall be as follows: a family with a child with exceptional needs shall be admitted first, then a family in which the primary home language is a language other than English, then the family that has been on the waiting list for the longest time. (WIC § 10271(b))

5) Requires a family, except as provided, upon establishing initial eligibility or ongoing eligibility for child care services, to be considered to meet all eligibility and need requirements for those services for not less than 24 months, to receive those services for not less than 24 months before having their eligibility or need recertified, and to not be required to report changes to income or other changes for at least 24 months. (WIC § 10271(h)(1))

6) Requires a family that establishes initial eligibility or ongoing eligibility on the basis of income to report increases in income that exceed the threshold for ongoing income eligibility, which is at or below 85% of the state median income, adjusted for family size, and requires the family's ongoing eligibility for services to be recertified at that time. (WIC § 10271(h)(3))

7) Defines "parental incapacity" as the temporary or permanent inability of the child's parent(s) to provide care and supervision of the child(ren) for any part of the day due to a physical and/or mental health condition. (5 California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 18078(r))

8) Specifies that, if the basis of need as stated on the application for services is parental incapacity, the following shall apply:

   a) The certified schedule for early learning and care services shall not exceed 50 hours per week; and,

   b) The parent's period of eligibility for early learning and care services shall be for no less than 12 months and the parent shall receive services for not less than 12 months before having eligibility and need recertified. (5 CCR § 18088(a))

9) Requires documentation of parental incapacity to include a release signed by the incapacitated parent authorizing a legally qualified health professional to disclose information necessary to establish that the parent meets the definition of parental incapacity and needs services. (5 CCR §18088(b))

10) Requires the documentation of incapacitation provided by the legally qualified health professional to include: a statement that the parent is incapacitated and incapable of providing care or supervision of the child for part of the day; the days and hours per week that services are recommended to accommodate the incapacitation; the name, business address, telephone number, professional license number, and signature of the legally qualified health professional who is rendering the opinion of incapacitation; and, if applicable, the name of the health organization with which the professional is associated. *(5 CCR 18088(c))*

11) Authorizes the contractor to contact the legally qualified health professional for verification or clarification. (5 CCR § 18088(d))

12) Requires the contractor to determine the days and hours of the certified schedule based on the parent's requested days and hours and the recommendation of the health professional. (5 CCR § 18088(e))

This bill:

1) States the intent of the Legislature to improve access to child care to support families with young children in finding and maintaining employment during a period of transition by ensuring uninterrupted access to child care.

2) Amends the definition of "workday" to additionally include time that a parent requires temporary care for a child for any of the following reasons:

   a) To search for a job.

   b) To provide care for oneself during a pregnancy-related leave from work.

   c) To provide care for a family member during a period of family leave.

3) Defines "parental incapacity" as meaning the temporary or permanent inability of a child's parent or parents to provide care and supervision of the child for any part of the day. Specifies this may be due to a physical or mental health condition, or may occur during periods of leave, including, but not limited to, pregnancy-related leave or paid family leave.

4) Adds a family that needs child care services because the parents are on pregnancy or family leave to the list of eligibility criteria for a family to be eligible for federal and state subsidized child development services.

5) Specifies a medical incapacity form shall not be required for a parent on leave to receive federal and state subsidized child development services. Specifies a parent may sign an attestation stating they are on leave.

6) Specifies no reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

Background

Child Care Eligibility. Certain eligibility and prioritization rules apply to subsidized child care in California. Families are eligible for non-CalWORKs subsidized child care if they meet at least one requirement in each of two areas: eligibility and need. First, they must meet one of the eligibility criteria, which include currently receiving aid, being income eligible, experiencing homelessness, or having children who are recipients of protective services or who have been identified as being, or at risk of being, abused, neglected, or exploited. Second, the

family must meet one of the "need" requirements, which are either that the child has been identified as a recipient of protective services or being, or at risk of being, abused, neglected or exploited; or the parents need to be employed or seeking employment, engaged in vocational training, seeking permanent housing for family stability, or are incapacitated.

Definition of "Workday." With regard to subsidized child care administration, state law defines "workday" as the time that a parent requires temporary care for a child for any of the following reasons: to undertake training in preparation for a job, to undertake or retain a job, or to undertake other activities that are essential to maintaining or improving the family's social and economic function, beneficial to the community, or required because of health problems in the family. When determining a parent or family's allowable hours for child care, an Alternative Payment Program agency must verify the parent's work or school schedule, then add any time needed to commute to work or school. Under current law, taking leave from work, including pregnancy and family leave, does not qualify a parent to receive subsidized child care. This means that if a parent's eligibility recertification month lands during the time they are on leave from work they would not have an eligible need for child care. Parents on pregnancy leave can prove their need for child care if they follow steps outlined in regulations to prove parental incapacity, described below. Parents on family leave from work would lose their eligibility, as they would no longer be deemed as having a need for child care.

Parental Incapacity. Title 5 licensing regulations define "parental incapacity" as the temporary or permanent inability of the child's parent to provide care and supervision of the child for any part of the day due to a physical and/or mental health condition. Regulations additionally describe the required documentation to prove parental incapacitation and determine the certified schedule for care. This process includes obtaining documentation of incapacitation provided by a qualified health professional and signed authorization release allowing the health professional to disclose relevant information. According to Child Action, Inc., an Alternative Payment Program agency, this often results in parents needing to make time to visit their doctor in person to get the incapacity paperwork completed. Additionally, according to Child Action, Inc., Kaiser Permanente, one of the region's largest healthcare providers, no longer allows doctors to fill out parental incapacity forms. Instead, Kaiser redirects parents to a business services office and uses its own form, creating more administrative hurdles for families.

Benefits of Paid Leave. According to Prenatal-to-3 Policy Impact Center, studies have found that six weeks of paid leave immediately after the birth or adoption of a

child leads to improvements in children's physical health and safety, both in infancy and longer term; increases timely vaccinations; boosts maternal mental health; and increases parent-child activities together, including reading and meals. Additionally, according to a study by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), paid family leave around the time of childbirth can support lower income mothers' return to work. ASPE found that paid family leave assisted mothers in making child care arrangements by providing time for them to find care and address logistics, and to let babies acclimate to care.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1528 (Committee on Human Services, 2025) of the current legislative session would, among other things, extend family fee exemptions from 12 to 24 months for children referred for or at risk of receiving child protective services and amend the definition of "attendance." AB 1528 has been referred to the Senate Human Services Committee.

SB 792 (Arreguín, 2025) of the current legislative session would make a series of changes to child care programs, including: aligning the income cap for disenrollment from subsidized child care programs with the income eligibility cap at 85% of the state median income, extending the family fee exemption for a family with children who are recipients of child protective services, and amending the definition of "attendance." SB 792 is set to be heard by the Assembly Human Services Committee on July 1, 2025.

Comments

This bill seeks to make retaining eligibility for subsidized child care easier for parents by recognizing pregnancy and family leave as an eligible need. Simply being on leave from work would not make someone eligible for child care; the parent or family would still need to be income eligible to receive a child care subsidy. This bill would allow families on leave from work to maintain their existing child care arrangement.

This bill additionally recognizes that care work is real work that often requires one's whole focus. Taking leave from work to care for oneself during or after pregnancy or to care for a family member can be a vulnerable time. Additionally, it may not be optimal for caretakers to multitask care for a family member and young children. This bill would ensure that families do not have to choose between priorities and would expand the capacity of caretakers to provide for the wellbeing of the whole family.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

Child Action, Inc.
Child Care Resource Center
Children Now
Grace Institute - End Child Poverty in CA
Silicon Valley Community Foundation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-4, 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, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, 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, Lackey, Sanchez, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Kalra, Macedo, Papan, Patterson, Ta

Prepared by: Diana Dominguez / HUMAN S. / (916) 651-1524
7/1/25 16:32:12

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 931
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 931
Author: Kalra (D)
Amended: 6/19/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-2, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-0, 4/21/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: State Bar Act: consumer legal funding

SOURCE: Consumer Attorneys of California

DIGEST: This bill creates a regulatory framework for the litigation financing industry. This bill prohibits attorneys from directly or indirectly sharing legal fees with an out-of-state alternative business structure, except as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the State Bar Act and provides for the licensure and regulations of attorneys practicing in California. (Business (Bus.) & Professions (Prof.) Code § 6000 et seq.)

2) Requires all attorneys who practice law in California to be licensed by the State Bar. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), art. VI, § 9; Bus. & Prof. Code § 6000 et seq.)

3) Requires an attorney who contracts to represent a client on a contingency fee basis to, at the time the contract is entered into, provide a duplicate copy of the

signed contract to the plaintiff, as specified, which must include specified information. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6147(a).)

4) Provides that a written fee agreement is subject to the attorney-client privilege. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6149.)

5) Prohibits an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other nongovernmental entity from operating for the direct or indirect purpose, in whole or in part, of referring potential clients to attorneys, and no attorney can accept a referral of such potential clients, unless specified requirements are met. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6155.)

This bill:

1) Establishes the California Consumer Legal Funding Act.

2) Defines the relevant terms, including:

   a) "Consumer legal funding" means a nonrecourse transaction in which a consumer legal funding company purchases and a consumer assigns to the company a contingent right to receive an amount of the potential proceeds of a settlement, judgment, award, or verdict obtained in the consumer's legal claim.
   b) "Consumer legal funding company" means a person or entity that enters into a consumer legal funding contract with a consumer, except as provided.

3) Requires all consumer legal funding transactions to be codified in a written contract that meets specified requirements.

4) Requires the contract, to be valid, to contain a written acknowledgement by an attorney retained by the consumer attesting to specified conditions, including that the attorney has reviewed the disclosures with the consumer.

5) Provides that a contract for a consumer legal funding transaction shall remain valid and enforceable in the event the consumer terminates the attorney who made the required attestation.

6) Prohibits these contracts from imposing a prepayment penalty on a consumer.

7) Requires all contracts for a consumer legal funding transaction to disclose material terms to the consumer, as specified.

8) Provides that all contracts shall require the consumer or the consumer's attorney to notify the consumer legal funding company of the outcome of the legal claim, including, but not limited to, all settlements, verdicts, or other means of dispute resolution.

9) Requires the contracted amount to be paid to the consumer legal funding company be a predetermined amount based upon intervals of time from the funding date through the resolution date, and shall not be determined as a percentage of the recovery from the legal claim.

10) Prohibits a consumer legal funding company from engaging in specified conduct, including paying or offering to pay commissions, referral fees, or other forms of consideration to any attorney, law firm, or any of their employees for referring a consumer to the company; and receiving any right to, or making, any decisions with respect to the conduct of the underlying legal claim or any settlement or resolution thereof.

11) Provides that any legal funding company that engages in conduct that is prohibited in the preceding paragraph is liable for specified remedies, including automatic termination of the contract; statutory damages; and attorneys' fees.

12) Makes the contingent right to receive an amount of the potential proceeds of a legal claim assignable by a consumer.

13) Prohibits an attorney, or the attorney's immediate family, retained by a consumer from having a financial interest in a consumer legal funding company offering consumer legal funding, and from providing consumer legal funding directly to a consumer. Provides that any attorney who has referred the consumer to their retained attorney shall not have a financial interest in a funding company offering consumer legal funding to that consumer.

14) Prohibits an attorney retained by a consumer from disclosing any privileged information to a legal funding company without the written consent of the consumer. Disclosing information to a legal funding company at the consumer's request shall not otherwise void the attorney-client privilege.

15) Provides that an attorney shall not compensate, promise, or give anything of value to a person for the purpose of recommending or securing the services of the attorney or their firm, except as provided.

16) Subjects any attorney who violates the preceding conflict of interest provisions to discipline by the State Bar of California.

17) Prohibits any attorney licensed or otherwise authorized to practice in this state, from directly or indirectly sharing legal fees with an out-of-state alternative business structure, until January 1, 2030, unless specified conditions apply.

18) Provides that the above does not apply to any fee sharing arrangement if the following conditions are satisfied:

    a) The arrangement for the sharing of legal fees was ordered or approved by a court of competent jurisdiction, including the establishment or distribution of a common benefit fund in coordinated, consolidated, or multidistrict litigation.
    b) The manner in which the legal fees are to be allocated is subject to judicial oversight and determined to be fair, reasonable, and necessary for the administration of justice.

19) Subjects an attorney that violates the previous provision to the following:

    a) Statutory damages of $10,000 per violation or three times the actual damages incurred by the consumer, whichever is greater.
    b) Attorney's costs and fees.
    c) Injunctive or declaratory relief.

20) Provides that a violation of the fee sharing prohibition shall also constitute cause for the imposition of discipline by the State Bar of California.

21) Defines "alternative business structure" as any entity that provides legal services while allowing nonattorney ownership or decisionmaking authority. It does not include nonprofit organizations.

Background

Generally speaking, litigation financing is the practice in which a third party unrelated to an underlying lawsuit provides funds to a plaintiff in return for a portion of any financial recovery resulting from the case. This allows plaintiffs the

financial ability to pay bills and other expenses while they wait for their anticipated award. This financing is non-recourse, meaning that the lender only collects if the lawsuit is ultimately successful. However, if the case is successful, the plaintiff is usually required to pay back the loan and a pre-negotiated rate of interest.

Concerns have arisen that many of these litigation financing contracts are predatory and usurious, leaving plaintiffs with a fraction of their ultimate settlement or judgement. Issues have also been raised about potential conflicts of interest between consumers' attorneys and the lending companies. Critics argue that this type of lending disproportionately hurts vulnerable communities who have no other financial safety net to rely on. Given their unique nature, this type of financing is not thoroughly regulated, although some states outright ban such lending under a legal doctrine called champerty. This bill seeks to bring some needed oversight to the industry by erecting clear guardrails and implementing conflict of interest provisions.

This bill also prohibits any attorney licensed in this state, and associated entities, from directly or indirectly sharing legal fees with an out-of-state "alternative business structure," essentially an entity that provides legal services while allowing nonattorney ownership, management, or decision making authority. Much of the opposition is focused on this portion of this bill, which seeks to codify an existing California Rule of Professional Conduct. This section of this bill includes a sunset on January 1, 2030.

This bill is sponsored by the Consumer Attorneys of California. It is supported by a variety of consumer and legal organizations, including the Western Center on Law and Poverty. It is opposed by various business and insurance associations, including the California Trucking Association and the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. For a more thorough analysis, please see the Senate Judiciary Committee analysis of this bill.

Comment

According to the author:

> [R]ecognizing that the litigation finance industry, when behaving in an ethical manner, provides a vital service to plaintiffs, this bill adopts regulations that will enable the industry to operate while better protecting consumers. AB 931 establishes legal and ethical guidelines to protect consumers who must seek out litigation financing loans. This bill ensures that consumers are better informed about the terms

of their loan agreement, can rescind agreements signed under duress, and protects the sanctity of the attorney-client relationship by prohibiting litigation funding companies from dictating legal strategy. By permitting both consumers and the State Bar of California to enforce the provisions of this bill, Californians will be better protected from nefarious practices in the litigation financing industry.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

Consumer Attorneys of California (Source)
Alameda Contra-costa Trial Lawyers Association
Alliance for Responsible Consumer Legal Funding
California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc.
Capitol City Trial Lawyers Association
Central Valley Trial Lawyers Association
Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
Community Legal Aid SoCal
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Watchdog
Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety
La Raza Centro Legal
The Law Foundation of Silicon Valley
Legal Aid Association of California
Legal Services for Seniors
Marin Trial Lawyers Association
Orange County Trial Lawyers Association
San Francisco Trial Lawyers Association
San Joaquin County Trial Lawyer's Association
San Mateo County Trial Lawyers Association
Senior Advocacy Network
United Policyholders
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE) Institute
American Legion Auxiliary Department of California
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Asian Law Alliance
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
Calasian Chamber of Commerce
California African American Chamber of Commerce
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
California Black Chamber of Commerce
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California League of United Latin American Citizens
California Trucking Association
Center for Restorative Justice Works
Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
Commercial Real Estate Development Association, NAIOP of California
Cooperative of American Physicians, INC.
Family Business Association of California
Legal Access Advocates, LLC
Los Angeles Metropolitan Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Madera Coalition for Community Justice
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
OCA Sacramento - Asian Pacific American Advocates
Orange County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Responsive Law
Solano County Black Chamber of Commerce Political Action Committee
South Bay Center for Counseling
Strength Based Community Change

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Employment Lawyers Association argues:

> Litigation funding can serve as a financial lifeline for those injured due to another party's negligence, allowing them to cover essential expenses such as rent, medical bills, and daily necessities. However, the absence of regulation has allowed predatory practices to thrive,

leaving plaintiffs exposed to opaque contract terms and deceptive lending practices. Many individuals rely on these advances to survive. They may seek out litigation financing because they are in desperate financial situations due to injuries or other hardships. Unfortunately, without legal safeguards, too many consumers find themselves trapped in financially devastating agreements.

