

2025-26 SESSION

**SENATE
THIRD READING PACKET**

MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 2026



OFFICE OF SENATE FLOOR ANALYSES
651-4171

SENATE THIRD READING PACKET

Attached are analyses of bills on the Daily File for Monday, August 31, 2026.

Note	Measure	Author	Location
+	SB 423	Gonzalez	Unfinished Business
	SB 615	Allen	Unfinished Business
+	SB 715	Allen	Unfinished Business
+	SB 877	Pérez	Unfinished Business
+	SB 903	Padilla	Unfinished Business
+	SB 907	Archuleta	Unfinished Business
+	SB 947	McNerney	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1009	Becker	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1087	Cabaldon	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1130	Reyes	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1180	Allen	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1246	Cortese	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1342	Durazo	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1360	Cervantes	Unfinished Business
+	SB 1369	Reyes	Unfinished Business
+	SCR 145	Weber Pierson	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	SR 139	Becker	Senate Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 664	Alvarez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 817	Mark González	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 904	Aguiar-Curry	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1018	Bauer-Kahan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1156	Wicks	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1307	Ávila Farías	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1331	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1349	Bryan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1377	McKinnor	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1546	Schultz	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1560	Tangipa	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1642	Harabedian	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1680	Calderon	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1709	Lowenthal	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1795	Gipson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1830	Petrie-Norris	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1841	Ramos	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1871	Fong	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1903	Wicks	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 1969	Bonta	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2005	Ahrens	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2047	Bauer-Kahan	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2059	Wilson	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2065	Petrie-Norris	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2204	Gabriel	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2383	Zbur	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2414	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2440	Muratsuchi	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	AB 2493	Petrie-Norris	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

<u>Note</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Location</u>
+	<u>AB 2564</u>	Ward	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AB 2575</u>	Ortega	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AB 2694</u>	Alvarez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AB 2717</u>	Caloza	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AB 2727</u>	Nguyen	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AB 2760</u>	Sharp-Collins	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 165</u>	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 173</u>	Carrillo	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 176</u>	Elhawary	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 199</u>	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 207</u>	Kalra	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>ACR 211</u>	Celeste Rodriguez	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File
+	<u>AJR 6</u>	Aguiar-Curry	Assembly Bills - Third Reading File

+ ADDS

RA Revised Analysis

* Analysis pending

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 423
Author: Gonzalez (D), et al.
Amended: 8/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 4/22/25

AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto

SENATE NATURAL RES. & WATER COMMITTEE: 7-0, 4/30/25

AYES: Limón, Seyarto, Allen, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Stern

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 6-0, 5/23/25

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0, 6/4/25

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: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: California Public Records Act: private detention facilities

SOURCE: First Amendment Coalition
Immigrant Defense Advocates

DIGEST: This bill provides that certain records maintained by state agencies relating to private detention facilities are disclosable under the California Public Records Act (CPRA), as specified.

Assembly Amendments deleted the prior contents of the bill and amended in the current contents of the bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies are required to be open to public scrutiny. (California Constitution [Cal. 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 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 open to inspection at all times during the office hours of a state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, unless the record is exempt from public disclosure. Any reasonably segregable portion of a record shall be available for inspection by any person requesting the record after deletion of the portions that are exempted by law. (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.).
- 4) Provides that certain provisions of existing law may operate to exempt certain records under the CPRA. (Gov. Code § 7930.180.)

This bill:

- 1) Provides that the following records maintained by a state or local agency are not confidential and an agency must disclose those records upon request to any member of the public:
 - a) Any recording of any telephonic or other call to the agency that reports or describes an incident occurring at a private detention facility, or any transcript of any such recording.
 - b) Any written communication to the agency that reports or describes any incident occurring at a private detention facility.
 - c) Any records in the possession of a law enforcement agency, any writing related to the report, investigation, or findings of an incident reported or described in a recording or any transcript described in a) or a written communication described in b), except that an agency does not need to disclose a writing or portion of a writing during an active investigation being conducted by the agency that received the request if the disclosure would substantially interfere with the investigation, including by endangering the safety of a witness or a confidential source.
- 2) Requires an agency to redact any record disclosed under 1), above, to remove both of the following:
 - a) the name or identifying number of a person who reportedly experienced an incident or was the victim of specified crimes; and

- b) the name or identifying number of a person, including, but not limited to, a whistleblower, complainant, or witness, if there is a specific, articulable, and particularized reason to believe that failure to do so would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of that person.
- 3) Provides that the above does not apply to the office of the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, the Department of Consumer Affairs, or any board, bureau, committee, commission, program, or other state entity within the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Comments

The federal government, primarily through the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE), enforces federal immigration laws in the interior of the country, through placing individuals suspected of being deportable into deportation proceedings, carrying out expedited removals in certain circumstances, or executing outstanding deportation orders.¹ When someone is arrested by ICE for immigration enforcement, they may be detained to await adjudication of their deportation case or the effectuation of their deportation. Any person in the United States who is not a citizen has some level of risk that they could be deported from the United States, and individuals of all varieties of immigration status, from lawful permanent residency to those who are applying for asylum or who are undocumented, may be detained pending adjudication of charges of deportability or their application for relief from deportation. In many circumstances, a detained individual has a right to request a bond hearing before an immigration judge to request release from detention. In other cases, detainees are subject to “mandatory detention,” in which they do not have a right to a bond hearing.² Many immigrants are detained for months or even years, separating them from their families and subjecting them to the harsh and inhumane conditions of confinement.

Almost all immigration detention centers in the United States are owned and operated by private companies that contract with the federal government to provide immigration detention. All immigration detention centers in California are

¹ Deportation proceedings are administrative proceedings that are adjudicated by an immigration judge, who must make the determination of whether the non-citizen respondent is deportable, and whether they qualify for relief from deportation like asylum. Expedited removal is a process by which an immigration officer, not an immigration judge, may remove an individual from the United States without a hearing on their deportability. While expedited removal has historically been limited to narrow circumstances where an individual is apprehended close to the border, the Trump Administration has significantly expanded the circumstances to which it applies, despite significant due process and other constitutional concerns with the practice.