AB 931 addresses a pressing need for oversight and regulation in a largely unregulated industry that has significant impacts on vulnerable plaintiffs.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The American Property Casualty Insurance Association writes:

> We appreciate that AB 931 recognizes that hedge funds are controlling cases in California and believes that while AB 931 contains some positive provisions, the legislation currently lacks important consumer protection and transparency requirements that many other states have implemented, and so APCIA must oppose and request that these deficiencies in the bill be addressed. . . .
>
> Many states provide additional consumer protections that are not included in the current version of AB 931. California consumers should be afforded such protections. TPLF agreements with consumers often charge excessive interest rates that can leave borrowers with little to no recovery in their lawsuit. Some states limit the interest and other fees that consumers can be charged under TPLF arrangements. Given the widely acknowledged danger of excessive charges in this type of lending arrangement, these protections are essential to make AB 931 effective in protecting consumers.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-0, 4/21/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Ellis, 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, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Castillo, DeMaio, Dixon, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Papan, Patterson, Ramos, Sanchez, Sharp-Collins, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/3/25 16:02:56

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 978
Author: Hoover (R)
Amended: 7/1/25 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, 5/8/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Department of Transportation and local agencies: streets and highways: recycled materials

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill changes recycled material's requirements for local agencies as they pertain to streets and highways, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and a local agency that has jurisdiction over a street or highway, to the extent feasible and cost effective, to use advanced technologies and material recycling techniques that reduce the cost of maintaining and rehabilitating streets and highways and that exhibit reduced levels of greenhouse gases.

2) Requires beginning January 1, 2024, that local agencies who have jurisdiction over a street or highway, to the extent feasible and cost effective, to apply

standard specifications that allow for the use of recycled materials in streets and highways.

3) Requires beginning January 1, 2024, and until January 1, 2027, the standard specifications for recycled materials must be at or above the level allowed in the Caltrans' standard specifications that went into effect on October 22, 2018, for the use of recycled materials including: recycled base and subbase materials, reclaimed asphalt pavement and other materials in asphalt, reclaimed aggregate, fly ash, returned plastic concrete, and other materials in concrete.

4) Further exempts any special district or city whose population, according to the most recent census, is equal to or less than 25,000 people, or any county whose population, according to the most recent census, is equal to or less than 100,000 people.

5) Establishes Caltrans and provides that it has full possession and control of all state highways, property, and rights in property acquired for state highway purposes, construct all state highways.

6) Encourages Caltrans and cities and counties to use advanced technologies and material recycling techniques, where possible and cost effective, when maintaining and rehabilitating the streets and highways with monies from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account.

This bill:

1) Requires, indefinitely a local government's standard specifications to allow recycled materials at a level no less than the level allowed in Caltrans' specifications, to the extent feasible and cost effective.

2) Provides that if a local agency determines it is not feasible to utilize the equivalent level of recycled materials as provided in Caltrans' specifications, the local agency is required to provide a response, as specified, upon request of a bidder, in regards to the reasoning behind that determination.

3) Specifies a local agency may exceed the maximum level of Caltrans' specifications of recycled base and subbase, reclaimed asphalt concrete (RAP), and reclaimed aggregate, fly ash, and returned plastic concrete.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "As California continues to adopt sustainable and cost-saving practices, we must encourage local agencies to do the same. Technological advances with reclaimed (recycled) asphalt pavement (RAP) offer us the opportunity to produce cost-effective and reliable roads. Public and private roadwork jobs use recycled materials with notable success. AB 978 helps bring local agencies in line with state and national trends as we pursue progress in sustainability."

2) *What are recycled materials in pavement*? Aggregate consists of hard, graduated fragments of inert mineral materials, including sand, gravel, crushed stone, slag, rock dust, or powder; inert solid waste is concrete, asphalt, dirt, brick, and other rubble. Recycled aggregate is produced by crushing concrete, and sometimes asphalt, to reclaim the aggregate. Asphalt refers to the bituminous substance used to bind aggregate together to make asphalt concrete (AC). RAP is used AC pavement that has been processed. Recycled asphalt concrete is the product of mixing RAP with new aggregates, asphalt and/or recycling agent. A recycling agent is used to soften and rejuvenate the existing asphalt pavement. Lastly, RAP can be processed through hot recycling, cold recycling, or in-place recycling depending on the method used to reclaim and reuse the material.

3) *Recycled and Reused.* California policy has long supported recycling and reuse of pavement as it reduces waste and potentially provides greater economic benefits than using new material. In 2012, AB 812 (Ma, Chapter 230, Statutes of 2012) was passed encouraging Caltrans to use up to 40% of recycled asphalt. In 2014 legislation was passed requiring local governments to adopt Caltrans recycled material standards unless they publicly articulated why they could not. In 2017 SB 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), the Road Repair and Accountability Act, required the use of material recycling where cost effective and feasible. Most recently, AB 2953 (Salas, Chapter 872, Statues of 2022), requires certain local agencies to apply standard specifications for the use of recycled materials on their streets and highways that are at or above Caltrans' specification levels to the extent feasible and cost effective. This measure, AB 978, aims to build off and make modifications to the provisions enacted in AB 2953 in 2022.

4) *Caltrans' specifications*. Caltrans' "Pavement Standard Specifications" sets the standards, policies, and best practices for pavement construction and

maintenance on California highways. The specifications cover material requirements, construction methods, and quality assurance measures for a number of pavement types. Specifically for purposes of this measure, Division Five, "Surfacing and Bases," outline the requirements for RAP use in asphalt mixtures including, but not limited to, material composition, processing methods, and performance criteria.

5) *Local entities*. The primary purpose of this bill is to require local governments to adopt Caltrans recycled material standards in the areas of base / subbase materials, asphalt pavement, and aggregates. Over the years, as a variety of measures have been introduced and / or enacted on this policy matter, local entities have stressed that a "one-size-fits-all" approach could potentially negatively impact local government's ability to cost effectively deliver public works projects. Specifically, the issue for local governments is their large variation in size, geography, and local conditions. What might be suitable in metropolitan Los Angeles with year-round temperate weather and access to many contractors might be a bad fit for a smaller community with more extreme weather, different traffic conditions and fewer contractors with lesser capabilities. Hence some flexibility for local governments is warranted. In order to provide this flexibility while still making strides towards sustainability goals, this measure allows local governments to provide a reason / justification for not utilizing recycled materials at levels specified in Caltrans' specifications.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

Granite Construction Company (sponsor)
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
California Construction & Industrial Materials Association
Southern California Contractors Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

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: Manny Leon / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
7/8/25 16:38:48

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1004
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1004
Author: Wallis (R)
Amended: 4/9/25 in Assembly
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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Tribal financial information: public records: exemption

SOURCE: Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians

DIGEST: This bill provides that any record that contains financial information provided by an Indian tribe to a state or local agency as a condition of or requirement for receiving financial assistance to be confidential, not a public record, and not open to public inspection and makes conforming changes.

ANALYSIS: Existing law:

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

    a) Requires a statute to be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access. (Cal. const. art. I, § 3(b)(1).)

b) Requires a statute that limits the public's right of access to be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest. (Cal. const. art. I, § 3(b)(1).)

2) Governs the disclosure of information collected and maintained by public agencies pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA). (Government (Gov.) Code §§ 792.000 et seq.)

   a) States that the Legislature, mindful of the right of individuals to privacy, finds and declares that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state. (Gov. Code § 7921.000.)

   b) Defines "public records" as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics. (Gov. Code § 7920.530.)

   c) Defines "public agency" as any state or local agency. (Gov. Code § 7920.525(a).)

3) Provides that all public records are accessible to the public upon request, unless the record requested is exempt from public disclosure. (Gov. Code § 7922.525.)

   a) Some records are prohibited from being disclosed and other records are permissively exempted from being disclosed. (*See* e.g. Gov. Code §§ 7920.505 & 7922.200.)

   b) There are several general categories of documents or information that are permissively exempt from disclosure under the CPRA essentially due to the character of the information. The exempt information can be withheld by the public agency with custody of the information, but it also may be disclosed if it is shown that the public's interest in disclosure outweighs the public's interest in non-disclosure of the information. (*CBS, Inc. v. Block* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, at 652.)[1]

[1] *CBS, Inc. v. Block* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, at 652 (stating that "[t]wo exceptions to the general policy of disclosure are set forth in the [CPRA]. Section 6254 lists 19 categories of disclosure-exempt material. These exemptions are permissive, not mandatory. The [CPRA] endows the agency with discretionary authority to override the statutory exceptions when a dominating public interest favors disclosure."). The exemptions in Section 6254 were continued under the reorganization of the CPRA and may be referred to as former Section 6254 provisions. (Gov. Code § 7920.505.)

4) Provides, in relation to tribal-state gaming compacts, that the financial and legal records of California Indian tribes and tribal business enterprises are records of a sovereign nation and are not subject to disclosure by private citizens or the state. This is explicitly recognized in amendments to tribal-state gaming compacts ratified by the Legislature, which provide for the securitization of annual payments to be received from the Indian tribes by the state or by an agency, trust, fund, or entity specified by the state. (Gov. Code § 63048.63(a)(1).)

    a) Specifies that neither the CPRA or any other provision of law permits the disclosure of any records of an Indian tribe received by the state, or by an agency, trust fund, or entity specified by the state, in connection with the sale of any portions of the designated tribal-state gaming compact assets or the issuance of bonds, or any summaries or analyses thereof. (*Id*. at subd. (b).)

This bill:

1) Provides that, notwithstanding any other law, any record that contains financial information provided by an Indian tribe to a public agency, as a condition of or requirement for receiving financial assistance, is confidential, is not a public record, and is not open to public inspection and makes conforming changes.

2) Requires each public agency agreement or contract with an Indian tribe related to financial assistance to contain a provision stating that any financial information disclosed pursuant to the agreement or contract shall remain confidential, shall not be a public record, and shall not be open to public inspection.

3) Provides that the Legislature finds and declares that the financial and legal records of Indian tribes and tribal business enterprises are records of a sovereign nation and are not subject to disclosure by private citizens or the state.

4) Defines the following terms for these purposes:

    a) "Indian tribe" means a federally recognized Indian tribe and any department, division, subdivision, agency, or arm or instrumentality thereof.

b) "Financial assistance" means grants, cooperative agreements, noncash contributions or donations of property, direct appropriations, food commodities, and other financial assistance provided by a public agency.

c) "Public agency" has the same meaning as the term is defined in Section 7920.525 of the Government Code.

Comments

The CPRA makes all public records of a public agency open to public inspection upon request and grants the public the right to obtain a copy of any public record, unless the records are otherwise exempt from public disclosure. Existing law provides that that the financial and legal records of California Indian tribes and tribal business enterprises provided in relation to tribal-state gaming compacts are records of a sovereign nation and are not subject to disclosure by private citizens or the state. This bill seeks to provide that any record containing financial information of an Indian tribe provided to a public agency as a condition of or requirement for receiving financial assistance is confidential and not a public record.

Under the CPRA, public records are open to inspection by the public at all times during the office hours of the agency, unless they are exempt from disclosure. (Gov. Code § 7922.525.) A public record is defined as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business that is prepared, owned, used, or retained by any public agency regardless of physical form or characteristics. (Gov. Code § 7920.530.) There are several general categories of documents or information that are permissively exempt from disclosure under the CPRA essentially due to the character of the information. The exempt information can be withheld by the public agency with custody of the information, but it also may be disclosed if it is shown that the public's interest in disclosure outweighs the public's interest in non-disclosure of the information. (*CBS* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, at 652.). Additionally, some records are prohibited from disclosure or are specifically stated to not be public records. (*see* Gov. Code § 7924.110(a).)

California generally recognizes that public access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right.[2] At the same time, the state recognizes that this right must be balanced against the right to privacy.[3] The general right of access to public records may, therefore, be limited when records include personal or sensitive information.

[2] Cal. Const., art. I, § 3; Gov. Code, § 7921.000.
[3] Cal. Const., art. I, § 1.

Native American tribes are "nations that exercise inherent sovereign authority over their members and territories." (Cal. Jur. 3d. Indians Sec. 2.) State law recognizes this sovereignty by making financial information provided by Indian tribes to the state for the purposes of negotiating tribal-state gaming compacts confidential and exempt from disclosure in response to a CPRA request. (Gov. Code § 63048.63(a)-(b).) This bill seeks to ensure that any financial information provided by an Indian tribe to a state or local agency as a condition of or requirement for receiving financial assistance receives the same confidentiality protection and is protected from public disclosure. This bill states that the Legislature finds and declares that the financial and legal records of Indian tribes and tribal business enterprises are records of a sovereign nation and are not subject to disclosure by private citizens or the state.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/1/25)

Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (source)
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
California Nations Indian Gaming Association
Morongo Band of Mission Indians

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

> As sovereign nations, California Indian Tribes maintain their own legal frameworks for handling financial information. Yet, when Tribes apply for or receive state or local financial assistance -such as grants, loans, or cooperative agreements—they are often required to submit detailed financial records. Because current law does not provide explicit protections for these non-gaming financial disclosures, the records risk exposure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA), which undermines tribal sovereignty and self-governance.
>
> AB 1004 clarifies that any record containing financial information provided by an Indian Tribe to a public agency as a condition of receiving financial assistance is confidential, is not a public record, and is not open to public inspection. The bill further requires that all such agreements contain provisions acknowledging and reinforcing this confidentiality. This bill closes a critical gap in current law. While tribal gaming compacts already benefit from statutory

> confidentiality protections, there is no comparable safeguard for other tribal financial information submitted for public assistance programs. AB 1004 addresses this inconsistency and ensures that California respects the sovereignty of its tribal partners. By doing so, AB 1004 upholds government-to-government relationships, promotes equitable participation in public programs, and protects sensitive information from improper disclosure. It is a targeted, common-sense measure that reinforces tribal self-determination and honors longstanding state policy.

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the sponsor of the bill, writes:

> By clarifying the confidentiality of Tribal financial information, AB 1004 fosters a more equitable, respectful partnership between Tribes and the State of California – one that honors sovereignty while promoting responsible participation in state programs.

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: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/1/25 16:19:01

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1008
Author: Addis (D)
Amended: 7/1/25 in Senate
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.

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/1/25 simply move the language into a new code section to avoid conflicts with other similar bills.

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 Appropriations Committee)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

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 7/2/25)

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
7/2/25 15:08:53

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1014
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1014
Author: Rogers (D)
Amended: 4/8/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 13-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Gonzalez, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Umberg
NOES: Strickland
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 5/23/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Traffic safety: speed limits

SOURCE: Del Norte County
Streets are For Everyone

DIGEST: This bill extends to the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) the authority given to local authorities to lower speed limits by five miles per hour (mph).

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Prohibits driving at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for weather, visibility, traffic, and the surface and width of the highway, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property. This is known as California's Basic Speed Law. (Vehicle Code Section (VEH) § 22350).