² See, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c); *Johnson v. Arteaga-Martinez* (2022) 596 U.S. 573.

operated as private detention centers. Currently, there are seven private detention centers in California: the Golden State Annex; Mesa Verde ICE processing center; Adelanto ICE processing center; Desert View Annex; Otay Mesa Detention Center; Imperial Regional Detention Facility; and the California City Detention Center. There are 6,459 detainees being detained in California detention centers as of February 2026.³

While private detention centers are required to meet a variety of health and safety standards set by ICE, they regularly fail to meet those standards and are plagued by reports of unsafe and inhumane conditions.⁴ These include reports of inadequate medical care, a lack of access to safe drinking water, inedible or spoiled food, the use of solitary confinement and extreme temperatures or 24-hour overhead lighting, poor and unsanitary amenities, overcrowding, and harassment and abuse.⁵

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.) In 2004, the right of public access was enshrined in the California Constitution with the passage of Proposition 59 (Nov. 3, 2004, statewide general election), which amended the California Constitution to specifically protect the right of the public to access and obtain government records: "The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and therefore . . . the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny." (Cal. Const., art. I, sec. 3 (b)(1).) In 2014, voters approved Proposition 42 (Jun. 3, 2014, statewide direct primary election) to further increase public access to government records by requiring local agencies to comply with the CPRA and the Ralph M. Brown Act, and with any subsequent statutory enactment amending either act, as provided. (Cal. Const., art. I, sec. 3 (b)(7).)

Under the CPRA, public records are open to inspection by the public at all times during the office hours of the agency, unless exempted from disclosure. (Gov. Code § 7922.252.) A public record is defined as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any public agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.

³ *Id.*

⁴ Akash Pillai et al., "Health issues for immigrants in detention centers," Kaiser Family Foundation (Sept. 30, 2025), <https://www.kff.org/racial-equity-and-health-policy/health-issues-for-immigrants-in-detention-centers>.

⁵ *Id.*; Disability Rights California, "Newly Opened California City ICE Detention Facility: Dangerous for Disabled People" (Nov. 3, 2025) <https://www.disabilityrightscalifornia.org/reports/california-city-ice-processing-center-a-dangerous-expansion-of-immigration-detention-in>; Muzaffar Chisti & Valerie Lacarte, "U.S. detention grows to record heights under Trump Administration," Migration Policy Institute (Oct. 29, 2025) <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-immigrant-detention>.

(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, Inc. v. Block* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 646, at 652.). Additionally, some records are prohibited from disclosure or are specifically stated to not be public records. (e.g. Gov. Code § 7924.110(a).) One such exemption, is for records of “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.)

The sponsors and supporters of this bill report that journalists have attempted to obtain records of emergency calls from these facilities under the provisions of the CPRA, but have faced roadblocks to obtaining records due to agencies claiming exemptions to disclosure.

Supporters of this bill write:

Journalists have been tirelessly pursuing stories about what occurs in detention. And for good reason. Between September 2025 and March 2026, there were six deaths at two facilities in California. This month ICE announced that it will no longer report the deaths of detainees who have recently been released from custody – even if the cause of death could have been an illness or incident that occurred at the facility. Numerous reports of inhumane conditions, medical neglect, mistreatment and sexual violence underscore the need for greater transparency and oversight.

Journalists trying to document these important stories in California often face barriers to public records. For example, a 2026 CalMatters investigation found a rise in reports of rape and other sexual violence at the Otay Mesa detention facility in San Diego County. The limited amount of public records made available showed that in 2025 there were 159 calls for service, 21 of them related to the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act, and seven of those alleging rape. When journalists tried to uncover more information, the sheriff's department refused to release recordings of the 911 calls or the full dispatch log, stating that the records were exempt as they were records of a law enforcement investigation, even though a contract revealed that the sheriff had ceded control of the investigations to private administrators employed by the

for-profit prison contractor. Reporters at other news organizations have experienced similar barriers to crucial information. The San Bernardino Sun this year reported a sixfold increase in 911 calls from Adelanto's detention center. But when the reporter sought to understand specific incidents in greater detail, the sheriff's department withheld the information citing the investigatory records exemption.

In order to increase transparency surrounding the conditions in these facilities, this bill limits the discretion of an agency to withhold 911 calls and other records related to private detention facilities, while ensuring certain personal or sensitive information is redacted.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

First Amendment Coalition (source)
Immigrant Defense Advocates (source)
ACLU California Action
Amnesty International USA
Asian American Journalists Association, Greater Los Angeles
Association of Alternative Newsmedia Publishers
Blue Turn Indivisible
Buen Vecino
California Mandela Campaign
California News Publishers Association
CCNMA Latino Journalists of California
Central Valley Immigrant Integration Collaborative
Disability Rights California
Freedom of the Press Foundation
Friends of La Peña Immigrant Rights
Gregory Pleasants Law, APC
Indivisible Alta-Pasadena
Indivisible Marin
Indivisible Media City
Indivisible Palo Alto Plus
Indivisible Sacramento
Indivisible Santa Cruz County
Indivisible West CoCo County
Indivisible West Marin
Indivisible Westside Los Angeles

Inland Counties Legal Services
IWCCC
Law Office of Helen Lawrence
League of Women Voters of California
Los Angeles Press Club
National Association of Hispanic Journalists, Bay Area
Oakland PRivacy
Oasis Legal Services
Orange County Press Club
Pacific Media Workers, TNG-CWA
Refreshments & Resistance
Richmond Indivisible
San Diego Pro Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists
Society of Professional Journalists
Society of Professional Journalists, Greater Los Angeles Chapter
Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California
Society of Professional Journalists, San Diego PRO Chapter
South Bay People Power
Venice Resistance
Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

Private detention facilities in California currently detain approximately 6,400 people and have been the subjects of numerous reports of inhumane conditions – yet because they are run by private, for-profit corporations, the public has little ability to see what happens inside them. California's Attorney General inspects and reports on conditions at these facilities, but records of emergencies and calls for help—911 recordings, dispatch logs, and reports of assault, medical crises, and sexual violence—are routinely withheld when agencies invoke law enforcement exemptions under the Public Records Act. In one recent case, according to a CalMatters investigation, a Sheriff's department refused to release audio recordings of 911 calls or a full dispatch log from a private facility, citing a law enforcement investigation exemption -- despite the fact that the Sheriff's department was not investigating the incident. SB 423 amends the California Public Records Act to require local agencies to disclose records of emergency calls from private detention facilities, while protecting privacy by redacting

victims' identifying information and allowing limited withholding of records that would substantially interfere with an active investigation. No facility that holds people in government custody should operate in the dark, and the bill gives California the ability to hold these facilities accountable when they violate the rights of those they detain.

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
8/30/26 22:12:04

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 615
Author: Allen (D), et al.
Amended: 8/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/2/25

AYES: Blakespear, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez

NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares, Dahle

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 11-2, 4/22/25

AYES: Cortese, Archuleta, Arreguín, Blakespear, Cervantes, Gonzalez, Grayson, Limón, Menjivar, Richardson, Umberg

NOES: Strickland, Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-1, 5/23/25

AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 28-6, 5/29/25

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Choi, Grove, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Dahle, Limón, Niello, Reyes, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Vehicle traction batteries

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: Requires, by July 1, 2028, a battery supplier to include on a new vehicle traction battery sold in the state a permanent label containing specified information.

Assembly Amendments create a labelling requirement for electric vehicle (EV) traction batteries and task the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with implementing this bill. Previously, this bill required responsible end-of-life management for EV traction batteries with regulations and implementation by CalRecycle.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL) and provides DTSC with responsibility for overseeing the management of hazardous waste in California. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) §§ 25100 et seq).
- 2) Establishes CARB as the air pollution control agency in California and requires CARB, among other things, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources and implement the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA). (Health and Safety Code (HSC) §39500 et seq.)
- 3) Defines “battery electric vehicle” as a vehicle that operates solely by use of an electric battery or battery pack, or that is powered primarily through the use of an electric battery or battery pack but uses a flywheel or capacitor that stores energy produced by the electric motor or through regenerative braking to assist in vehicle operation (HSC § 44269)
- 4) Requires CARB, in conjunction with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, to develop and administer a program to provide grants to individuals, local governments, public agencies, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses, to encourage the purchase or lease of a new zero-emission vehicle. (HSC § 44260)

This bill:

- 1) Defines:
 - a) “Vehicle traction battery” as a traction battery to propel a motor vehicle, including a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle;

- b) “Battery supplier” as
 - i) The vehicle manufacturer of a vehicle containing a vehicle traction battery;
 - ii) The manufacturer of a replacement vehicle traction battery; and
 - iii) The importer, distributor, retailer, dealer, or wholesaler who sells the vehicle traction battery if the manufacturer is not in the state.
 - c) “Remanufacturing” as a standardized industrial process through which battery cores are returned to same-as-new, or better, condition and performance; and
 - d) “Remanufacturer” as a person, other than the battery supplier regarding its own batteries, who engages in remanufacturing of vehicle traction batteries.
- 2) Requires, beginning July 1, 2028, battery suppliers to put a permanent label on vehicle traction batteries which is visible, accessible, and includes the following information:
 - a) The name of the battery supplier;
 - b) The date of manufacture;
 - c) An identification of the battery chemistry, as specified;
 - d) The rated capacity or energy, as specified;
 - e) Product safety and recall information; and
 - f) Safe disposal information.
 - 3) Requires remanufacturers to relabel the vehicle traction battery and indicate that the original label is obsolete;
 - 4) Allows battery suppliers and remanufacturers to use a quick response (QR) code linking to a data repository with the above information;
 - 5) Requires battery suppliers and remanufacturers to register with CARB no later than 90 days after this bill is chaptered;
 - 6) Requires battery suppliers to pay a fee to CARB to cover the costs associated with implementing and enforcing the bill;

7) Requires CARB:

- a) to develop regulations implementing this bill by July 1, 2031;
 - b) to determine the most cost-effective means to accept electronic submissions from battery suppliers and remanufacturers;
 - c) to revise the regulations to ensure consistency with federal regulations;
 - d) to create a tiered fee schedule to generate revenue sufficient to cover the costs associated with implementing and enforcing the bill;
 - i) the tiered fee schedule shall consider the battery supplier's share of total vehicle registrations with vehicle traction batteries in the state for the past 10 years;
 - ii) The tiered fee schedule shall be subject to public comment; and
 - iii) Moneys received from the tiered fee schedule shall be deposited into the Vehicle Traction Recovery Fund.
- 8) Allows CARB to adopt additional or differing battery labelling requirements for battery suppliers.

Background

- 1) *California's electric vehicle goals.* Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-79-20 requires all passenger vehicles sold in the state to be zero emissions by 2035.¹ The California Air Resources Board (CARB) set targets of zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) sales approaching 2035, starting with 35% of sales in 2026 to 100% of sales in 2035.² Since 2010 and as of 2026, California has sold 2.5 million ZEVs, exceeding previous goals set by Governor Brown.³ However, rapid growth of ZEVs necessitates robust waste management of the hazardous materials in ZEVs, such as lithium-ion batteries.

¹ Governor's Office (2020) *Governor Newsom Announces California Will Phase Out Gasoline-Powered Cars & Drastically Reduce Demand for Fossil Fuel in California's Fight Against Climate Change*, <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2020/09/23/governor-newsom-announces-california-will-phase-out-gasoline-powered-cars-drastically-reduce-demand-for-fossil-fuel-in-californias-fight-against-climate-change/>

² CARB (2022) *California moves to accelerate to 100% new zero-emission vehicle sales by 2035*, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/california-moves-accelerate-100-new-zero-emission-vehicle-sales-2035>

³ Cohen-Petrow, C. (2026) *California exceeds clean car goal despite declining federal support*, Los Angeles Times. <https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2026-01-20/california-exceeds-clean-car-goal-despite-declining-federal-support>

- 2) *Regulation of batteries.* The California Hazardous Waste Control Law prohibits the disposal of all batteries in the trash or household recycling collection bins intended to receive other non-hazardous waste and/or recyclable materials. Many types of batteries, regardless of size, exhibit hazardous characteristics and are considered hazardous waste when they are discarded. All batteries in California that are intended for disposal must be recycled, or taken to a household hazardous waste disposal facility, a universal waste handler (e.g., a storage facility or broker), or an authorized recycling facility.
- 3) *Lithium-ion batteries.* Lithium-ion batteries, widely used in portable electronics like laptops, smart phones, digital cameras, game consoles, and cordless power tools, are also widely used as vehicle batteries in zero emission vehicles (ZEVs). Lithium-ion batteries contain hazardous and corrosive materials, they also pose a fire risk if not stored or disposed of properly. Therefore, any program to manage used Lithium-ion batteries needs to account for this possible fire risk. According to a presentation to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) from Occupational Knowledge International at a DTSC workshop in 2017, it is estimated by 2028, roughly eight million kilotons of waste Lithium-ion batteries from ZEVs will be generated; by 2038, the estimate is 55 million kilotons.
- 4) *Lithium-ion Car Battery Recycling Advisory Group (Advisory Group):* In 2018, AB 2832 (Dahle) Chapter 822, Statutes of 2018 required the convening of the Lithium-Ion Battery (LIB) Recycling Advisory Group. AB 2832 mandated that the LIB Recycling Advisory Group submit policy recommendations to the Legislature to ensure “that as close to 100% as possible of lithium-ion batteries in the state are reused or recycled at end-of-life.” Two policy proposals that define end-of-life (EOL) management responsibility rose to the level of majority support of the LIB Advisory Group members: core exchange with a vehicle backstop and producer take-back. Additionally, other policy proposals from the LIB Advisory Group included a labeling requirement on EV traction batteries.
- 5) *Drive Forward.* Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-27-25 tasked CARB with developing “Advanced Clean Cars III regulation consistent with State and federal law, that reduces greenhouse gas, criteria air pollutant, and toxic emissions from passenger cars and light-duty trucks, medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, to advance progress towards the deployment of clean air vehicles and

technologies in the State.”⁴ Under this authority, CARB instituted Drive Forward which “supports the potential development of light-, medium- and heavy-duty vehicle regulations, incentive programs, outreach and education, and complementary efforts and policies that enable clean vehicle deployment.”⁵ CARB is currently undergoing rulemaking for the Drive Forward Light-duty Vehicle Program which may impact regulation pertaining to EV batteries.⁶