2) Establishes a maximum speed of 65 mph under most circumstances and allows for lower speed limits under numerous specified conditions. (VEH § 22354 and VEH § 22358)

3) Defines "engineering and traffic survey" (ETS) as a survey of highway and traffic conditions in accordance with methods determined by Caltrans for use by state and local authorities. An ETS must consider prevailing speeds, accident records, and conditions not readily apparent to the driver. An ETS may consider residential density and bicycle and pedestrian safety. (VEH § 627)

4) Authorizes Caltrans and local authorities to establish a speed limit on most streets of between 15 mph to 60 mph in five mph increments on the basis of an ETS. (VEH § 22354 and VEH § 22358)

5) Authorizes a local authority to lower speed limits by an additional five mph, so long as the total speed limit is not reduced by a maximum of 12.4 mph from the 85th percentile speed, under the following circumstances:

   a) An area designated as a safety corridor (VEH § 22358.7);

   b) An area with a high concentration of pedestrians and cyclists, as determined by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (VEH § 22358.7);

   c) A business activity district (VEH § 22358.9); and,

   d) To maintain or go back to a preexisting speed limit set by a prior ETS and if a registered engineer has evaluated the section of highway and determined that no additional general purpose lanes have been added to the roadway since completion of the traffic survey that established that speed limit. (VEH § 22358.8)

6) Provides that a "safety corridor" is defined by Caltrans in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD). In making this determination, Caltrans was required to consider highways that have the highest number of serious injuries and fatalities based on collision data that may be derived from, but not limited to, the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System. No more than 1/5th of a jurisdictions streets may be designated a safety corridor. (VEH § 22358.7)

7) Provides that a "business activity district" is that portion of a highway that includes central or neighborhood downtowns, urban villages, or zoning designations that prioritize commercial land uses at the downtown or neighborhood scale and meets at least three of the following requirements:

    a) No less than 50% of the contiguous property fronting the highway consists of retail or dining commercial uses, including outdoor dining, that open directly onto sidewalks adjacent to the highway;

    b) Parking, including parallel, diagonal, or perpendicular spaces located alongside the highway;

    c) Traffic control signals or stop signs regulating traffic flow on the highway, located at intervals of no more than 600 feet; and,

    d) Marked crosswalks not controlled by a traffic control device. (VEH § 22358.9)

This bill:

1) Authorizes Caltrans to lower speed limits by five mph under the following circumstances:

    a) In an area designated as a safety corridor, as determined by the CA MUTCD;

    b) In an area with a high concentration of pedestrians and cyclists;

    c) In a business activity district on a highway that is not a freeway; and,

    d) To maintain or go back to a preexisting speed limit set on a highway that is not a freeway by a prior ETS and if a registered engineer has evaluated the section of highway and determined that no additional general purpose lanes have been added to the roadway since completion of the traffic survey that established that speed limit.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "The current process for setting speed limits fails to adequately address safety concerns in high-traffic rural areas, where vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, and individuals

with disabilities are at significant risk. Existing speed limits, based on the 85th percentile speed, can lead to higher speed limits even in areas with heavy foot traffic or known safety issues. This bill provides CalTrans with the flexibility to adjust speed limits on state highways by up to five miles per hour based on specific safety concerns. By allowing CalTrans to respond to evolving safety needs, this bill aims to protect vulnerable populations and create safer road conditions."

2) *AB 43 allowed lower speeds on local roads.* AB 43 (Friedman, Chapter 690, Statutes of 2021) made various changes to how speed limits are set to give Caltrans and local governments more flexibility to lower speed limits, based on the recommendations made by the Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force. The Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force was created pursuant to AB 2363 (Friedman, Chapter 650, Statutes of 2018), which directed the California State Transportation Agency to convene a statewide task force to conduct an academic research synthesis to identify findings and recommendations for policy consideration to reduce traffic fatalities to zero. Based on the task force's recommendations, AB 43 gave local jurisdictions the ability to lower speed limits by five mph on high injury streets, referred to as "safety corridors," streets with a high concentration of bicyclists and pedestrians, and in areas deemed a business activity district. This bill expands the flexibility granted to local authorities to lower speed limits based on these safety-related conditions to Caltrans.

3) *Do lower speed limits work?* The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration identified lower speed limits as a highly effective and affordable speed management measure.[1] According to the Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force report, "research synthesis found that research studies clearly indicate speed limit changes cause changes in drivers' speed. Moreover, 'reducing vehicle speed limits will likely reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety across most road environments.'" The task force's report went on to find that, "[o]ther studies support the finding that even a small change in vehicle operating speed can have large safety impacts. According to one, 'a reduction of 3 mph in average operating speed on a road with a baseline average operating speed of 30 mph is expected to produce a reduction of 27% in injury crashes and 49% in fatal crashes.' Furthermore, since pedestrians and bicyclists are particularly vulnerable to severe injury and death when struck by higher-speed vehicles, 'countermeasures aimed at reducing vehicle speeds have the potential to save lives.' National research results, as well as the results of the UC ITS research

[1] https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures-that-work/speeding-and-speed-management/countermeasures

synthesis, support the notion, which is advocated by many California cities and local governments, that lowering speed limits will make streets safer." However, lower speed limits are most effective when paired with engineering measures and enforcement efforts.

4) *Slowing state highways.* This bill would allow Caltrans to reduce the speed limit on state highways by five mph in certain areas after completing an engineering and traffic survey. One of the areas eligible for the reduction would be highway segments that have the highest number of serious injuries and fatalities, known as safety corridors. Another eligible area would be portions of highway adjacent to high concentrations of bicyclists or pedestrians, especially those from vulnerable groups such as children, seniors, persons with disabilities, and the unhoused.

   Del Norte County, one of the sponsors of AB 1014, argues that lowering speed limits on state roads is particularly important in rural areas, where recreation is more likely to take place along the side of state highways. The County states, "[i]n Del Norte County, speed is a major factor in traffic collisions that result in pedestrian fatalities or injuries along state highways that intersect State and National Recreation Areas, such as U.S. Route 199 that passes portions of Jedediah Smith State Park, the Six Rivers National Forest/Smith River National Recreation Area, and recreationally designated segments of the Wild and Scenic Smith River around the communities of Hiouchi and Gasquet. Highways that intersect State and National Recreation Areas continue to be hazardous areas, where pedestrians are at high risk of injury or death due to fast-moving vehicles and the added volume of cars and pedestrian traffic from kayakers, rafters, hikers, bicyclists, and fishermen; pedestrians may cross highways to travel between areas, or tourists may walk alongside highways to reach campsites. To complicate the matter, the unique conditions in terms of visitor-serving and recreational activities are not properly accounted for in current law, leading to speed limits in excess of what these communities generally consider to be safe."

   This bill also extends to Caltrans the authority local jurisdictions currently have to set a 25 or 20 mph speed limit in "business activity districts," defined as neighborhood downtown areas. Nevada County Transportation Commission points out in support of the bill that, "[i]n many rural California communities like ours, Caltrans highways serve as the local main street or a general-purpose highway that connects small communities and carries local traffic, in addition to people on bikes and walking."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

Del Norte County (co-source)
Streets are for Everyone (co-source)
Amy Foell Consulting INC
Bike LA
Bike Long Beach
Bike Slo County
California Bicycle Coalition
County of Monterey
Hopland Municipal Advisory Council
Los Angeles Walks
Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Monterey; County of
Move California
Move Santa Barbara County
Nevada County Transportation Commission
Office of Monterey County Supervisor Chris Lopez
Peopleforbikes
Rural County Representatives of California
Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
Santa Monica Safe Streets Alliance
Santa Monica Spoke
Slow Down Sacramento
So Cal Cycling
Socal Families for Safe Streets
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
Sonoma County Transportation Authority/regional Climate Protection Authority
Street Racing Kills
Streets for All
Transportation Agency for Monterey County
West Hollywood Bicycle Coalition

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 5/23/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, 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, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Hoover, Nguyen, Sanchez, Sharp-Collins, Ta, Wicks

Prepared by: Isabelle LaSalle / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
7/8/25 16:38:49

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1123
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1123
Author: Muratsuchi (D)
Amended: 6/9/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Choi, Cortese, Laird, Limón
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/8/25 - See last page for vote

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SUBJECT: Commission on Teacher Credentialing: membership

SOURCE: California Community College Early Childhood Educators
Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles
Child Care Resource Center
Head Start California
PEACH

DIGEST: This bill modifies the composition of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to allow for early childhood education (ECE) representation without expanding the total number of commissioners.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the CTC as an independent state agency consisting of 15 voting members, 14 of whom are appointed by the Governor with Senate confirmation. (Education Code (EC) § 44210)

2) Requires the commission to include:

   a) Six practicing public school teachers;

b) One person employed under a services credential (excluding administrative services);

c) One public school administrator;

d) One certificated human resources administrator;

e) One governing board member of a school district;

f) Three public representatives with no recent K-12 employment or board service;

g) One higher education faculty member;

h) The Superintendent of Public Instruction (or designee).

3) Terminates commission membership if appointees no longer meet the eligibility criteria.

4) Prohibits more than one member from being appointed from the same school district or university campus.

5) Sets staggered terms for appointed members and limits them to two consecutive full terms. (EC §§ 44210, 44213)

6) Requires the CTC to establish and renew child development permits and to approve related alternative training and experience. (EC § 8301; Title 5, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §§ 80107, 80111)

This bill:

1) Allows one of the six teacher positions on the Commission to be filled by a teacher who holds a CTC-issued child development permit and teaches at a state-funded preschool or prekindergarten program licensed under Title 5 regulations.

2) Converts, upon the first vacancy, one of the three public member seats into a designated seat for a faculty member from the early childhood education system. This faculty member must teach either:

a) In a child development or ECE baccalaureate program at a University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU), or;

b) In an associate degree ECE program at a California Community College (CCC).

Comments

1) *Need for this bill.* According to the author, "The State of California issued the first Child Development Permits to early childhood educators in 1961, making it the first state to professionalize this critical workforce. But in the six decades since, early childhood education (ECE) professionals in California have never had a voting member on the commission which governs their licensure and preparation.

"By adding ECE appointments to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), AB 1123 will ensure that ECE educators, administrators, and the faculty who prepare them have a voice on issues of direct consequence to them and the families they serve. By adding these professionals to the CTC, this bill will bring valuable expertise, experience, and perspectives to the CTC.

"Over the years, ECE teachers have been without a voting voice on the CTC when significant issues have arisen. Indeed, the Child Development Permit has been updated numerous times without the voting participation of ECE educators. In a recent example, stakeholders expressed concern that Child Development Permit holders had minimal opportunity to engage in the CTC's Child Development Permit Workgroup.

AB 1123 is a long overdue measure that will provide a voice for ECE educators, administrators, and faculty on the future of their profession."

2) *ECE Stakeholder Inclusion without Commission Expansion.* This bill reflects a strategic shift from its earlier version, which proposed adding three new members to the CTC. In response to concerns from CTC staff and other stakeholders about increasing the Commission's already complex structure, the current version reallocates two existing seats to incorporate ECE perspectives. This approach introduces ECE expertise into the Commission while preserving its current size, mitigating administrative and logistical burdens.

3) *Addressing a Longstanding Representation Gap.* The CTC has regulated child development permits since the 1960s, yet early childhood educators and faculty have never held voting seats on the Commission. In recent years, the CTC has adopted policies that directly affect the ECE workforce, including revising the Child Development Permit structure, establishing Teaching Performance Expectations for preschool educators, and adopting the PK–3 Early Childhood

Education Specialist Credential. The absence of ECE voices in these deliberations has been a recurring concern among stakeholders. By reassigning existing seats, this bill provides a targeted remedy to a historical gap in representation.

4) *Maintaining Structural Integrity of the Commission.* CTC staff previously expressed concern that expanding the size of the Commission would create governance and logistical challenges. These include more complex scheduling, increased costs, and potential dilution of core roles. This bill's recent amendments address these concerns by preserving the current 15-member size, which CTC staff has indicated is already at the upper bound of functionality.

5) *Precedent for Future Representation Requests?* The inclusion of ECE professionals on the CTC may prompt other stakeholder groups—such as those representing English learners, special education, or rural educators—to seek guaranteed representation in the future. While that is a possibility, the circumstances surrounding this bill are unique: early childhood educators have existed under the Commission's jurisdiction for over 60 years without voting representation, despite having their own permit structure, preparation pipelines, and ongoing regulatory changes. The long-standing exclusion of ECE voices, despite the scale of CTC activity affecting their workforce, creates a compelling rationale for inclusion that does not necessarily extend to all educator subgroups.

6) *Representation Supports Better Governance.* The inclusion of ECE educators is not just symbolic—it may improve policy development and implementation. The CTC frequently adopts preparation standards, program guidelines, and credentialing regulations with direct implications for the ECE workforce. Having practitioners and faculty from that sector present during deliberations can lead to more practical, informed, and equitable decision-making. As California expands transitional kindergarten and invests in a more professionalized ECE system, embedding these voices within the CTC is aligned with the state's broader education priorities.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

California Community College Early Childhood Educators (Co-Source)
Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles (Co-Source)
Child Care Resources Center (Co-Source)
Head Start California (Co-Source)

PEACH (Co-Source)
Alameda County Office of Education
Association of California Community College Teacher Education Programs
California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
Californians Together
CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Child Action, Inc.
Delta Kappa Gamma International - Chi State
Early Edge California
EveryChild California
Local Planning Council of Ventura County
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Options for Learning
Ventura County Office of Education
One Individual

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 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, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, 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, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Boerner, Carrillo, Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Celeste Rodriguez, Wallis

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
7/1/25 16:32:13

****** 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: 7/3/25 in Senate
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.

Senate Floor Amendments specify within the restitution statute that victim restitution is to 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. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 1202, subd. (f).)

4) Prohibits consideration of a defendant's inability to pay in determining the amount of a restitution order. (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 7/1/25)

San Francisco District Attorney Brooke Jenkins (source)
California District Attorneys Association
California Police Chiefs Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS 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. /
7/7/25 16:11:58

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1258
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1258
Author: Kalra (D)
Amended: 4/2/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/24/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-13, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Deferred entry of judgment pilot program

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill extends the operation of the Transition Age Youth Pilot Program operating in Butte, Nevada, and Santa Clara counties until January 1, 2029.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides that the counties of Alameda, Butte, Napa, Nevada, and Santa Clara may establish a pilot program to operate a deferred entry of judgment pilot program until January 1, 2024 for certain eligible defendants. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 1000.7, subd. (a).)

2) Provides that a defendant may participate in a deferred entry of judgment pilot program within the county's juvenile hall if that person is charged with committing a felony offense, except as specified, they plead guilty to the charge or charges, and the probation department determines that the person meets all of the following requirements:

a) Is 18 years of age or older, but under 21 years of age on the date the offense was committed, or is 21 years of age or older, but under 25 years of age on the date the offense was committed with the approval of the county multidisciplinary team established pursuant to this pilot program;

b) Is suitable for the program after evaluation using a risk assessment tool, as specified;

c) Shows the ability to benefit from services generally reserved for delinquents, including but not limited to, cognitive behavioral therapy, other mental health services, and age-appropriate educational, vocational, and supervision services, that are currently deployed under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court;

d) Meets the rules of the juvenile hall developed in accordance with the applicable regulations;

e) Does not have a prior or current conviction for committing certain specified offenses; and,

f) Is not required to register as a sex offender, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (b).)

3) Requires the probation department, in consultation with the superior court, district attorney, and sheriff of the county or the governmental body charged with operating the county jail, to develop an evaluation process using a risk assessment tool to determine eligibility for the program. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (c).)

4) Makes ineligible for the deferred entry of judgment pilot program a defendant who is required to register as a sex offender, as specified, or who has been convicted of one or more of the following offenses:

a) A "serious" felony, as that term is defined by law;

b) A "violent" felony, as that term is defined by law; or,

c) A serious or violent crime as that term is defined pertaining to juveniles. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (d).)

5) Requires the court to grant deferred entry of judgment if an eligible defendant consents to participate in the program, waives their right to a speedy trial or a

speedy preliminary hearing, pleads guilty to the charge or charges, and waives time for the pronouncement of judgment. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (e).)

6) Provides that if the probation department determines that the defendant is not eligible for the deferred entry of judgment pilot program or the defendant does not consent to participate in the program, the proceedings shall continue as in any other case. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (f)(1).)

7) States that if it appears to the probation department that the defendant is performing unsatisfactorily in the program as a result of the commission of a new crime or the violation of any of the rules of the juvenile hall or that the defendant is not benefiting from the services in the program, the probation department may make a motion for entry of judgment. After notice to the defendant, the court is required to hold a hearing to determine whether judgment should be entered. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (f)(2).)

8) States that if the court finds that the defendant is performing unsatisfactorily in the program or that the defendant is not benefiting from the services in the program, the court is required to render a finding of guilt to the charge or charges pleaded, enter judgment, and schedule a sentencing hearing, and the probation department, in consultation with the county sheriff, is required to remove the defendant from the program and return him or her to custody in county jail. The mechanism of when and how the defendant is moved from custody in juvenile hall to custody in a county jail shall be determined by the local multidisciplinary team, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (f)(2).)

9) Provides that if the defendant has performed satisfactorily during the period in which deferred entry of judgment was granted, at the end of that period, the court is required to dismiss the criminal charge or charges. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (f)(3).)