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, "California is home to the fastest growing electric vehicle (EV) market in the nation. However, as the number of EVs on the road increases and the market matures, so does the number of EV batteries reaching the end of their useful life. California is beginning to see piecemeal development of a market and infrastructure designed to capture the value imbedded in these batteries once removed from a vehicle; including high-value critical materials such as lithium, cobalt, nickel, natural graphite, and manganese. Recycling batteries to capture this material reduces demand for raw materials, thereby avoiding the negative social and environmental impacts of mining, and potentially catalyzing a domestic supply as demand for critical materials increases. However, our nascent system relies on the expectation that the value of the material will drive proper management. California lacks a policy framework to encourage reuse, repair, and repurposing, or ensure that batteries are recycled when no longer useful."
- 2) *End-of-life management.* As California achieves its ZEV sales goals, ZEVs will increasingly approach end-of-life. Therefore, ZEV traction batteries will need to be responsibly disposed of or repurposed. While labelling and tracking ZEV traction batteries is a first step to responsible end-of-life management, SB 615 does not stipulate that responsible waste management should be front-of-mind for subsequent CARB rulemaking. SB 615 may represent a first step but there is substantial work to be done to ensure responsible end-of-life management for ZEV traction batteries.
- 3) *Drive Forward Scope.* Presently, CARB’s Drive Forward program has authority over new ZEV sales. In contrast, SB 615 places requirements on

⁴ Governor Newsom (2025) Executive Order N-27-25. <https://www.library.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/GovernmentPublications/executive-order-proclamation/40-N-27-25.pdf>

⁵ CARB, Drive Forward. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/drive-forward>

⁶ CARB, Drive Forward Light-duty Vehicle Program. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/drive-forward-light-duty-vehicle-program>

battery suppliers, which includes manufacturers of new ZEVs, new plug-in hybrid vehicles, and replacement vehicle traction batteries. Therefore, SB 615 could expand CARB's authority on ZEVs.

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

This bill has been amended substantially since it was heard in the Assembly Appropriations committee and therefore does not have a fiscal analysis.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/25/26)

California Automotive Wholesalers' Association
California Environmental Voters (formerly Clev)
Californians Against Waste
Calstart INC.
Climate Reality Project Bay Area Chapter
Climate Reality Project Riverside County Chapter
Climate Reality Project San Diego
Climate Reality Project San Fernando Valley Chapter
Climate Reality Project, Los Angeles Chapter
Climate Reality Project, Orange County
Environmental Defense Fund
Ford Motor Company
Lkq Corporation
National Stewardship Action Council
Natural Resources Defense Council
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)
Sierra Club
Union of Concerned Scientists

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/25/26)

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generation
California Communities Against Toxics
California Safe Schools
Communities for a Better Environment
Cudahy Alliance for Justice
Lucid
Motorcycle Industry Council
Neighbors Against Phibro-tech
Parents Against Santa Susana Field Lab

Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Rivian
Tesla
West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project

Prepared by: Alyssa Poletti / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
8/30/26 14:48:28

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 715
Author: Allen (D) and Stern (D)
Amended: 5/1/25
Vote: 21

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 9-1, 4/29/25
AYES: Wahab, Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez,
Grayson, Padilla
NOES: Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SUBJECT: Regional housing need: methodology: distribution

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill revises the regional housing need allocation (RHNA) methodology to require redistribution of housing units lost in one jurisdiction during a state of emergency to other jurisdictions within the region.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires each city and county to adopt a housing element, which must contain specified information, programs, and objectives, including:
 - a) An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to the meeting of these needs;
 - b) A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to affirmatively furthering fair housing and to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing; and

- c) A program that sets forth a schedule of actions during the planning period, and timelines for implementation, that the local government is undertaking to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the housing element.
- 2) Requires the housing element to identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs, including the jurisdiction's share of the RHNA; identify adequate sites with appropriate zoning to meet the housing needs of all income segments of the community; and demonstrate local efforts to remove governmental and nongovernmental constraints that hinder the jurisdiction from meeting its share of the regional housing need, among other requirements.
 - 3) Provides that each community's fair share of housing be determined through the RHNA process, which is composed of three main stages:
 - a) The Department of Finance and Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) develop regional housing needs estimates;
 - b) Councils of government (COGs) allocate housing within each region based on these estimates (where a COG does not exist, HCD makes the determinations); and
 - c) Cities and counties incorporate their allocations into their housing elements.
 - 4) Requires each jurisdiction's RHNA plan to further five statutory objectives:
 - a) Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties in the region in an equitable manner.
 - b) Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, protecting environmental and agricultural resources, encouraging efficient development patterns, and achieving the state's greenhouse gas reduction targets.
 - c) Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.
 - d) Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category.
 - e) Affirmatively furthering fair housing.

This bill:

- 1) Requires a COG to distribute any housing units lost in a state of emergency proportionally, pursuant to the RHNA methodology, so as to further the statutory RHNA objectives.
- 2) Prohibits a COG from redistributing housing units lost in a state of emergency solely to the jurisdictions in which they were lost.
- 3) Removes the loss of units during a state of emergency, from the factors that must be considered by a COG when developing its RHNA methodology.
- 4) Makes corresponding changes for jurisdictions where HCD acts as COG.

Background

Housing elements. Every city and county in California is required to develop a general plan that outlines the community's vision of future development through a series of policy statements and goals. A community's general plan lays the foundation for all future land use decisions, as these decisions must be consistent with the plan. General plans are comprised of several elements that address various land use topics. State law mandates seven elements: land use, circulation (e.g., traffic), housing conservation, open-space, noise, and safety.

Each community's general plan must include a housing element, which outlines a long-term plan for meeting the community's existing and projected housing needs. The housing element demonstrates how the community plans to accommodate its "fair share" of its region's housing needs. Following a staggered schedule, cities and counties located within the territory of a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) must revise their housing elements every eight years, and cities and counties in rural non-MPO regions must revise their housing elements every five years. These five- and eight-year periods are known as the housing element planning period.