10) Prohibits a defendant participating in this program from serving longer than one year in juvenile hall. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (g).)

11) Requires the probation department to develop a plan for reentry services, including, but not limited to, housing, employment, and education services, as a component of the program. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (h).)

12) Requires the probation department to submit data relating to the effectiveness of the program to the Division of Recidivism Reduction and Re-Entry, within the Department of Justice, including recidivism rates for program participants

as compared to recidivism rates for similar populations in the adult system within the county. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (i).)

13) Prohibits a defendant participating in the program from coming into contact with minors within the juvenile hall for any purpose, including, but not limited to, housing, recreation, or education. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (j).)

14) Requires a county participating in the program to conduct an evaluation of the pilot program's impact and effectiveness in their county, as specified, and to prepare a report based on the evaluation, which is to be submitted to the Assembly and Senate Committees on Public Safety. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (n).)

15) Sunsets the pilot program on January 1, 2026. (Pen. Code, § 1000.7, subd. (o).)

This bill:

1) Extends the young adult deferred entry of judgment pilot program from January 1, 2026 to January 1, 2029.

2) Removes Alameda County from the pilot program.

Background

The Deferred Entry of Judgement Pilot Program is based on the premise that although 18 to 21 year olds are legally adults, young offenders are still undergoing significant brain development and may be better served by the juvenile justice system with corresponding age appropriate intensive services.

To be eligible for the transition age youth deferred entry of judgment program, the defendant must be between the ages of 18 and 21, and must not have a prior or current conviction for a serious, violent, or sex offense. Individuals between the age of 21 and 24 may also participate in the program with approval of the local multidisciplinary team. Participants must consent to participate in the program, be assessed and found suitable for the program, and show the ability to benefit from the services generally provided to juvenile hall youth. The probation department is required to develop a plan for reentry services, including, but not limited to, housing, employment, and education services, as a component of the program. Finally, a person participating in the program cannot serve more than one year in juvenile hall.

The pilot program is a deferred entry of judgment program, meaning that participants have to plead guilty in order to be eligible for the program. If they succeed in the program then the criminal charges are dismissed. If the individual is found to perform unsatisfactorily in the program, the probation department may file a motion of entry of judgement. Once it receives the motion, the court conducts a hearing to establish whether a judgment should be entered. If the court determines that an individual was not benefiting from the services and supports included in the program or is performing unsatisfactorily in the program, the court may render a verdict of guilty to the charge or charges and schedule a sentencing hearing.

This bill extends the operational date of the pilot program to January 1, 2029 and removes Alameda County as a participating county.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

California Judges Association
California Public Defenders Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California
County of Santa Clara
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT:

According to the Chief Probation Officers of California:

> SB 1004 (Hill, 2016) and SB 1106 (Hill, 2018) authorized specified counties to voluntarily enact a pilot program that allows young adults who have committed non-serious, non-violent, and non-sex offenses aged 18-21 to participate in the program which allows them to receive services and to have their charges dismissed upon successful completion of the program. Programming for these young adults includes cognitive behavioral therapy, mental health treatment, vocational training, reentry planning, and education, among others.

Probation is focused on helping justice-involved individuals transition out of the system permanently through transformative and evidence-based rehabilitation and by addressing the safety and treatment needs of the individual. The extension sought in this bill helps support the important continuity of services and community safety needs for individuals in the program.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 61-13, 6/2/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Hadwick, Hoover, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Dixon, Lackey, Blanca Rubio, Ta

Prepared by: Sandy Uribe / PUB. S. /
7/8/25 16:38:50

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1299
Author: Bryan (D) and Celeste Rodriguez (D)
Amended: 3/17/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/24/25
AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Gonzalez, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Seyarto, Umberg
NO VOTE RECORDED: Richardson, Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-1, 5/27/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Parking violations

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill authorizes a local authority to waive or reduce parking penalties at any time if a person can demonstrate circumstances relevant to their inability to pay the penalty, and requires processing agencies to allow indigent persons to request a parking penalty payment plan at any time.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes a local authority to allow payment of the parking penalty in installments or defer payments. (Vehicle Code (VEH) § 40215)

2) Provides several options to processing agencies collecting unpaid parking penalties for tickets, including filing an itemization of unpaid parking penalties and service fees with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for collection with the registration of a vehicle, so long as the processing agency:

a) Provides a payment plan option for indigent persons, as defined, that allows unpaid parking fines and fees to be paid off in monthly installments of no more than $25 for total amounts due that are $500 or less, in a period within 24 months. No prepayment penalty for paying off the balance prior to the payment period may be accessed;

b) Waives all late fees and penalty assessments, exclusive of any state surcharges, as defined, if an indigent person enrolls in the payment plan. Waived late fees and penalty assessments may be reinstated if the person falls out of compliance with the payment plan;

c) Limits the processing fee to participate in a payment plan to $5 or less for indigent persons and $25 or less for all other persons. The processing fee may be added to the payment plan amount at the discretion of the payee; and,

d) Allows the application for the determination if a person is indigent for a period of 120 calendar days from the issuance of a notice of parking violation, or 10 days after the administrative hearing determination, whichever is later. (VEH § 40220)

3) Requires a processing agency to allow a registered owner or lessee who falls out of compliance with a payment plan a one-time extension of 45 calendar days from the date the plan becomes delinquent to resume payments before the processing agency files an itemization of unpaid parking penalties and service fees with DMV. (VEH § 40220)

4) Requires a processing agency to include information regarding its payment plan option above on its public website, and a web page link and telephone number to more information on the program. (VEH § 40220)

5) Defines "indigent" for the purposes of this section to mean anyone who meets the income requirements for or is currently on several public assistance programs, including: Supplemental Security Income, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, or more commonly known as food stamps), Medi-Cal or In-Home Supportive Services . (VEH § 40220)

This bill:

1) Authorizes an issuing agency to consider at any time any other extenuating circumstances relevant to the payment of the parking penalty, including but not limited to, documented homeless status and financial hardship, when deciding to reduce or suspend parking penalties.

2) Requires processing agencies to extend the period of time they offer payment plans to indigent persons from within 120 days of receiving the parking ticket to any time in order for the issuing agency to use DMV as a collection agent.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, "AB 1299 is a common sense bill that gives local government's discretion to reduce or waive parking penalties based on the individual's circumstances, including, but not limited to, financial hardship. For people living in poverty, parking tickets pose are a severe financial burden that can quickly spiral from a $52 fine to a vehicle registration hold. This bill gives local agencies the ability to look at a person's whole circumstance when deciding an action on a parking ticket. For situations where a parking ticket can push an individual from poverty to financial crisis, local jurisdictions should have the ability to do what is best for their constituent."

2) *High Burden of Parking tickets.* Unpaid parking tickets can pose a significant burden for low-income individuals. Parking tickets can initiate a cascading effect of worsening consequences, from mounting fines, to the vehicle being towed, to a lien sale of the vehicle by the tow company at a total loss to the owner. According to the 2019 report *Towed into Debt: How Towing Practices in California Punish Poor People*, "[s]tatewide, over one fourth of tows are conducted just because the owner had unpaid parking tickets, lapsed registration, or parked in one place for 72 hours. Vehicles towed for these reasons are 2-6 times more likely to be sold at lien sale than the average towed car." The report identified that in San Francisco 50% of vehicles towed for unpaid parking tickets were sold by the tow company, while only 9% of all vehicles towed were sold.

3) *Past legislative efforts.* Under current law, processing agencies are already required to take several steps prior to asking DMV to collect the unpaid debt from indigent individuals, including establishing a payment program and waiving late fees and penalty assessments. The Legislature passed AB 503 (Lackey, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2017) to stem the spiral of debt for an

indigent person. The bill reduced parking penalties for indigent individuals by requiring the offering of a payment plan and the waiver of penalties. Assemblymember Lackey introduced two follow-up bills as a result of processing agencies trying to circumvent implementing the law. AB 2544 (Lackey, Chapter 494, Statutes of 2018), clarified that parking agencies had to offer payment plans for tickets issued before July 1, 2018, because processing agencies refused to consider older tickets when implementing the law. AB 833 (Lackey, Chapter 495, Statutes of 2019), clarified that the $300 maximum cap for which a parking agency had to offer a payment plan only applied to the base fines, not too late penalties because the City of Sacramento was refusing to provide payment plans for individuals who had more than two tickets with a late fee. In 2020, the Legislature passed AB 3277 (Jones-Sawyer, Chapter 55), which increased the maximum cap from $300 to $500. AB 3277 also lengthened the period of time an individual can request a payment plan from 60 calendar days from the issuance of a parking violation to 120 days from the issuance of a parking violation.

4) *Flexibility for issuing agencies.* This bill grants greater flexibility to agencies issuing parking tickets, easing restrictions on their ability to reduce, suspend, or offer payment plans for parking fines for individuals experiencing homelessness. First, this bill removes the requirement that a person who received a parking ticket must request a payment plan for their fine within 120 days. Instead, under this bill, a person could request to participate in a repayment plan at any time. According to this bill's sponsors, some individuals who need payment plans miss the 120 day window and thus become ineligible for payment plans. Second, this bill allows the issuing agency to defer, reduce, or waive the parking penalty at any time if the ticketed person can demonstrate their inability to pay, or other extenuating circumstances, such as homelessness or financial hardship. This provision is permissive to the issuing agency. Currently, an issuing agency is limited as to when, why, and to what extent they can reduce penalties.

   Research indicates that reducing fines and fees results in greater repayment rates. According to an analysis by the Judicial Council of California of citation repayment data, "repayment success rates increased as the ordered amount decreased. Furthermore, the results of these three studies align on the proportional relationship between repayment likelihood and the amount ordered, showing an approximately 20 percent repayment rate at fines exceeding $500 and increasing approximately 10 percent with each subsequent reduction of $100 up to 70 percent for amounts between $0 and $100."

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1022 (Kalra, 2025) – Would have removed the authority for a peace officer to impound a vehicle for having five or more unpaid parking tickets. This bill was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 1487 (Glazer, 2024) – Would have prohibited a late payment penalty for a parking violation from exceeding 30% of the original penalty and would extend the time to pay a parking violation before additional penalties accrue. This bill was held in Assembly Appropriations Committee on suspense.

AB 1082 (Kalra, 2023) – Would have, among other provisions, revised the ability of local processing agencies to refer delinquent parking violations to the DMV and revised requirements for payment plans. This bill was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee on suspense.

AB 1685 (Bryan, 2022) – Would have required processing agencies to forgive at least $1,500 in parking fines and fees annually for a qualified homeless person. The bill was vetoed by Governor Newsom.

AB 3277 (Jones-Sawyer, Chapter 55, Statutes of 2020) – Made various eligibility and programmatic changes to the payment plan program administered by local agencies relative to parking citations.

AB 503 (Lackey, Chapter 741, Statutes of 2017) – Required the offering of a payment plan and the waiver of penalties for indigent people with unpaid parking tickets prior to filing an itemization of them at the DMV, starting on July 1, 2018.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/7/25)

Bay Area Legal Aid
California Housing Partnership
California Mobility and Parking Association
Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organization
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto
Debt Free Justice California

Grace Institute - End Child Poverty in CA
Housing California
Initiate Justice
John Burton Advocates for Youth
Justice2jobs Coalition
Los Angeles City Attorney's Office
San Francisco Public Defender
Western Center on Law & Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/7/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-1, 5/27/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bennett, Jeff Gonzalez, Nguyen

Prepared by: Isabelle LaSalle / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121
7/8/25 16:38:51

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1369
Author: Ramos (D)
Amended: 6/23/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Laird, Limón

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/12/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil rights: school graduation ceremonies and related events: adornments

SOURCE: California Indian Legal Services
Tule River Tribe

DIGEST: This bill strengthens the existing authorization for students to wear specified adornments at school graduation ceremonies by explicitly authorizing students and their families to determine what adornments are deemed to be traditional tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance. The bill also prohibits local educational agencies (LEAs) from (1) requiring students to undergo a preapproval process in order to exercise the right described above and (2) requiring students to wear a graduation cap if it is incompatible with the specified adornment.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Authorizes a pupil to wear traditional tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance as an adornment at school graduation ceremonies. (Education Code (EC) § 35183.1)

2) Prohibits the authorization in 1) above from being construed to limit an LEA's discretion and authority to prohibit an item that is likely to cause a substantial disruption of, or material interference with, the ceremony. (EC § 35183.1)

3) Defines the following terms:

   a) "Adornment" means something attached to or worn with, but not replacing, the cap and gown customarily worn at school graduation ceremonies.

   b) "Cultural" means recognized practices and traditions of a certain group of people. (EC § 35183.1)

4) Authorizes the governing board of a school district to adopt a reasonable dress code policy that requires pupils to wear a school wide uniform or prohibits pupils from wearing "gang-related apparel" if the governing board of the school district approves a plan that may be initiated by an individual school's principal, staff, and parents, and it determines that the policy is necessary for the health and safety of the school environment. (EC § 35183)

5) Specifies that a pupil has the right to wear a dress uniform, issued by a branch of the United States Armed Forces, during his or her high school graduation ceremony if he or she has met the graduation requirements and is an active member of the United States Armed Forces. (EC § 35183.3)

This bill:

1) Explicitly authorizes students and their families to determine what adornments are deemed to be traditional tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance for graduation ceremonies.

2) Extends the existing authorization to wear specified adornments as well as the expanded discretion to apply when worn at a graduation related school event.

3) Prohibits LEAs from doing either of the following:

   a) Requiring students to undergo a preapproval process in order to exercise the right described above.

   b) Requiring students to wear a graduation cap if it is incompatible with the specified adornment.

4) Revises the definition of "adornment" to mean either of the following:

   a) Something attached to, worn with, or worn in place of, the cap customarily worn at school graduation ceremonies.

   b) Something attached to or worn with, but not replacing, the gown customarily worn at school graduation ceremonies.

Comments

1) *Need for this bill.* According to the author, "In 2018, the state passed legislation that recognized a student's right to wear traditional tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance at school graduation ceremonies. Despite the law and subsequent statutory reaffirmation of students' rights, they and their families continue to face obstacles to exercising this legal prerogative. For our tribal communities, high school graduations are times of great celebration. Eagle feathers and other symbols of Native American significance are often presented by a proud community to the student as a way to recognize personal achievement. It is a means for the tribe not only to honor the student but also to share in and express pride in the graduate's achievements. AB 1369 aims to add additional clarity in law to help reinforce all students' rights to freedom of expression."

2) *Students have a right to wear certain graduation adornments.* Since the passage of AB 1248 (Gloria, Chapter 804, Statutes of 2018), students have retained the right to wear tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance as an adornment at school graduation ceremonies. With this authorization came an explicit caveat that LEAs would retain the discretion and authority to prohibit an item that is likely to cause a substantial disruption or material interference with the ceremony.

   In recognition of this right, on May 22, 2025, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tony Thurmond, and the Attorney General (AG), Rob Bonta,

issued a joint letter to county and district superintendents, charter school administrators, and high school principals across the state, reminding these leaders of the graduates' rights to wear tribal regalia:

> "As we commemorate the dedication and accomplishments of our students, we urge you to implement policies that embrace culturally inclusive ceremonies and preserve the rights of our Native students. Let us ensure that these policies reflect and pay homage to the rich diversity present among our students and their families.
>
> "We encourage you to take the time to further review the portion of the California Education Code cited in this letter as well as local policies and explore opportunities for students to honor their heritage, which is crucial for creating an inclusive and supportive environment. As policies are reviewed, the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Office of the Attorney General (AG) recommend engaging with your local tribal leaders and American Indian communities to gain a deeper understanding of their traditions and values. These meetings allow for meaningful dialogue where perspectives can be shared and considerations for how cultural practices can be incorporated into graduation ceremony policies. By collaborating in this way, educational institutions can demonstrate respect for cultural diversity and create opportunities for students to celebrate their heritage proudly.
>
> "The CDE and the AG deeply appreciate your dedication to ensuring that all students feel valued in their educational journey. We are committed to upholding our students' cultural traditions and ensuring that graduation ceremonies are inclusive and reflective of the rich diversity within our student population."

3) *Native American Graduation Adornments Taskforce***.** In the years following the passage of AB 1248, the Legislature continued to receive reports of students facing significant barriers or denials to their ability to exercise their right to wear tribal regalia and other adornments. In response, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed AB 945 (Ramos, Chapter 285, Statutes of 2021), requiring CDE to convene the Native American Graduation Adornment Taskforce (NAGAT). NAGAT was directed to develop recommendations for best practices, protocols, and other policies that will address how to comprehensively implement all aspects of a student's authority to wear

traditional tribal regalia or recognized objects of religious or cultural significance as an adornment at school graduation ceremonies.

Although statute required the NAGAT to hold its first meeting on or before April 2022, conduct at least four additional public meetings annually, and submit a report to the Legislature that includes its findings and policy recommendations by April 1, 2023, the CDE website indicates that the Taskforce's timeline has been delayed, with the scheduled four public meetings instead occurring between September 2023 and May 2024. The required report with policy recommendations has yet to be released.

4) *Research highlights barriers, inconsistencies, and denials.* A report entitled, *California's Graduation Dress Codes: Violations of Indigenous Students' Rights to Self-Determination and Cultural Preservation*, conducted by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and one of the bill sponsors, the California Indian Legal Services (CILS), highlighted how variations in, or the absence of, a clear and comprehensive graduation dress code impacts the rights of Indigenous students. Of the 50 LEAs studied, the report found that 56% required students to undergo a pre-approval process to wear tribal regalia or cultural or religious adornments at graduation. These pre-approval processes typically require students to request approval between 5 to 14 days before the graduation ceremony.

   The report also highlighted significant variations across LEAs in the information available about the pre-approval process. While some LEAs referenced a pre-approval process in their student handbook, LEA board policies, or administrative regulations, many LEAs provided little to no context on the required paperwork for approval, the timeline for approval, or the guidelines for approval or rejection of the adornments.

   The report also highlighted recent examples of cases brought to the ACLU and CILS where students reported that they were barred from wearing adornments or faced significant barriers:

   - In 2023, a school's graduation policy prohibited students from wearing leis at graduation, urging students to keep the ceremony "classy." A Native Hawaiian family successfully advocated for their child's right to wear the lei at graduation;

- In 2023, a student who was graduating from the Elk Grove Unified School District was denied the right to wear his regalia at graduation, citing first that the family missed the deadline to request pre-approval to wear items in addition to the cap and gown at graduation, then attempting to limit the student's regalia to only one item, and subsequently requiring the eagle feather to be no longer than the tassel; and

- In 2024, the Clovis Unified School District denied a student's right to wear his regalia. School staff cited that the student had not filled out a pre-approval form as the primary reason he could not wear his regalia, regardless of the law.

In order to address the concerns about procedural burdens and inconsistencies highlighted in the study and in student experiences, this bill explicitly authorizes students and their families to determine what constitutes as tribal regalia or other culturally or religiously significant objects. Importantly, the bill retains the LEA's authority and discretion to prohibit an item that is likely to cause a substantial disruption of, or material interference with, the ceremony.

5) *California has the nation's highest concentration of Native American/ Alaska Native people.* According to most recent census data, California is home to more people of Native American/ Alaska Native heritage than any other state in the country. There are currently 109 federally recognized Indian tribes in California and several non-federally recognized tribes petitioning for federal recognition through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

   According to the CDE, in 2023-24, there were 25,424 pupils enrolled in California public schools identified as American Indian or Alaska Natives, representing .4% of the total enrollment statewide.

6) *Traditional tribal regalia at high school graduations.* According to a 2017 resolution adopted in by the National Congress of American Indians, American Indian and Alaska Native students seek to wear items of religious significance including but not limited to, eagle feathers, cedar hats, beadwork, headdresses, stoles and other traditional regalia at their commencement ceremony to express and practice their religious and spiritual beliefs and celebrate their academic achievement, leadership, and transition into adulthood.

   The resolution highlights graduation is an especially significant occasion for Native students and families, considering that, at the time of the resolution's

adoption, the American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduation rate was 67 %— "the lowest of any racial or ethnic demographic across all schools in the U.S." per the resolution. For the 2023-24 school year, CDE Ed-Data reports that the adjusted cohort graduation rate among American Indian or Alaska Native students in California was 79.6% compared to the statewide graduation rate of 86.4% for all students.

The National Congress of American Indians resolution supports "the right of American Indian and Alaska Native students to practice and express their traditional religious and spiritual beliefs and honor their academic and other achievements at commencement ceremonies and events" and urges "all schools to respect traditional tribal religious and spiritual beliefs by allowing Native students to practice their religious freedom."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

California Indian Legal Services (co-source)
Tule River Tribe (co-source)
CFT- A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Fresno Unified School District
Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake
Karuk Tribe
Los Angeles County Office of Education

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 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, 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: Nguyen, Stefani

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105
7/3/25 16:02:57

****** 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 1384.

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
7/8/25 9:12:59

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1389
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1389
Author: Blanca Rubio (D)
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 15-0, 7/8/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 4/10/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Horse racing: out-of-state thoroughbred races: New York Stakes

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill adds the New York Stakes to the group of identified race meetings which are exempt from the current 75-race per day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Article IV, Section 19(b) of the Constitution of the State of California authorizes the Legislature to provide for the regulation of horse races and grants the California Horse Racing Board the authority to regulate the various forms of horse racing authorized in this state.

2) Authorizes thoroughbred racing associations or fairs to distribute the audiovisual signal and accept wagers on the results of out-of-state and international thoroughbred races during the calendar period the association or fair is conducting live racing, including days on which there is no live racing being conducted by the association or fair.

3) Limits the number of races that may be imported by associations and fairs to no more than 75 races-per-day on days when live thoroughbred or fair racing is being conducted in this state, with specified exceptions.

4) Exempts from that 75 races-per-day limit any imported races that are part of the race card of the Kentucky Derby, the Kentucky Oaks, the Preakness Stakes, the Belmont Stakes, the Jockey Club Gold Cup, the Travers Stakes, the Pegasus World Cup, the Arlington Million, the Breeders' Cup World Championship, the Dubai World Cup, the Arkansas Derby, the Apple Blossom Handicap, the Blue Grass Stakes, the Whitney Stakes, or the Haskell Invitational.

This bill adds the New York Stakes to the group of identified race meetings which are exempt from the current 75-race per day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering.

Background

Author's Statement. According to the author's office, "this bill would exempt all races imported by a thoroughbred association or fair that are part of the race card of the overall New York Stakes day from the 75-race per day limit as defined in current law. The law has been amended over the years to allow the importation of certain prominent races outside of this cap for promotional and financial reasons."

Further, "this bill will help increase the wagering handle on this specific day, which will result in higher purses, racetrack revenue, and breeders' awards in California. Purses are critical to California's racing industry because they provide revenue to horse owners for their racing operations. In addition, they provide revenue to breeders through an increase in the value of their breeding stock."

Satellite Wagering. Satellite wagering via an off-track facility has been legal in California since the 1980s when California racetracks started to experience declining attendance and handle figures. The industry believed that making the product easier to access not only would expose and market horse racing to potential customers, but also would make it more convenient for the existing patrons to wager more often. However, while off-track-betting and simulcasting can open new revenue pathways, they often cannibalize traditional on-track income, putting tracks at further financial risk and potentially contributing to closures.

Simulcasting. Simulcasting is the process of transmitting the audio and video signal of a live racing performance from one facility to a satellite for re-transmission to other locations or venues where pari-mutuel wagering is permitted. Simulcasting provides racetracks with the opportunity to increase revenues by exporting their live racing content to as many wagering locations as possible, such as other racetracks, fair satellite facilities, and Indian casinos. Revenues increase because simulcasting provides racetracks that export their live content with additional customers in multiple locations who would not have otherwise been able to place wagers on the live racing event.

Distribution of Audiovisual Signals and Wagering. Thoroughbred racing associations and fairs in California can distribute the audiovisual signal and accept wagers on the results of out-of-state thoroughbred races during their own race meetings. This is allowed even on days when no live races are being held at their venues. There is a limit on the number of out-of-state races that can be imported into California for betting purposes. On days when there is live thoroughbred or fair racing happening in California, the total number of races imported from out-of-state must not exceed 75 races-per-day.

However, there are exceptions to this limit. Races that are part of specific major events like the Kentucky Derby, Breeder's Cup, and other specified races can be imported without falling under the 75 race-per-day limit. Additional exceptions are made for importing races into certain geographical zones of California when no local live racing is occurring. Any wagering on these out-of-state races must comply with specific provisions of California's Horse Racing Law that govern how betting should be conducted. Wagers on out-of-state races are not allowed after 7 p.m. Pacific Standard Time unless there is consent from the local harness or quarter horse racing associations conducting live racing in certain counties.

Racetrack Attendance. Prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic, and closure of non-essential businesses in California, the horse racing industry had already been experiencing a general decline in the number of people attending and wagering at live tracks in California. This has been occurring for more than three decades due to myriad factors including; increased competition from other forms of gaming, unwillingness of customers to travel a significant distance to racetracks, and the availability of off-track wagering.

Despite poor weather conditions and a sloppy racing surface, Churchill Downs reported that 147,406 people attended the 2025 Kentucky Derby. The all-sources betting handle on the Derby and the entire racing card reported records of $234.4

million and $349 million, respectively. NBC Sports reported an average of 17.7 million viewers across NBC and Peacock for their 25th Kentucky Derby broadcast, the largest television audience for the race since 1989. The declining attendance at live horse racing events in California has prompted racetracks to rely on revenues from in-state and out-of-state satellite wagering and account wagering.
Status of the Horse Racing Industry in California. The California horse racing industry's long-term health is threatened by a combination of factors, including competition from racing in other states, other forms of gaming within California, declining attendance, and the potential for higher return from development than operating revenues. As resources shrink, the industry is experiencing deficits in virtually every one of its revenue sources. Traditional take out, allocation and distribution formulas are no longer able to sustain ongoing operations.

As the value of racing operations decline, track ownership is struggling to maximize the necessary return on the investment and tempted by alternative uses of the property that yield higher returns. Consequently, the racing industry is suffering unprecedented instability and capital flight. Tens of thousands of industry jobs are in immediate jeopardy, along with breeding farms and precious open space in urban centers throughout California. Also at risk is a substantial amount of local and state revenue generated both directly and indirectly by the industry.

Further exacerbating the horse racing industries woes, the USA Today published an article in June of this year titled, "ICE raid on track workers sends shockwaves around racing, 'puts horses at risk.'" In the article, USA Today reports that federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents raided the Delta Downs racetrack in Vinton, Louisiana on June 17. More than 80 backstretch workers were reportedly detained, which the article notes "should be a wake-up call for an industry that would simply not be able to function without a workforce of grooms and hotwalkers and stall cleaners who are, by some credible estimates, 75% immigrants. They come from places like Venezuela, Panama, Colombia and Mexico, working low-wage jobs but filling indispensable roles, caring round-the-clock for animals worth hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars."

Prominent trainer Dale Romans told reporters during a Kentucky Derby-week news conference set up to address the threat posed by a potential U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement raid at a racetrack, "if we couldn't have an immigrant workforce on the backside, I don't know how horse racing exists."

The New York Stakes. The New York Stakes is a Grade I American thoroughbred horse race for fillies and mares aged four-years-old and older run over a distance of one and one-quarter miles on the turf and scheduled annually in early June at Belmont Park in Elmont, New York. Prior to 1962, the race was open to horses of either sex. For 1972 only, it was restricted to three-year-old fillies. Inaugurated in 1940 as the New York Handicap at Aqueduct Racetrack, it was moved to Belmont Park in 1961 but returned to Aqueduct in 1963, where it remained until 1975, when it was permanently shifted to Belmont Park. Since its inception, it has been contested at various distances on both dirt and turf.

The annual race headlines the day-before-Belmont Stakes card, which is the third and final leg of horse racing's Triple Crown. The current purse is $750,000. In 2022, Homerique won the New York Stakes, giving trainer Chad Brown his third victory in this prestigious race.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 347 (Strickland, 2025) authorizes thoroughbred and Appaloosa horses to enter into quarter horse races at any distance, as specified; and, amends the conditions that a licensed quarter horse racing association can conduct thoroughbred racing as part of its racing program, as specified. This bill is pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee.

SB 844 (Rubio, 2025) increases the limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races by a California thoroughbred racing association or fair for pari-mutuel wagering from 75 to 80 races-per-day, as specified. This bill is pending in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee.

AB 1526 (Committee on Governmental Organization, 2025) makes various technical and non-substantive changes to provisions of law related to horse racing. This bill is pending in on the Senate Floor.

AB 1946 (Alanis, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2024) added the Whitney Stakes to the group of races which are exempt from the existing imported race-per-day limitation.

AB 3261 (M. Fong, Chapter 439, Statutes of 2024) raised the previous limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races, for the purposes of accepting wagers on those races, from 50 to 75 out-of-state races-per-day; and, prohibited, when the total number of those races imported is between 51 and 75 races-per-day,

a thoroughbred association or fair from accepting wagers on those races commencing after 5:00 p.m. without the consent of the harness or quarter horse racing association that is then conducting a live race meeting in the County of Orange or the County of Sacramento.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 4/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Carrillo, Chen, Gallagher, Garcia, Hoover, Jackson, Papan, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
7/10/25 15:52:55

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1393
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1393
Author: Blanca Rubio (D)
Introduced: 2/21/25
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 15-0, 7/8/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 4/10/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Gambling Control Commission

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill modifies the requirement that one member of the California Gambling Control Commission (Commission) be an attorney and a member of the State Bar of California with regulatory law experience, to instead require that one member of the Commission be an attorney and a member of the State Bar of California with regulatory or gaming law experience.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Provides, under the Gambling Control Act (Act), for the licensure and regulation of various legalized gambling activities and establishments by the Commission and the investigation and enforcement of those activities and establishments by the Bureau of Gambling Control (Bureau), under the California Department of Justice (DOJ).

2) Provides that the Commission is composed of five members who are appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the Senate.

3) Prohibits the appointment of an individual to the Commission if, within two years prior to appointment, the person was employed by or derived substantial income from, any gambling establishment.

4) Prohibits a member of the Commission from engaging in any other business, vocation, or employment.

5) Requires one member of the Commission to be a certified public accountant or a person with experience in banking or finance, one member to be an attorney and a member of the State Bar or California with regulatory law experience, one member to have a background in law enforcement and criminal investigation, and one member to have a background in business with at least five years of business experience or five years of governmental experience, and one member be from the public.

6) Requires the Governor to fill any vacancies on the Commission, subject to confirmation, within 60 days of the date of the vacancy.

This bill:

1) Modifies the requirement that one member of the Commission be an attorney and a member of the State Bar or California with regulatory law experience, to instead require that one member of the Commission be an attorney and a member of the State Bar of California with regulatory *or gaming* law experience.

2) Makes various technical, non-substantive changes.

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "gaming laws are often complex, covering a range of issues such as licensing, taxation, consumer protection, responsible gambling, and anti-money laundering. An expert in gaming law can help navigate these complexities and ensure the laws and regulations are applied correctly."

The author points out that "one of the main roles of regulatory bodies is to protect consumers and ensure fair play. Someone with expertise in gaming law can help the Commission further create policies that safeguard players from unfair practices and ensure their rights are respected. In addition, the gaming industry is evolving quickly with new technologies, such as sports betting, online gaming, e-sports, and mobile platforms. A gaming law expert would help the Commission stay ahead of these trends while making sure new practices are compliant with existing laws or can be properly regulated."

Gambling Control Act. The Act provides the Commission with jurisdiction over the operation of gambling establishments in California. The Act requires every owner, lessee, or employee of a gambling establishment to obtain and maintain a valid state gambling license. The Act assigns the Commission the responsibility of assuring that gambling licenses are not issued to, or held by, unqualified or disqualified persons, or by persons whose operations are conducted in a manner that is harmful to the public health, safety, or welfare.
The Act directs the Commission to issue licenses only to those persons of good character, honesty and integrity, whose prior activities, criminal record, if any; reputation, habits and associations do not pose a threat to the public interest of this state. The DOJ conducts background and field investigations and enforces the provisions of the Act in this regard.

Current law requires the Commission to be comprised of five members. One member is required to be from the public at large, the other four members are required to have the following career backgrounds:

- Certified public accountant or a person with experience in banking or finance.
- Attorney and a member of the State Bar of California with regulatory law experience.
- Background in law enforcement and criminal investigation.
- Background in business with at least five years of business experience or alternatively five years of governmental experience.