In general, a housing element must identify and analyze existing and project housing needs, identify adequate sites with appropriate zoning to meet its share of the RHNA, and ensure that regulatory systems provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development.

RHNA process. Before each housing element revision, each community is assigned its fair share of the region's housing need for four separate income categories (very low-, low-, moderate-, and above-moderate income households) through a two-step process known as RHNA. First, HCD determines the aggregate housing need for the region during the planning period the housing element will cover; then the COG allocates the regional housing need to each city and county within the region.

Comments

Author statement. “The recent fires in Los Angeles have brought into focus the limitations of planning and inadequacies of our infrastructure to respond to wind-driven urban wildfires, leading to devastating outcomes well beyond the boundaries of the burned areas. Continuing development in the wildland-urban interface magnifies the destruction and leads to disastrous, long-term consequences for families, communities, and the state. SB 715 makes modest changes to the regional housing needs allocation process relating to these issues by ensuring units lost during a state of emergency be allocated in the next round of RHNA based on the region's methodology, rather than automatically returned to the jurisdiction in which the units were lost. This allows for population drift and climate hazards to be more appropriately considered during post-disaster planning and rebuilding.”

Improving RHNA. In past housing element cycles, RHNA was criticized as being a political rather than a methodologically sound, data-driven process. In the past, jurisdictions with a higher share of wealthier, whiter residents were more likely to have received lower allocations of moderate- and lower-income housing, while more diverse and lower-income cities sometimes received higher allocations of those categories. The Legislature has made a number of changes to the RHND, RHNA, and housing element process over the past several years to strengthen the law and restrict the ability of jurisdictions to evade their housing obligations.

As part of the efforts to address RHNA concerns, the Legislature directed HCD to develop recommendations to improve the RHNA process and methodology in a manner that promotes and streamlines housing development, and substantially addresses California's housing shortage (AB 101, Committee on Budget, Chapter 159, Statutes of 2019). Last year, after developing recommendations through a stakeholder engagement process, HCD published these recommendations.¹

¹ HCD, *California's Housing Future 2040: The Next Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)*, April 2024, at [California's Housing Future 2040 The Next Regional Housing Needs Allocation \(RHNA\)](#), POLICY RECO #2 IS pp. 68-70.

Addressing a RHNA report recommendation. This bill is modeled on Policy Recommendation #2 of the HCD report, “Explore Assigning Units Lost During a State of Emergency Declaration to the Overall Allocation.”

In the report, HCD notes that when acting as a COG in the seventh RHNA cycle in 2023 (HCD acts as COG in some small, primarily rural counties), it used data provided by CalOES and CalFIRE to adjust for units lost due to a declared state of emergency. The report explains that after the Paradise Fire in Butte County, the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) was given an 8,803-unit increase to its RHND. BCAG then directly assigned those units to the Town of Paradise and the unincorporated county – the two jurisdictions that lost housing to the Camp Fire – based on their proportion of homes lost in the fire. This raised concerns about reallocating RHNA to jurisdictions with a continuing risk of losing homes to fires, as well as the need to plan for additional housing in nearby jurisdictions that absorbed displaced households.

Based on these concerns, HCD recommended that the Legislature consider statutory changes to require units lost in a state of emergency to be included in the overall allocation. HCD notes that such a change would require the units to be allocated according to the COG’s allocation methodology, rather than being directly applied to jurisdictions that lost units. This would ensure that any reallocation would further the five statutory RHNA objectives and better align with state planning priorities, as well as acknowledging that all jurisdictions in the region need to plan for additional housing capacity after a disaster.

Where can we build? California is experiencing a serious housing crisis and it is essential to expedite construction of critically needed housing units. In order to make this happen, it is important for every jurisdiction to meet its full regional housing obligation and to create an environment where housing is available to all Californians of all income levels. Toward this end, the Legislature has enacted multiple bills in recent years to provide both funding and incentives to help increase compliance with housing element law. The state faces a difficult policy question in that it must balance the protection of its residents from wildfires, sea level rise, floods, earthquakes, and other risks, against meeting the need for more housing.

RHNA and very high risk fire areas. Recent legislation (SB 182 (Jackson) of 2020) and (SB 12 (McGuire) of 2022) attempted to address concerns about localities including housing in very high fire risk areas in their RHNA plans. Key RHNA-related provisions of both bills included:

- a) A new statutory objective of “promoting resilient communities,” with a statement that “furthering this objective shall include reducing development pressure within very high fire risk areas.”
- b) A requirement for a COG to allocate a lower proportion of housing to cities and counties within its jurisdiction if they would otherwise have to identify sites in very high fire hazard areas in order to meet their RHNA obligation, with the intent to “reduce development pressure” in these areas, with the caveat that this shall not waive or reduce a city’s or county’s obligation to meet its RHNA share.
- c) A prohibition on a city or county approving a development of nine or more units located in a very high fire hazard zone unless, among other things it makes a finding that the development can be reasonably accessed and served in the event of a wildfire, with the caveat that that these requirements do not waive or reduce a city’s or county’s obligation to ensure that its housing element inventory accommodates, at all times through the planning period, its remaining RHNA share.

SB 182 was subject to extensive negotiations over two years, and was eventually vetoed; the Governor’s veto message noted, in part, that the bill “creates a loophole for regions to not comply with their housing requirements...” The final language of SB 182 was reintroduced in SB 12 (which was also negotiated over two years), but that bill failed in the Assembly Local Government Committee. This committee and many stakeholders expressed strong concerns during negotiations on both bills about jurisdictions potentially using these provisions to escape their RHNA obligations despite the critical need for housing in every part of the state.

Trying again. In order to help ensure a reasonable redistribution across the COG of housing units lost in a natural disaster, this bill elevates the loss of units from a factor a COG must consider when developing the RHNA methodology, to a requirement A COG must meet when making allocations. In other words, this bill requires a COG to filter lost units back through the methodology and redistribute them proportionately across the COG.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/20/25)

Brentwood Alliance of Canyons & Hillsides
California Native Plant Society
Canyon Back Alliance

Catalyst for Local Control
Center for Biological Diversity
Endangered Habitats League
Friends of Ballona Wetlands
Friends of Griffith Park
Friends of North Sonoma
Hills for Everyone
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
Preserve Rural Sonoma County
Russian Riverkeeper
State Alliance for Firesafe Road Regulations
Sustainable Mill Valley
The Climate Alliance
The Escondido Creek Conservancy
Urban Wildlife Research Project
Valley of the Moon Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/20/25)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: A coalition of environmental organizations states that “SB 715 offers a commonsense solution to help safeguard communities while meeting housing needs.”

Prepared by: Erin Riches / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124
5/20/25 16:51:17

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 877
Author: Pérez (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE INSURANCE COMMITTEE: 6-0, 4/22/26
AYES: Padilla, Niello, Becker, Menjivar, Richardson, Rubio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Jones

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

SENATE FLOOR: 35-0, 5/20/26
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil, Becker, Choi, Grove, Jones

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Residential property insurance: loss estimate transparency

SOURCE: Consumer Watchdog / Every Fire Survivor's Network

DIGEST: This bill modifies the definition of “claim-related documents” under the California Standard Form Fire Insurance Policy to include all valuation, measurement, and loss adjustment calculations, whether preliminary or final, related to the amount of loss, covered damage, and cost of repairs.

Assembly Amendments 1) Clarify the definition of applicable claim-related documents. 2) Add coauthors. 3) Address chaptering issues with SB 876.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law provides the standard form for a fire insurance policy, which insurers use when providing a fire policy.

Existing regulations:

- 1) State that insurers must maintain claims data that is accessible, legible, and retrievable for examination, including the claim number, line of coverage, date of loss and date of payment of the claim, date of acceptance, denial or date closed without payment. This data must be available for all open and closed files for the current year and the four preceding years.
- 2) Specify that insurers record such a file the date the licensee received, date(s) the licensee processed and date the licensee transmitted or mailed every material and relevant document in the file.
- 3) Stipulate that insurers must maintain hard copy files or claims files that are accessible, legible and capable of duplication to hard copy files, for the current year and the preceding four years.
- 4) Specify that after receiving notice of claim, every insurer shall in no more than 15 calendar days acknowledge receipt to the claimant unless payment is made within that period of time, provide to the claimant necessary forms, instructions, and reasonable assistance, including, specifying the information the claimant must provide for proof of claim, and begin investigation of the claim.

This bill modifies the definition of “claim-related documents” under the Standard Form Fire Insurance Policy to include valuation, measurement, and loss adjustment calculations, whether preliminary or final, related to the amount of loss, covered damage, and cost of repairs.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 876 (Padilla), of the current legislative session, would require insurers to develop emergency response plans for disasters, as well as create additional consumer-related provisions for homeowners affected by wildfires by addressing matters related to underinsurance, insurer practices, claims resolution, additional living expenses, and building code upgrades.

SB 878 (Pérez), of the current legislative session, would establish timelines for insurers to acknowledge, investigate, and determine the status of residential property insurance claims, and require documented justifications for any delays. Also requires that payment be issued within 30 days of claim acceptance, the date

of loss, or the execution of a replacement contract, with interest accruing on any late payments, as specified.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

Costs of approximately \$29,000 in fiscal year (FY) 2026-27 and \$48,000 in FY 2027-28 to CDI to review new homeowners insurance filings submitted by insurers to reflect the updated standard policy form (Insurance Fund).

Additionally, costs of an unknown amount, potentially in excess of \$150,000, to CDI for increased administrative, investigation, and enforcement workload to the extent there is significant insurer non-compliance with expanded disclosure requirements or a high volume of related consumer complaints (Insurance Fund).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/25/26)

Consumer Watchdog (co-source)
Every Fire Survivor's Network (co-source)
350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
AARP
Affordable Homeownership Foundation INC
Altadena Colab
Americans for Financial Reform
Ballona Wetlands Institute
Bay Area System Change Not Climate Change
Bay Area-system Change Not Climate Change
Bayardo Strategies LLC
Beverly Hills; City of
Bright Operations
California Community Foundation
California Environmental Voters
California Insurance Commissioner Emeritus Dave Jones
California Nurses Association
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
Climate Defenders
Consumer Action
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Federation of America

Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Protection Policy Center
Consumer Protection Policy Center/USD School of Law
Courage California
Defend Ballona Wetlands
Dena Rise Up
Eaton Fire Renters Coalition
Eaton Fire Residents United
Extreme Weather Survivors
Extreme Weather Survivors Action Fund
Food & Water Watch
Freeport Haven
Green America
Individual
Jewish Federation of the Greater San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys
League of California Cities
Leap of Faith Family to Family Support
Los Angeles; City of
My Tribe Rise
Office of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass
Pasadenans Organizing for Progress
Public Citizen
Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce
Rise Economy
Rural County Representatives of California
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
So Cal 350 Climate Action
Socal 350 Climate Action
Socal350 Climate Action
Sunflower Alliance
Team Palisades
The American Policyholder Association
United Policyholders
West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs
Xtreme Athletics

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/25/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to Consumer Watchdog and Every Fire Survivor's Network, co-sponsors of the bill:

“SB 877 requires disclosure of all claim documents, including original and revised loss estimates, so homeowners can clearly see how their payout was calculated and if changes were made. If the numbers change, policyholders deserve to know. Insurance companies are already required to keep this information by law. SB 877 simply makes clear that companies must provide all versions of claims documents to a homeowner, not only the final version.

Without transparency, insurers can quietly slash damage estimates and survivors are left in the dark. With transparency, homeowners can verify accuracy, challenge errors, and access the full benefits they paid for. SB 877 restores fairness and trust in the claims process. We respectfully urge your support.”

Prepared by: Brandon Seto / INS. / (916) 651-4110
8/30/26 21:54:36

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 903
Author: Padilla (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 11-0, 4/13/26
AYES: Wahab, Choi, Archuleta, Arreguín, Caballero, Grayson, Menjivar, Niello,
Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Umberg

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 8-0, 4/20/26
AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Padilla, Reyes, Seyarto, Umberg, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Jones

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0, 5/19/26
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,
Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-
Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Mental health professionals: artificial intelligence

SOURCE: California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists
California Behavioral Health Association
California Psychological Association
National United Healthcare Workers

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits individuals, corporations, or entities from using, advertising, or offering psychotherapy services, including through artificial intelligence (AI), unless conducted by a licensed health care professional, as defined; 2) authorizes licensed health care professionals to use AI for limited administrative or supplementary support, as indicated; and 3) provides state licensing boards and enforcement agencies the authority to pursue legal recourse for any violations.

Assembly Amendments update definitions, clarify provisions related to consent, make conforming changes related to confidentiality of medical information, make various prohibitions related to the operations of and advertising by AI companies, limit activities of AI systems unless certain requirements have been met, and prohibit licensees from having action taken against them for actions undertaken by AI.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “Artificial intelligence” or “AI” as an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy, and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments. (Government Code (GC) § 11546.45.5)
- 2) Defines “Generative artificial intelligence” or “GenAI” to mean an artificial intelligence system that can generate derived synthetic content, including text, images, video, and audio that emulates the structure and characteristics of the system’s training data (GC § 11549.64(b))
- 3) Defines “Companion chatbot” to mean an AI system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses to user inputs and is capable of meeting a user’s social needs, including by exhibiting anthropomorphic features and being able to sustain a relationship across multiple interactions. Does not include a bot that is used only for customer service purposes. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) § 22601 (b 1-2))

This bill:

- 1) Defines for purposes of this bill the following: licensed professional, administrative support, artificial intelligence, companion chatbot, consent, licensed professional, peer support, psychotherapeutic communication,

psychotherapeutic services, religious counseling, supplementary support and triage or screening, as specified.