This bill maintains that one member of the Commission, among other qualifications, would still have to be an attorney. However, they could have experience in either regulatory or gaming law. Current law excludes gaming law experience, which, the author argues, not only limits the pool of qualified candidates but also prevents individuals with extensive knowledge of gaming laws and overall gambling from applying.

Prior/Related Legislation

SB 864 (Governmental Organization Committee, 2025) requires the Commission to post a public record of every vote on its Internet Web site no later than two business days after the meeting at which the vote was taken. This bill is pending on the Assembly Floor.

AB 77 (Aguiar-Curry, 2025) increases from 10 to 12 members, the membership of the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee and would require the additional members to include representative of academia who possesses knowledge on matter related to gaming and on representative from the Bureau. Additionally, the bill requires the executive director of the Commission, to convene the GPAC at least twice a year, rather than from time to time. This bill is pending on the Senate Inactive File.

SB 1524 (Governmental Organization Committee, 2024) would have reduced the time by which the Governor must fill a vacancy of the Commission from 60 to 45 days. This bill was gutted and Amended to an Unrelated Issue.

AB 2084 (Lackey, 2024) would have reduced the time by which the Governor must fill a vacancy on the Commission from 60 to 45 days. This bill was never heard in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee.

AB 1167 (Bigelow, 2021) would have reduced the time by which the Governor must fill a vacancy on the Commission from 60 to 45 days. The bill would have also required the Governor to notify the Legislature of the removal of a member of the Commission. This bill was never heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2097 (Gallagher, 2019) would have reduced the time by which the Governor must fill a vacancy on the Commission from 60 to 45 days. The bill would have also required the Governor to notify the Legislature of the removal of a member of the Commission. This bill was never heard in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee.

SB 1313 (Vidak, 2018) would have modified the membership of the Commission by eliminating the requirement that Commission members have specified career backgrounds. This bill was never heard in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee.

SB 666 (Vidak, Chapter 245, Statutes of 2017) prohibits a member of the Commission, the executive director, the chief, and any employee of the Commission or the department designated by regulation, for a period of three years after leaving office or terminating employment, for compensation, from acting as an agent or attorney for any other person before the Commission or the DOJ, if the appearance or communication is for the purpose of influencing administrative actions, as specified.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/10/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/10/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 67-0, 4/10/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Carrillo, Chen, Gallagher, Garcia, Hoover, Jackson, Papan, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Felipe Lopez / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
7/10/25 15:52:56

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1414
Author: Ransom (D), et al.
Amended: 6/19/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 4/21/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Landlord-tenant: internet service provider subscriptions

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires a landlord or association to permit a tenant to opt out of any subscription from a third-party internet service provider for internet services that is offered as part of residing in the dwelling unit, as provided.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

1) Establishes the Telecommunications Act to regulate interstate telephone, telegraph, television, radio, and internet communications across the United States. Establishes the Federal Communications Commission to implement and enforce the Act. (47 United States Code (U.S.C.) §§ 151 *et seq.*)

2) Prohibits an Internet Services Provider (ISP) from entering into or enforcing a contract with a landlord of a residential multi-tenant environment (MTE) that provides the ISP the exclusive access to the MTE for internet services. (47 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 64.2500(b).)

3) Prohibits an ISP from entering into or enforcing a contract regarding the provision of communications service in a MTE that gives the MTE owner

compensation on a graduated basis or in return for access to the MTE and its tenants. (47 C.F.R. § 64.2500(c)-(d).)

4) Requires an ISP to disclose the existence of any contract for the exclusive right to market its services to a tenant of a MTE, as specified. 947 C.F.R. § 64.2500(e).)

Existing state law, governs the relations between, and sets forth the rights and responsibilities of, landlords and tenants in a residential dwelling. (Civil Code (Civ. Code) §§ 1940 *et seq.*)

This bill:

1) Requires, for any new or renewed tenancies on or after January 1, 2026, a landlord or association, as defined, to provide a tenant the option to opt out of any subscription from a third-party internet service provider for wired-internet, cellular, or satellite service that is offered as part of residing in the dwelling unit.

2) Specifies that, if the landlord violates the provision described in (1), above, the tenant may deduct the cost of the subscription from their rent.

3) Specifies that nothing in this bill's provisions prevent a landlord from offering bulk billing arrangements to their tenants.

4) Prohibits a property owner from retaliating in any manner against a tenant for exercising their rights under this bill, consistent with specified tenant protections against retaliation.

5) Defines, for the purposes of its provisions, the following terms:

   a) "internet service provider" to be the definition of that term provided in Section 3100 of the Civil Code, which defines it as a business that provides broadband internet access service to an individual, corporation, government, or other customer in California;
   b) "association" as the same as is defined in Section 4080 of the Civil Code.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/3/25)

California Apartment Association
City and County of San Francisco, Board of Supervisors
Consumer Attorneys of California
City of Oakland
Power CA Action
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/3/25)

Bizfed Central Valley
Calbroadband
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Chamber San Mateo County
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Chamber of Commerce
National Rental Home Council
Orange County Business Council
San Mateo County Economic Development Association (SAMCEDA)
The Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to the Center for Accessible Technology, which supports AB 1414:

> Assembly Bill 1414 advances many of the goals of the state.
>
> 1. Ubiquitous Connectivity – The state's motto is "Broadband For All". In order to secure broadband for all, it is necessary for state residents, regardless of their living situation, to be able to utilize any service willing to serve their residence in order to secure the price point and service level that meets their needs. As with any service, one size does not fit all. People have different needs depending on their financial situation, occupational needs, family size, the kind of online activities they favor, and preferences regarding privacy policies. If the market is able to meet their needs, there should not be barriers preventing people from using the companies and services that they prefer.

2. Affordability – California continues to have a broadband affordability problem. Affordability and making a dent in California's expensive cost of living is a legislative priority in 2025. Tenants, in particular, are facing significant rent burdens. Saving $10 or $20 or $30 on the cost of an Internet subscription every month by using an alternate provider can be a huge help to struggling families on a tight budget. No one should be locked into a costly or inadequate Internet subscription because it is more convenient for their landlord or for their HOA.

3. Competition – Any theory of market economics stresses that competition is a key lever on prices. The ability of consumers to seek out more affordable services is what keeps markets healthy. California's Internet marketplace has not been characterized by robust competition and many consumers have only one or two choices available to them. Internet Choice policies help to build more competition and thus long-term more affordable options, by not artificially restricting consumer choices and helping more Internet providers to enter and survive in the marketplace.

4. No Bureaucracy – AB 1414 does not create a costly bureaucracy or enforcement regime. It simply empowers Californians of all stripes to fully participate in the consumer marketplace to meet their own needs to the best of their ability. Californians that are perfectly happy with the choice provided for them by a property owner or HOA can continue to use that service. Californians that are not so happy can investigate other options without unnecessary barriers or impediments.

Assembly 1414 is compatible with and supplements federal law. The Federal Communications Commission issued apartment internet regulations in 2024 emphasizing the importance of Internet Choice. Those rules govern Internet Service Providers and prohibit ISP's from entering into service agreements that grant exclusive rights to access and service a building. The FCC's rules state "These types of contracts can harm competition by stopping additional providers from serving tenants in a building, and limit consumer choice".

The FCC also prohibits revenue-sharing agreements with property owners that incentivize property owners to limit access by providing financial incentives when occupants sign up for a particular ISP's services.

However, as the FCC acknowledges, despite their observations that exclusive use agreements harm competition and limit consumer choice, the

federal rules do not regulate landlords and property owners from restricting access.

FCC rules only apply to certain service providers and not to landlords, so a landlord may refuse to allow other service providers to offer service to tenants. While a service provider may not enter into an agreement that grants exclusive access to an MTE property, a landlord may still choose the providers it allows into the building, even if that means only one company provides service.

Assembly 1414 closes that gap and ensures that the intent of federal law to enhance competition and consumer choice is not blocked.

To be clear, AB 1414 does not ban or prevent bulk billing arrangements when they provide quality broadband service at an affordable price. It simply gives Californians the opportunity to decide if those mass arrangements work for them and their particular household situation – or not.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to the National Rental Home Council, which opposes AB 1414:

AB 1414 addresses a problem that has already been solved. Federal law already protects the right of a tenant to access the cable provider of its choice by prohibiting a cable operator from enforcing or executing "any provision in a contract that grants to it the exclusive right to provide any video programming service (alone or in combination with other services) to a MDU [multiple dwelling unit]. All such exclusivity clauses are null and void." 47 CFR 76.2000 (a).

In short, tenants already have choice under federal law. AB 1414, however, goes much further by eliminating legitimate, pro-consumer arrangements that lower costs and expand access.

AB 1414 Threatens Affordable Broadband in Multi-Tenant Housing

Property owners are permitted however, to enter bulk service agreements, which provide consumers with great value:

Loss of Negotiated Discounts and Incentives: AB 1414 could prevent landlords from negotiating exclusive volume-based contracts that offer lower prices and additional financial incentives, benefits which are routinely passed through to tenants. Without these bulk agreements, tenants will be left to purchase retail services at higher rates.

Increased Upfront Costs for Tenants: Bulk agreements often eliminate costly upfront fees like installation charges, equipment deposits, and credit check fees. Without them, tenants would be subject to these avoidable costs, making broadband less accessible for many.

Complicated Service and Maintenance Logistics: Bulk agreements typically allow for centralized broadband service setup and maintenance, simplifying the process for tenants. AB 1414 would likely have the consequence of requiring each tenant to coordinate individually with service providers, complicating service setup and potentially delaying repairs—particularly burdensome in multi-tenant environments.

Loss of Provider Incentives and Increased Rents: Landlords would lose access to exclusive incentives offered by ISPs, which could result in higher operational costs. These costs could ultimately be passed onto tenants through increased rents, compounding the financial impact on residents.

Reduced Infrastructure Investment and Tenant Choice: Prohibiting bulk agreements discourages broadband providers from investing in new network infrastructure, especially in multi-tenant properties. The loss of financial viability for such investments would reduce competition and tenant choice, and disproportionately harm residents of affordable housing communities.

In summary, AB 1414 could have the consequence of eliminating a vital tool for delivering affordable broadband service, especially to low-income families.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 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, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Gallagher, Papan, Ramos, Sharp-Collins

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/8/25 9:23:42

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1430
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1430
Author: Bennett (D)
Amended: 3/17/25 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/18/25
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Laird, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-1, 5/23/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: County recorders: fees

SOURCE: County Recorders Association of California

DIGEST: This bill increases county recording fees and makes various changes to the allocation of these fees.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Allows county boards of supervisors to levy authorized fees or charges in amounts reasonably necessary to recover the costs of providing products or services or the cost of enforcing regulations. The fees or charges may reflect the average cost of providing products or services or enforcing regulations, plus limited indirect costs.

2) Provides that county recorders are responsible for examining and recording all documents dealing with the ownership of land in counties. These documents include payments of taxes or fees, filings of fictitious business names, deeds, mortgage documents, easements, power of attorney documents, liens, and any documents that affect the ownership of any given property. Other documents

include deeds of trust, court decrees, and many other documents affecting title to real property; commercial code filings; subdivision maps; vital statistics such as births, deaths, and marriages; and other items.

3) Allows county recorders to charge a filing fee for recording and indexing every instrument, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded.

4) Limits the maximum charge to $10 for the recording of the first page and $3 for each additional page. One dollar of each $3 dollar fee for an additional page must go into the county general fund. In addition, recorders can also collect a $1 fee on the first and each additional page if they use it solely to support, maintain, improve, and provide for the full operation for modernized creation, retention, and retrieval of information in each county's system of recorded documents. Recorders have been able to charge an additional $1 fee for filing every instrument, paper, or notice for record in order to defray the cost of converting the recorder's document storage system to microfilm.

This bill:

1) Increases the recording and indexing fee to $15 for recording the first page and $4 for recording each additional page at the county recorder's office. It also increases the recorder fee that goes solely to support, maintain, improve, and provide for the full operation for modernized creation, retention, and retrieval of information in each county's system of recorded documents, from $1 to $3 for each additional page.

2) Prohibits fee amounts from exceeding the reasonable costs of the county recorder's office for providing these services. This measure removes the requirement that one dollar of each $3 dollar fee for an additional page must go into the county general fund, and instead requires county recorder fees be dedicated to, and solely utilized for, the recorder's office.

3) Repeals the January 1, 2026 sunset on provisions that expanded the uses of the fee to over county recorder archive programs and the preservation of recorded documents to electronic media or in a cloud computing storage service.

Background

According to the County Recorders' Association of California, 34 of the 58 county recorders rely on county general funds to for their operations. They want to increase recording fees to alleviate their reliance on county general funds.

Comments

1) *Purpose of this bill*. According to the author, "California Recorder's Offices are supposed to be funded via fees on recorded documents. However, their fees have not been increased since 2011, resulting in growing budget shortages. AB 1430 addresses the fact that it is time for recorder's fees to catch up to the rising costs that recorders' offices face, and clarifies that any dollars raised by their fees must be used to fund the services they provide."

2) *Raise the roof!* AB 1430 increases the fees that county recorders can charge when someone must file a document. While the measure prohibits fee amounts from exceeding the reasonable costs of the county recorder's office for providing these services, fees could increase by at least 50% as a result of the base recording fee increasing from $10 to $15. The supporters of this measure, like the County Recorders' Association of California, argue this is justified to account for inflation since the last increase in 2009, and to decrease their reliance on county general funds to backfill their offices. This will come as little solace to individuals who seek to record a document and find costs significantly higher than they were the year before. However, since the county recorder will not have to rely on general fund resources for as much support, the county may have additional resources to devote to core programs and services. Does AB 1430 adequately balance increased fees for recorders and impacts on their residents?

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/25)

County Recorders Association of California (Source)
California State Association of Counties
California State Council of Service Employees International Union
County of Colusa
County of Contra Costa
County of El Dorado
County of Los Angeles
County of Riverside
County of Santa Barbara
County of Solano
County of Sonoma
Rural County Representatives of California
Urban Counties of California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-1, 5/23/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NOES: DeMaio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Castillo, Chen, Ellis, Gallagher, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Nguyen, Sanchez, Sharp-Collins, Ta, Tangipa, Wicks

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
7/1/25 16:19:01

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1525
Author: Committee on Judiciary
Amended: 6/23/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 7/8/25
AYES: Umberg, Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/28/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Attorneys: discipline: sensitive services

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill provides that an excluded event is not grounds for disciplinary action by the State Bar of California (State Bar), nor does it require an attorney or applicant to report that event to the State Bar. This bill provides that an excluded event does not supply evidence that an attorney is culpable of professional misconduct in this state or serve as grounds to deny admission of an applicant to the State Bar. This bill defines "excluded event" to mean certain actions taken when based on the application of another state's law that interferes with any person's right to receive, provide, recommend, enable, or advocate for sensitive services, as defined, that would be lawful in California.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Requires all attorneys who practice law in California to be licensed by the State Bar and establishes the State Bar, within the judicial branch of state government, for the purpose of regulating the legal profession. (California

Constituion, art. VI, § 9; Business & Professions Code (Bus. & Prof. Code) §§ 6000 et seq.)

2) Establishes that protection of the public, which includes support for greater access to, and inclusion in, the legal system, is the highest priority for the State Bar in exercising their licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6001.1.)

3) Provides that conviction of a felony or misdemeanor, involving moral turpitude, constitutes a cause for disbarment or suspension. In any proceeding to disbar or suspend an attorney because of that conviction, the record of conviction constitutes conclusive evidence of guilt of the crime of which they have been convicted. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6101.)

4) Provides that a willful disobedience or violation of an order of the court requiring any attorney to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of their profession, which they ought in good faith to do or forbear, and any violation of the oath taken by them or of their duties as such attorney, constitute causes for disbarment or suspension. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103.)

5) Provides that the commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, or corruption, whether the act is committed in the course of their relations as an attorney or otherwise, and whether the act is a felony or misdemeanor or not, constitutes a cause for disbarment or suspension. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6106.)

6) Requires a licensee of the State to report to the State Bar, within 30 days of the licensee gaining knowledge of any of the following:

    a) The filing of three or more lawsuits in a 12-month period against the attorney for malpractice or other wrongful conduct committed in a professional capacity;
    b) The entry of judgment against the attorney in a civil action for fraud, misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, or gross negligence committed in a professional capacity;
    c) The imposition of judicial sanctions against the attorney, except for sanctions for failure to make discovery or monetary sanctions of less than one thousand dollars ($1,000);
    d) The bringing of an indictment or information charging a felony against the attorney;

e) The conviction of the attorney, including any verdict of guilty, or plea of guilty or no contest, of a felony, or a misdemeanor committed in the course of the practice of law, or in a manner in which a client of the attorney was the victim, as specified;
f) The imposition of discipline against the attorney by a professional or occupational disciplinary agency or licensing board, whether in California or elsewhere; and
g) Reversal of judgment in a proceeding based in whole or in part upon misconduct, grossly incompetent representation, or willful misrepresentation by an attorney. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(o).)

7) Provides that a certified copy of a final order made by any court of record or anybody authorized by law or by rule of court to conduct disciplinary proceedings against attorneys, of the United States or of any state or territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia, determining that a licensee of the State Bar committed professional misconduct in such other jurisdiction, is conclusive evidence that the licensee is culpable of professional misconduct in this state. (Bus. & Prof. Code §6049.1.)

8) Requires the California Supreme Court, upon receipt of the certified copy of the record of conviction where it appears therefrom that the crime of which the attorney was convicted involved, or that there is probable cause to believe that it involved, moral turpitude or is a felony under the laws of California, the United States, or any state or territory thereof, to suspend the he attorney until the time for appeal has elapsed, if no appeal has been taken, or until the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or has otherwise become final, and until the further order of the court. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6102.)

This bill:

1) Prohibits an excluded event from being grounds for suspension, disbarment, or other disciplinary action.

2) Provides that no attorney or applicant is required to report the excluded event to the State Bar, or supply evidence that an attorney is culpable of professional misconduct in this state, and that an excluded event cannot serve as grounds to deny admission for any applicant for admission to practice law.

3) Provides that the provisions of 1) through 2) do not apply to events that would subject an attorney or applicant to a similar claim, charge, or action under the laws of this state.

4) Defines, for these purposes, the following terms:

   a) "Attorney" means an attorney admitted to practice law in this state;
   b) "Applicant" means an applicant for admission to practice law in this state;
   c) "Excluded event" means the entry of a judgment, imposition of sanctions, filing of an indictment or criminal charges or implementation of professional discipline against an attorney or applicant that is based on the application of another state's law that interferes with any person's right to receive, provide, recommend, enable, or advocate for sensitive services that would be lawful in this state, regardless of the location in which the event takes place and regardless of the location of the attorney or applicant; and
   d) "Sensitive services" means all health care services related to mental or behavioral health, sexual and reproductive health, sexually transmitted infections, substance use disorder, gender-affirming care, and intimate partner violence, obtained by a patient at or above the minimum age specified for consenting to the service, as specified.

Comments

In 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court published its opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* (2022) 597 U.S. 215.), overturning 50 years of precedent and revoking a constitutional right. Prior to *Dobbs,* the Supreme Court had continuously upheld the holding of *Roe v. Wade,* that found the implied constitutional right to privacy extended to a person's decision whether to terminate a pregnancy, while allowing some state regulation of abortion access as permissible. ((1973) 410 U.S. 113.) As a result of the *Dobbs* decision, people in roughly half the country may lose access to abortion services or have them severely restricted. In addition, a growing number of states have been passing laws putting residents who seek essential gender-affirming care at risk of being prosecuted. States are attempting to classify the provision and seeking of gender-affirming health care as a crime warranting prison time and are threatening parents with criminal penalties if they attempt to travel to another state in order to secure life-saving gender-affirming care for their child. California has enacted laws to protect health care professionals providing sensitive healthcare services from disciplinary action by their licensing entity. This bill seeks to provide similar protections for attorneys providing legal advice and other services related to the provision of sensitive services.

In the wake of the *Dobbs* decision, many states have enacted statutes targeting providers of abortions or those who "aid and bet" a person in receiving an abortion. For example, a Texas law prohibits a physician from knowingly performing or inducing an abortion on a pregnant woman if the physician detected a fetal heartbeat, as specified, or failed to perform a test to detect a fetal heartbeat[1] and prohibits anyone from "aiding and abetting" a person in obtaining such abortion (*see* Tex. Health & Safety Code § 171.201 et seq.; 171.208.) In the wake of the enactment of this law, the international law firm of Sidley Austin, LLP offered staff in its Houston and Dallas offices travel reimbursement policies to seek reproductive healthcare services if needed.[2] In response to this, the Texas Freedom Caucus sent a letter to the firm stating that it believed the firm is complicit in providing illegal abortions and wrote that "[l]itigation is already underway to uncover the identity of those who aided or abetted these and other illegal abortions."[3] The letter further detailed that the caucus was seeking further legislation to require the state to disbar any attorney licensed in Texas who assists someone in obtaining an abortion.[4] Additionally, some states have begun targeting transgender individuals and providers of gender affirming care, particularly when it comes to transgender youth. According to Human Rights Watch, as of February 2023, legislatures nationwide had introduced over 340 anti-LGBTQ+ bills, over 150 of which specifically targeted transgender people.[5]

The Legislature has enacted several bills over the past years to protect not only those seeking sensitive services, but also those providing those services and assisting individuals in obtaining those services.[6] These bills demonstrate California's commitment to protecting individuals' rights to both reproductive freedom and access to gender-affirming care. In 2019, Governor Newsom issued a proclamation reaffirming California's commitment to making reproductive freedom a fundamental right in response to the numerous attacks on reproductive

---

[1] Committee staff notes that the application of the term "fetal heartbeat" as applied in restrictive abortion laws, such as ones in Texas, may be misleading. See Kaitlin Sullivan, *Heartbeat bills: Is there a fetal heartbeat at six weeks of pregnancy?*, NBC News, (Apr. 17, 2022) https://www.nbcnews.com/health/womens-health/heartbeat-bills-called-fetal-heartbeat-six-weeks-pregnancy-rcna24435**.**

[2] Jacqueline Thomsen, *Texas lawmakers target law firms for aiding abortion access*, Reuters (July 8, 2022) available at https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/texas-lawmakers-target-law-firms-aiding-abortion-access-2022-07-08/**.**

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] *Ibid*.

[5] Human Rights Watch, Press Release, Human Rights Campaign Working to Defeat 340 Anti-LGBTQ+ Bills at State Level Already, 150 of Which Target Transgender People – Highest Number on Record (Feb. 15, 2023), https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/human-rights-campaign-working-to-defeat-340-anti-lgbtq-bills-at-state-level-already-150-of-which-target-transgender-people-highest-number-on-record (all links current as of June 20, 2022**).**

[6] ***See* Prior Legislation section, below.**

rights across the nation.[7] Additionally, Governor Newsom's signing message of SB 107 (Wiener, Chapter. 810, Statutes, 2022) stated "[i]n California we believe in equality and acceptance. We believe that no one should be prosecuted or persecuted for getting the care they need—including gender-affirming care."[8] This bill furthers these policies by providing protections to California licensed attorneys from discipline by the State Bar for actions in another state related to sensitive services that are legal in California.

Attorneys who wish to practice law in California generally must be admitted and licensed by the State Bar. (Cal. Const., art. VI, Sec. 9.) The State Bar of California is a public corporation. The Office of Chief Trial Counsel is charged with receiving complaints against attorneys, conducting investigations, determining whether to file formal charges, and prosecuting cases in the State Bar Court. Under existing law, conviction of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude constitutes a cause for disbarment or suspension, and the record of such conviction constitutes conclusive evidence of guilt of that crime in any proceeding to disbar or suspend an attorney. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6101.) A licensed attorney is required to notify the State Bar of California of criminal and civil charges files against the attorney in another jurisdiction, as well as any professional misconduct charges levied against the attorney by a sister state's regulatory body. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(o).) This bill prohibits an excluded event from being used to discipline an attorney licensed in this state or deny an application for licensure in this state. An "excluded event" means the entry of a judgment, imposition of sanctions, filing of an indictment or criminal charges or implementation of professional discipline against an attorney or applicant that is based on the application of another state's law that interferes with any person's right to receive, provide, recommend, enable, or advocate for sensitive services that would be lawful in this state.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

---

[7] California Proclamation on Reproductive Freedom (May 31, 2019) available at https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Proclamation-on-Reproductive-Freedom.pdf.
[8] Governor's signing message on Sen. Bill No. 107 (Sep. 29, 2022), available at https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/SB-107-SIGNING.pdf?emrc=1a80c5.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

> As a new administration has taken hold in Washington D.C., dedicated legal professionals are finding themselves targeted for retaliation, retribution, and job losses. From unfairly laid off federal attorneys to large law firms being cowered by threats of loss of business and legal sanctions.
>
> However, these challenges provide opportunities for California to reaffirm its commitment to justice and the rule of law. Building on prior protections for medical professionals, this bill protects California attorneys who provide legitimate legal advice to clients even if another jurisdiction believes such advice violates laws preventing a person from assisting another in seeking specified medical care. Jointly, these proposals will strengthen and protect the legal profession in California from attacks from outside of the state.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 4/28/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Flora, Krell, Sanchez

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
7/10/25 15:52:57

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE AB 1526
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1526
Author: Committee on Governmental Organization
Introduced: 3/18/25
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 15-0, 7/8/25
AYES: Padilla, Valladares, Archuleta, Ashby, Blakespear, Cervantes, Dahle, Hurtado, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Wahab, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/1/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Horse racing: minisatellite wagering facilities

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes various technical and non-substantive changes to provisions of the Horse Racing Law, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Article IV, Section 19(b) of the Constitution of the State of California authorizes the Legislature to provide for the regulation of horse races and grants the California Horse Racing Board (CHRB) the authority to regulate the various forms of horse racing authorized in this state.

2) Authorizes the CHRB to approve minisatellite wagering sites, as defined, under specified conditions.

3) Requires an organization formed by associations or fairs to operate the audiovisual signal system to execute a specified agreement with the association conducting a racing meeting and the minisatellite wagering facility that

specifies, among other things, the components of its racing program, including, out-of-zone, out-of-state, and out-of-country races, that an association or fair will make available to the site.

This bill:

1) Explicitly requires the above mentioned agreement to specify which live in-state races would be provided by the association or fair to the site.

2) Makes other non-substantive changes, including deleting obsolete statute.

Background

Author's Statement. According to the author's office, "this bill removes an outdated provision concerning mini-satellite wagering sites and makes related technical updates. Furthermore, it defines 'live' for mini-satellite contractual purposes to mean 'live in-state' races as part of the organization's overall racing program."

Satellite Wagering. Satellite wagering via an off-track facility has been legal in California since the 1980s when California racetracks started to experience declining attendance and handle figures. The industry believed that making the product easier to access not only would expose and market horse racing to potential customers, but also would make it more convenient for the existing patrons to wager more often. However, while off-track-betting and simulcasting can open new revenue pathways, they often cannibalize traditional on-track income, putting tracks at further financial risk and potentially contributing to closures.

Simulcasting. Simulcasting is the process of transmitting the audio and video signal of a live racing performance from one facility to a satellite for re-transmission to other locations or venues where pari-mutuel wagering is permitted. Simulcasting provides racetracks with the opportunity to increase revenues by exporting their live racing content to as many wagering locations as possible, such as other racetracks, fair satellite facilities, and Indian casinos. Revenues increase because simulcasting provides racetracks that export their live content with additional customers in multiple locations who would not have otherwise been able to place wagers on the live racing event.

Distribution of Audiovisual Signals and Wagering. Thoroughbred racing associations and fairs in California can distribute the audiovisual signal and accept wagers on the results of out-of-state thoroughbred races during their own race meetings. This is allowed even on days when no live races are being held at their venues. There is a limit on the number of out-of-state races that can be imported into California for betting purposes. On days when there is live thoroughbred or fair racing happening in California, the total number of races imported from out-of-state must not exceed 75 races-per-day.

However, there are exceptions to this limit. Races that are part of specific major events like the Kentucky Derby, Breeder's Cup, and other specified races can be imported without falling under the 75 race-per-day limit. Additional exceptions are made for importing races into certain geographical zones of California when no local live racing is occurring. Any wagering on these out-of-state races must comply with specific provisions of California's Horse Racing Law that govern how betting should be conducted. Wagers on out-of-state races are not allowed after 7 p.m. Pacific Standard Time unless there is consent from the local harness or quarter horse racing associations conducting live racing in certain counties.

Racetrack Attendance. Prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic, and closure of non-essential businesses in California, the horse racing industry had already been experiencing a general decline in the number of people attending and wagering at live tracks in California. This has been occurring for more than three decades due to myriad factors including; increased competition from other forms of gaming, unwillingness of customers to travel a significant distance to racetracks, and the availability of off-track wagering.

Despite poor weather conditions and a sloppy racing surface, Churchill Downs reported that 147,406 people attended the 2025 Kentucky Derby. The all-sources betting handle on the Derby and the entire racing card reported records of $234.4 million and $349 million, respectively. NBC Sports reported an average of 17.7 million viewers across NBC and Peacock for their 25th Kentucky Derby broadcast, the largest television audience for the race since 1989. The declining attendance at live horse racing events in California has prompted racetracks to rely on revenues from in-state and out-of-state satellite wagering and account wagering.

Status of the Horse Racing Industry in California. The California horse racing industry's long-term health is threatened by a combination of factors, including competition from racing in other states, other forms of gaming within California, declining attendance, and the potential for higher return from development than

operating revenues. As resources shrink, the industry is experiencing deficits in virtually every one of its revenue sources. Traditional take out, allocation and distribution formulas are no longer able to sustain ongoing operations.

As the value of racing operations decline, track ownership is struggling to maximize the necessary return on the investment and tempted by alternative uses of the property that yield higher returns. Consequently, the racing industry is suffering unprecedented instability and capital flight. Tens of thousands of industry jobs are in immediate jeopardy, along with breeding farms and precious open space in urban centers throughout California. Also at risk is a substantial amount of local and state revenue generated both directly and indirectly by the industry.

Further exacerbating the horse racing industries woes, the USA Today published an article in June of this year titled, "ICE raid on track workers sends shockwaves around racing, 'puts horses at risk.'" In the article, USA Today reports that federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents raided the Delta Downs racetrack in Vinton, Louisiana on June 17. More than 80 backstretch workers were reportedly detained, which the article notes "should be a wake-up call for an industry that would simply not be able to function without a workforce of grooms and hotwalkers and stall cleaners who are, by some credible estimates, 75% immigrants. They come from places like Venezuela, Panama, Colombia and Mexico, working low-wage jobs but filling indispensable roles, caring round-the-clock for animals worth hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars."

Prominent trainer Dale Romans told reporters during a Kentucky Derby-week news conference set up to address the threat posed by a potential ICE raid at a racetrack, "if we couldn't have an immigrant workforce on the backside, I don't know how horse racing exists."

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 347 (Strickland, 2025) authorizes thoroughbred and Appaloosa horses to enter into quarter horse races at any distance, as specified; and, amends the conditions that a licensed quarter horse racing association can conduct thoroughbred racing as part of its racing program, as specified. This bill is pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee.

SB 844 (Rubio, 2025) increases the limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races by a California thoroughbred racing association or fair for pari-

mutuel wagering from 75 to 80 races-per-day, as specified. This bill is pending in the Assembly Governmental Organization Committee.

AB 1389 (Rubio, 2025) adds the New York Stakes to the group of identified race meetings which are exempt from the current 75-race per day limit on imported races into California for the purposes of wagering. This bill is pending on the Senate Floor.

AB 1946 (Alanis, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2024) added the Whitney Stakes to the group of races which are exempt from the existing imported race-per-day limitation.

AB 3261 (M. Fong, Chapter 439, Statutes of 2024) raised the previous limit on the importation of out-of-state thoroughbred races, for the purposes of accepting wagers on those races, from 50 to 75 out-of-state races-per-day; and, prohibited, when the total number of those races imported is between 51 and 75 races-per-day, a thoroughbred association or fair from accepting wagers on those races commencing after 5:00 p.m. without the consent of the harness or quarter horse racing association that is then conducting a live race meeting in the County of Orange or the County of Sacramento.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

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: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
7/10/25 15:52:58

****** 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 ACR 54
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 54
Author: Ta (R), et al.
Introduced: 3/17/25
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Huell Howser Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates October 18, 2025, as Huell Howser Day, to commemorate his impact on the history, culture, and people of California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Huell Howser was born on October 18, 1945, in the City of Gallatin, Tennessee. Howser graduated from the University School of Nashville in 1963, then studied history and political science at the University of Tennessee, where he served as student body president.