- 2) Allows an individual, corporation, or entity that provides or facilitates psychotherapy services to use AI tools or systems only to assist in providing administrative support or supplementary support in psychotherapy services, provided the use of those tools or systems are carried out in a manner consistent with applicable law.
- 3) Prohibits an individual, corporation, or entity to engage in the use of AI to record or transcribe therapeutic communications, psychotherapy sessions or triage/screening unless the patient or legally authorized representative is informed in writing or verbally that AI will be used; the specific purpose of the AI tool or system that will be used, and the patient or client or legally authorized representative provides consent to the use of AI. If consent is not given to use AI, the patient or client does not surrender any of their rights to care.
- 4) Prohibits an individual, corporation, or entity from advertising, or otherwise offering psychotherapy services when the services are provided using companion chatbots or by claiming the companion chatbot is a therapist or provides therapy.
- 5) Prohibits an individual, corporation, or entity when used in connection with the provision of psychotherapy services or conducting triage or screening, from allowing AI to do any of the following without review and approval by a licensed professional: make therapeutic decisions; directly interact with clients in any form of psychotherapeutic communication unless the tool or system is approved or cleared with the FDA guidance for low-risk general wellness products or clinical support software, and is compliant with HIPAA; generate therapeutic recommendations, assessment results, diagnoses, or treatment plans; detect emotions or mental states; or perform triage or screening.
- 6) Requires a licensed professional when using AI in connection with psychotherapy services, or triage or screening to maintain responsibility for ensuring that they or anyone under their supervision uses the AI in a clinically appropriate manner that is compliant with this bill.
- 7) Requires an employer or contracting entity, when a licensed professional uses artificial intelligence for psychotherapy services, that has been required and authorized by an employing or contracting entity, to be responsible for ensuring

the artificial intelligence is used in compliance with the provisions of this bill; and directs the licensed professional to use AI in compliance with the provisions of this bill.

- 8) States that a licensed professional is not subject to discipline or any other enforcement action under this chapter for a violation that results from any feature, configuration, function, or other element of an artificial intelligence tool or system that is not within the control of the licensed professional if the use is required by the licensed professional's employer or contracting entity, including a violation that results solely from a function or element that prevents the licensed professional from using the tool or system in compliance with this chapter. The licensed professional's required use of the tool or system is not considered a cause of the violation, for purposes of this section.
- 9) Authorizes the use of AI, without requiring prior review and approval by a licensed professional to do the following: recommend in response to an individual's articulated expression of serious mental health concerns, that the individual discuss their need for psychotherapy services with a licensed professional; administer a standardized screening questionnaire to an individual, collect the individual's responses, score them in accordance with the instrument's standardized scoring rules, and transmit the responses and any resulting score to a licensed professional for review, provided that the artificial intelligence tool or system does not use the responses or score to assess, evaluate, advise, inform, or make any decision regarding the condition of the individual or the urgency, clinical nature, or appropriate level of the individual's need for psychotherapy services; schedule confirm, cancel, or send reminders regarding appointments, or provide logistical information in preparation for a visit, provided that those functions do not involve psychotherapeutic communication and do not constitute triage or screening.
- 10) Requires the use of AI in patient or client records for psychotherapy services to comply with the CMIA. Prohibits a company or entity from sharing, selling, storing, or training their models on any data obtained from psychotherapy in a manner inconsistent with any applicable law.
- 11) Authorizes the appropriate health care professional licensing board or enforcement agency to do the following: pursue an injunction or restraining order to enforce the provisions of this bill; retain the authority to pursue any remedy otherwise authorized under the law; and adopt rules and regulations necessary to implement any provisions that are consistent with this bill; states

that the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or their designee shall determine the appropriate health care professional licensing board or enforcement agency, if jurisdiction is unclear.

- 12) Exempts religious counseling, peer support, self-help materials, educational resources that are available to the public and do not offer psychotherapy services, AI systems used solely for training or simulation purposes, and research as defined.

Background

Digital Mental Health Applications. As AI continues to evolve in mental health care, so do digital mental health applications. Scripted digital mental health applications are often, but not always, designed with input from trained professionals that incorporate built-in protocols to ensure that responses to users are verified. These are unregulated digital mental health platforms that do not make medical claims but are developed to address mental health concerns and emotional well-being. Applications like Wysa, and Woebot use AI chatbots to provide mental health support to users in the form of effective and practical evidenced based therapies such as cognitive behavioral health therapy to quell anxiety, provide reframing of negative thoughts to alleviate depressive symptoms, track mood, as well as provide mindfulness exercises for general wellness, amongst other things.

AI chatbots are effective at providing users with immediate support to address a myriad of mental health concerns allowing for a welcoming environment that encourages unconstrained conversations and a reduced feeling of perceived stigma. According to an article in ScienceDirect, “honest responding is particularly valuable in mental health settings due to the intimate nature of information required” and “participants who believe they are interacting with a computer versus a human operator reported lower fear of self-disclosure, lower impression management and were more willing to disclose.” The study concluded that human interaction could interfere with an individual’s ability to be forthright when disclosing personal information and perceived anonymity with a computer-monitored application gives the illusion of privacy decreasing the risk of embarrassment and judgement. Easy, accessibility, the ability to reach a wider demographic with low to no costs, combined with the popularity of utilizing a text-based modality makes AI chatbot applications very appealing to users.

A second type of digital mental health application uses Generative AI chatbots also known as companion apps which produce a more human like response when

deployed by users. These unregulated companion apps also do not claim to be developed to address mental health concerns but are designed to provide users with an interactive avatar like companion. Replika is an AI companion that provides emotional support, conversation and a certain level of companionship to often alleviate a user's perceived loneliness and create a safe space free of judgment. Users can personalize their avatar's appearance and define their relationship creating a sense of a proprietary companion. These companion applications are very popular amongst users encouraging roleplaying with some users developing an intense emotional attachment with their AI companion which can result in an unhealthy relationship. For users that are emotionally distressed or psychologically vulnerable these immersive companions can cause serious harm. Young users are especially susceptible to companion apps that can use inappropriate dialogue including sexual content, substance use, trivialize bullying behavior, and in some cases encourage self-harm with several young users committing suicide after allegedly receiving advice and instructions on how to self-harm from their AI companion.