2) After serving in the United States Marine Corps Reserve and on the staff of United States Senator Howard Henry Baker, Jr., Howser began his television career at WSMV-TV in the City of Nashville, Tennessee, where he produced shows focused on human interest stories, such as "Happy Features" and "The Happy World of Huell Howser".

3) Howser moved to the City of Los Angeles in 1981 to work as a reporter for KCBS-TV, and over the next couple of years, served as weekend host and correspondent for "Entertainment Tonight".

4) In 1991, after spending his vacation driving across the state and visiting with all 13 PBS stations in California, "California's Gold" premiered in April of that year. "California's Gold" highlighted small towns, landmarks, events, or places of interest throughout the state that were not well known to the general public.

5) Howser also produced shows such as “California’s Communities,” “California’s Golden Fairs,” “Downtown,” “California’s Water,” “California’s Green,” “California’s Golden Coast,” “California’s Golden Parks,” “Road Trip,” “Visiting... with Huell Howser,” “California Missions,” “Palm Springs,” “Our Neighborhoods,” “The Bench,” and other various specials.

6) Howser’s entire body of work helped to shape the history, culture, and people of California.

This resolution designates October 18, 2025, as Huell Howser Day, to commemorate his impact on the history, culture, and people of California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/9/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Flora, Pellerin, Blanca Rubio

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/9/25 16:03:38

****** 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.
Amended: 7/9/25 in Senate
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.

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/9/25 add co-authors to the resolution and make a nonsubstantive technical change.

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
7/11/25 11:00:23

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 83
Author: Wilson (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/12/25
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 11-0, 6/23/25
AYES: Ashby, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Grayson, Menjivar, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Umberg, Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 5/23/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Maritime Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims May 22, 2025 as California Maritime Day in the State of California and urges federal, state, and local agencies, as well as private industry, to collaborate on policies, incentives, workforce development, and infrastructure investments that will enable the reestablishment of a competitive and sustainable shipbuilding industry in California

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Establishes the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) for the purpose of serving as the lead state entity for economic strategy and marketing of California on issues relating to business development, private sector investment and economic growth. (Government Code (GC) §§ 12096 – 12098.7)

2) Authorizes GO-Biz as the lead entity for economic strategy and the marketing of California on issues relating to business development, private sector

investment, and economic growth. Authorizes GO-Biz, in this capacity, to coordinate the development of policies and criteria to ensure that federal grants administered or directly expended by state government advance statewide economic goals and objectives. Authorizes GO-Biz to market the business and investment opportunities available in California by working in partnership with local, regional, federal, and other state public and private institutions to encourage business development and investment in the state. Authorizes GO-Biz to support small businesses by providing information about accessing capital, complying with regulations, and supporting state initiatives that support small business. (GC § 12096.3)

3) Specifies that GO-Biz is the primary state agency authorized to attract foreign investments, cooperate in international public infrastructure projects, and support California businesses in accessing markets, and requires the Director of GO-Biz to develop an international trade and investment program (ITI Program) attracting employment-producing direct foreign investment to the state and providing support for California businesses in accessing international markets and increasing exports. (GC § 13996.41)

This resolution:

1) Makes various declarations about the importance of the state's maritime history in economic development and cites historic information about California's shipyards.

2) States that advances in global shipbuilding have led to the outsourcing of this industry to foreign nations, resulting in the loss of domestic manufacturing capability, skilled labor, and maritime self-sufficiency.

3) States that the reestablishment of a robust shipbuilding industry in California would generate high-wage union jobs, revitalize coastal economies, provide career pathways in skilled trades, engineering, and green maritime technology, and strengthen California's industrial resilience. Adds that modern shipbuilding offers California an opportunity to lead in sustainable vessel design, electrification of port infrastructure, and the development of green shipping corridors aligned with the state's ambitious climate goals.

4) States that the federal government has prioritized investment in new maritime manufacturing as a matter of economic resilience, national security, and environmental sustainability, creating a timely opportunity for federal-state

partnerships in California to modernize shipyards, expand workforce training, and support innovation in commercial, military, and clean energy maritime industries.

5) States that revitalizing California's shipbuilding capabilities can contribute to national security, energy independence, and the creation of domestic supply chains critical for commercial and military maritime operations.

Background

According to a 2021 report of the federal Maritime Administration, *The Economic Importance of the U.S. Private Shipbuilding and Repairing Industry*, the U.S. private shipbuilding and repairing industry is comprised of establishments that are primarily engaged in operating shipyards (fixed facilities with drydocks and fabrication equipment). Shipyard activities include ship construction, repair, conversion and alteration, as well as the production of prefabricated ship and barge sections and other specialized services. The industry also includes manufacturing and other facilities outside of the shipyard, which provide parts or services for shipbuilding activities within a shipyard. In 2019, the U.S. private shipbuilding and repairing industry directly provided 107,180 jobs, $9.9 billion in labor income, and $12.2 billion in gross domestic product to the national economy. Including direct, indirect, and induced impacts, on a nationwide basis, total economic activity associated with the industry reached 393,390 jobs, $28.1 billion of labor income, and $42.4 billion in GDP in 2019.

On April 9, 2025, the President signed an Executive Order (EO) aimed at revitalizing U.S. shipbuilding and maritime industries. The EO authorizes Defense Production Act Title III authorities to facilitate direct federal investment and incentivize private capital investments into shipyards and subcomponent supply chains. The EO establishes a maritime security trust fund to provide financing and introduces financial incentives to encourage private-sector investment in domestic shipbuilding. The EO also includes reporting requirements on expanding education and training opportunities and modernizing the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. To address a labor shortage that has been cited as a top issue constraining U.S. shipbuilding capabilities.

Currently, GO-Biz administers the following programs and units:

- Made In California program for the purpose of encouraging consumer product awareness and to foster the purchases of products manufactured in California.

- The California Inclusive Innovation Hub Program (iHub2) to incubate and/or accelerate technology and science-based firms, with a focus on underserved regions and communities.

- The California Competes Tax Credit Program under which "businesses who want to come to California or stay and grow in California" can receive an income tax credit.

- The California Business Investment Services Unit, which provides no-fee, tailored site selection services to employers and others who may be considering California for relocation or expansion.

- The California Business Portal, which provides information to California businesses about common questions, permitting, financial options, and more.

- The California Community Reinvestment Grants Program, which was included in Proposition 64, authorized GO-Biz to award grants to local health departments and certain nonprofit organizations to support communities disproportionately affected by the War on Drugs.

- Office of the Small Business Advocate which provides information and assistance to small businesses.

- The Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV) Infrastructure Unit which works to accelerate the deployment of ZEV infrastructure.

- The International Affairs and Business Development Unit, which serves as California's primary point of contact for expanding international trade and investment relations. This unit focuses on foreign direct investment (services for foreign investors, foreign investment technical assistance, and the EB-5 Investor Visa Program), international trade promotion (STEP program, trade missions, export assistance, and the California-China Trade Office), and international agreements.

In 2022, GO-Biz established the Community and Place-Based Solutions Team (Team) to support local governments, non-profits, community-based organizations, colleges and universities, and other economic development partners in their community development needs. The Team provides key technical assistance for community and economic development planning. According to the Team's website, place-based economic development strategies are initiatives to encourage economic and community development activity in defined geographic areas. Many communities have started emphasizing place-based strategies to strengthen

hyperlocal activities around physical place, economic conditions and social infrastructure. Place-based economic development strategies include a variety of approaches to incentivize investment in disadvantaged communities, including funding for infrastructure & public facilities, job creation & workforce development, affordable & workforce housing, and more.

In February 2025, the *California Jobs First State Economic Blueprint* was released, following the establishment of a state Regional Investment Initiative (RII) in 2021. The report noted that the RII brought together "a diverse set of community members to build the economic vision for their region". 13 economic regions were identified: North State, Redwood, Capital, Sierra, Bay Area, North San Joaquin, Central San Joaquin, Central Coast, Kern County, Los Angeles County, Inland SoCal, Orange County, and Southern Border.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/1/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0, 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, 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, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Chen, Nguyen, Sanchez, Sharp-Collins, Wicks

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. /
7/1/25 16:32:14

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 93
Author: Dixon (R), et al.
Introduced: 6/2/25
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 6/19/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Aromatic L-Amino Acid Decarboxylase Deficiency Awareness Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates October 23, 2025, as Aromatic L-Amino Acid Decarboxylase Deficiency Awareness Day.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) A rare disease is generally considered to be a disease that affects fewer than 200,000 people in the United States at any given time.

2) Aromatic l-amino acid decarboxylase (AADC) deficiency is a life-limiting, severely debilitating genetic neurologic condition that significantly impacts a patient's development, motor skills, growth, and cognitive and language skills.

3) AADC deficiency results from an inherited genetic disease where patients lack the AADC enzyme that is required to create dopamine. Without dopamine, patients will never achieve motor milestones like holding their heads up, sitting, or standing, develop the ability to communicate, or perform the most basic of life's needs. Patients are diagnosed through genetic and other biochemical tests.

4) AADC deficiency is a rare genetic neurological disease, and there have been approximately 350 cases of AADC Deficiency reported worldwide.

This resolution designates October 23, 2025, as Aromatic L-Amino Acid Decarboxylase Deficiency Awareness Day and encourages Californians to become better informed about, and aware of, AADC deficiency.

Related/Prior Legislation

HR 125 (Blanca Rubio, 2025) – Adopted in Assembly.
ACR 105 (Berman, Resolution Chapter 158, Statutes of 2023).
ACR 92 (Petrie-Norris, Resolution Chapter 123, Statutes of 2022).
SCR 36 (Melendez, Resolution Chapter 98, Statutes of 2021).

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

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

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/2/25 16:25:04

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 95
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Introduced: 6/11/25
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 6/19/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: The 2025 International Day of Yoga

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes June 21, 2025, as the 2025 International Day of Yoga in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) While yoga originated from Hindu and Vedic traditions, yoga is currently practiced by people of different cultures, traditions, religions, and nationalities, demonstrating that all people have the shared goal to uplift the human experience.

2) Yoga can be more than a type of mental or physical exercise. Yoga may be used as a means to discover a sense of oneness and connection within oneself, other people, the world, nature, and the universe. A regular practice of yoga may help promote a healthy body, a violence-free society, a clear mind, an open intellect, peacefulness with past experiences, a joyful soul, and a strong breath.

3) California is home to many yoga teachers, students, studios, and classes that have collectively contributed to the significant growth of yoga throughout the United States. Yoga has become one of the fastest growing wellness practices in the past decade, with approximately 36 million Americans estimated to practice yoga regularly, and one in three Americans have at least tried yoga once.

4) This resolution recognizes June 21, 2025, as the 2025 International Day of Yoga in California to provide an opportunity to better understand the benefits of yoga as a path to uplift the human experience.

This resolution recognizes June 21, 2025, as the 2025 International Day of Yoga in California to provide an opportunity to better understand the benefits of yoga as a path to uplift the human experience.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 209 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 168, Statutes of 2024)
ACR 78 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 114, Statutes of 2023)
ACR 191 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 99, Statutes of 2022)
ACR 85 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 96, Statutes of 2021)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/2/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 6/19/25
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, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wilson, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Dixon, Flora, Kalra, Nguyen, Wicks, Zbur

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/2/25 16:25:05

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

SENATE RULES COMMITTEE ACR 99
Office of Senate Floor Analyses
(916) 651-1520 Fax: (916) 327-4478

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 99
Author: Davies (R), et al.
Introduced: 6/16/25
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Scleroderma Awareness Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution declares June 29, 2025, as Scleroderma Awareness Day in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

1) Scleroderma is a chronic, systemic autoimmune disease primarily characterized by the hardening of the skin, its hallmark symptom, but its impact can extend far beyond the skin to involve internal organs, which can lead to severe complications.

2) Statistically, scleroderma affects approximately 300,000 Americans, of which 80% are women who are usually between the ages of 30 and 50, although it can manifest at any age.

3) The psychological and socio-economic impacts of scleroderma on patients and their families are considerable, affecting quality of life and daily functioning.

4) The Scleroderma Foundation of California funds education and awareness programs with a mission to empower the scleroderma community to live their best lives through programs dedicated to support, education, and research.

This resolution declares of June 29, 2025, as Scleroderma Awareness Day in California reflects the state's commitment to public health and the well-being of its constituents.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/8/25)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 75-0, 6/27/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bauer-Kahan, Flora, Pellerin, Blanca Rubio

Prepared by: Sofia Pachon-Mendez / SFA / (916) 651-1520
7/9/25 16:03:39

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AJR 3
Author: Schiavo (D), et al.
Amended: 7/8/25 in Senate
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.

Senate Floor Amendments of 7/8/25 add co-authors to the bill and make nonsubstantive changes.

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:

4) 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 & Institutions Code (WIC) § 12300 et seq.)

5) 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 the 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

[1] https://www.ssa.gov/history/briefhistory3.html

[2] https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/top-ten-facts-about-social-security

[3] ibid

calls on Congress to prevent any cuts to Social Security or attempts at privatization.

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

---

[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.

Medicaid, and any changes to the program that would effectively act as funding cuts.

Related/Prior Legislation

AJR 11 (Davies, 2024) proposed 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 7/8/25)

California Alliance for Retired Americans (Sponsor)
California State Council of Service Employees International Union (Co-Sponsor)
Health Care for All – California (Co-Sponsor)
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
Leading Age 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 7/8/25)

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
7/9/25 16:03:40

****** 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 6
Author: Aguiar-Curry (D), et al.
Introduced: 3/26/25
Vote: 21

SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/25
AYES: Hurtado, Alvarado-Gil, Cortese, McNerney, Padilla

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/5/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Child nutrition: federal programs: funding cuts

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution calls on the state's representatives in Congress to continue to support investments in the federal Local Food for Schools and Child Care (LFSCC) program and would call on the President of the United States to work with Congress to support family farmers who produce fresh, locally-sourced food for school meals.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law establishes the Agricultural Marketing Services Local Food for Schools and Child Care program (LFSCC) under the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). USDA awards funds to states for food assistance purchases of domestic local foods for distribution to schools and child care institutions. The LFSCC program, among other things, helps states address supply chain disruptions and support local and regional food systems.

This resolution calls on the California Congressional Delegation to continue to support investments in the LFSCC program and work with President Trump and congress to support family farmers who produce fresh, locally-sourced food for school meals.

Background

In December, 2021, LFSCC was part of several COVID relief programs and provided $200 million in non-competitive grant funding to state agencies through cooperative agreements for the purchase of local, unprocessed or minimally processed foods from farmers, ranchers, and small businesses to distribute to schools that participate in the National School Lunch and Breakfast programs.

In October, 2024, USDA announced it would provide $660 million for LFSCC to continue providing these services and add childcare. However, in March 2025, USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service terminated this second round of funding with a 60-day notice that cooperative agreements would be ended because the program "no longer effectuates agency priorities."

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/1/25)

California School Boards Association
California School Employees Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/1/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author:

> "AJR 6 calls on the Trump Administration to restore funding for the Local Food for Schools and Child Care (LFSCC) program. LFSCC provides healthy, locally sourced meals to students while supporting small farmers and food producers. School meal programs play a vital role in ensuring California schoolchildren receive the nutrition needed to thrive academically and physically. Additionally, the LFSCC program strengthens local economies by creating opportunities for California's farmers, their workers, and California's agricultural industry as a whole. Cutting this funding threatens students' well-being, weakens local food systems, and could cause California to lose over $150 million in economic impact. Restoring these investments is essential to protecting California's most vulnerable children, supporting family farmers, and maintaining a strong California economy. Our Congressional Delegation and the Trump Administration should do everything possible to prevent the damage from cutting this program."

The California School Employees Association wrote in support of the resolution stating:

> "The LFSCC program provides federal funding to school food authorities to help increase local food purchases in schools and expand economic opportunities for local farmers and ranchers. The California Department of Education has received over $23 million through this program and distributed that money to schools to purchase local foods. Eliminating this program will hurt both kids and small family farmers, forcing school food authorities to spend limited nutrition funds on cheaper alternatives that are less likely to be locally sourced."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 77-0, 5/5/25
AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, 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, 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: Bains, Ellis

Prepared by: Reichel Everhart / AGRI. / (916) 651-1508
7/1/25 16:32:15

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