Clearly, AI chatbots have not had the same education or specialized training as licensed health care professionals and are not legally obligated to follow the same ethical guidelines that require mandated reporting of any potential harm to self or others or maintain patient confidentiality. Ideally, individuals that utilize mental health apps would do so in conjunction with a therapeutic relationship with a licensed mental health professional. Since that is often not the case for most, extreme caution should be exercised when utilizing any type of digital mental health application as they are not designed or intended to provide clinical feedback or treatment and often do not include adequate safety protocols to protect individuals from harm which is why it remains crucial that this technology is regulated.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, the bill will result in costs of an unknown amount to BBS, which anticipates an increase in complaint volume and related enforcement costs but are unable to estimate the fiscal effect. The Board of Psychology and the Medical Board of California (MBC) also anticipate increased complaints but expect costs to be minor and absorbable. However, the MBC notes that if it is required to pursue an injunction as a result of this bill, the costs might not be absorbable.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/24/26)

California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (co-source)
California Behavioral Health Association (co-source)
California Board of Psychology (co-source)
National United Healthcare Workers (co-source)
Alameda Labor Council
Alliance for Children's Rights
Association of Community Human Services Agency
Board of Registered Nursing
California Alliance of Child and Family Services
California Association of School Counselors
California Association of School Psychologists
California Coalition for Behavioral Health
California Conference of Machinists
California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California Institute for Behavioral Health Solutions
California Long Term Care Ombudsman Association
California Pan Ethnic Health Network
California Peer Watch
California Psychological Association
California State PTA
CFT, A Union of Educators & Classified Professions, AFL-CIO
Children's Institute, INC
Contra Costa Central Labor Council
County Behavioral Health Directors Association
El Hogar Community Services
Engineers and Scientists of California, IFPTE Local 20, AFL-CIO
Hope Cooperative
Inland Empire Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Kings View
Mental Health America of California
Oakland Privacy
Osteopathic Medical Board of California
Pacific Clinics
Pathpoint
Portia Bell Hume Behavioral Health and Training Center
Power California Action
Safe Passages
San Diego & Imperial Counties Labor Council

SEIU California
Shields for Families
Sistahfriends
Southern California Health & Rehabilitation Program
Stars Behavioral Health Group
Steinberg Institute
Tarzana Treatment Centers, INC.
Techequity Action
The California Association of Local Behavioral Health Boards and Commissions
The Village Family Service
Turning Point Community Programs
UFCW - Western States Council
Wellspace Health

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/11/26)

Ata Action
California Chamber of Commerce
California Hospital Association
California Medical Association
Technet
Teladoc Health, Inc.
Timelycare

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Supporters state that AI tools marketed as “AI Therapists” may offer convenience and accessibility, but they also lack the clinical training, professional oversight and ethical obligations required to safely deliver mental health treatment. Establishing clear safeguards governing the use of artificial intelligence in delivering psychotherapy services is paramount in protecting consumers from harm. SB 903 prevents AI from making independent therapeutic decisions or engaging in clinical communications that could influence diagnosis, treatment planning, or client safety. These provisions reinforce the essential role of licensed practitioners and ensure that AI remains a supportive tool rather than a replacement for human expertise.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Opponents note that the bill remains overly restrictive and prevents licensed clinicians from using beneficial AI tools that are widely accepted and consistent with their scope of practice, stating clinicians should be able to use AI as a clinician tool under their professional judgement and oversight, not merely for background support functions.

Prepared by: Anna Billy / B., P. & E.D. /
8/30/26 20:08:44

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 907
Author: Archuleta (D), et al.
Amended: 7/2/26
Vote: 21

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

SENATE FLOOR: 36-0, 5/26/26
AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Durazo, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Gonzalez, Smallwood-Cuevas, Weber Pierson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Driving under the influence and other driving offenses:
comprehensive reform

SOURCE: CA Safe Roads Coalition; Los Angeles County District Attorney; Mothers Against Drunk Driving; Orange County District Attorney

DIGEST: This bill creates mandatory sentences for hit and run causing injury or death when the defendant has a prior conviction within the previous 10 years for DUI, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or gross vehicular manslaughter; and expands application of the *Watson* advisement to apply in cases DUI with no injury cases in which the defendant pleads not guilty or no contest to a different or lesser offense instead.

Assembly Amendments removed provisions of this bill that required imprisonment in the state prison or county jail for up to one year for hit and run causing damage to property within 10 years of a separate conviction for DUI, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or gross vehicular manslaughter, and created a mandatory 3-year enhancement for each prior separate conviction that occurred within the previous 10 years for felony DUI, DUI with no injury and with three or more priors, DUI with injury and specified priors, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, when a person is convicted of any one of those offenses.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug, or who has 0.08 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol (BAC) in their blood, to drive a vehicle (hereafter, “DUI”). (Vehicle (Veh.) Code, § 23152, subds. (a), (b), (f), & (g).)
- 2) Establishes graduated penalties for a first DUI, DUI with one prior, DUI with two priors, and DUI with three or more priors, including jail time, fines, ignition interlock device (IID) installation, license suspension or revocation, and completion of a DUI program. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, 13352.1, 23538, 23540, 23542, 23546, 23550, 23552, 23548, 23575.3.)
- 3) Requires a 10-year license revocation if a person has been convicted of three or more DUIs or DUIs causing bodily injury, the last of which was punishable as a DUI or DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, a DUI with three or more priors, or as an alternate-felony misdemeanor because of a prior specified felony. (Veh. Code, § 23597, subd. (a).)
- 4) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or the combined influence of the two, or who has a BAC of .08 or more, to drive a vehicle, and concurrently do any act forbidden by law or neglect any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, which proximately causes bodily injury to any person other than the driver (hereafter, “DUI causing bodily injury.”) (Veh. Code, § 23153 subds. (a), (f), & (g).)

- 5) Establishes graduated penalties for a first DUI causing bodily injury, DUI causing bodily injury with one prior, and DUI causing bodily injury with two or more priors, including jail or prison time, fines, IID installation, license suspension or revocation, and completion of a DUI program. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, 23554, 23556, 23560, 23562, 23566, 23568, 23575.3.)
- 6) Provides that a person who proximately causes bodily injury or death to more than one victim in any one instance that results in a felony conviction of a DUI causing bodily injury, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, shall receive a one-year sentence enhancement in state prison for each additional victim injured (maximum of three). (Veh. Code, § 23558.)
- 7) Punishes a person convicted of a DUI causing bodily injury, where the violation proximately causes great bodily injury to any person other than the driver, and the offense occurred within 10 years of two or more priors, as a felony by imprisonment for two, three, or four years in state prison, a \$1,015 to \$5,000 fine, and a five-year license revocation (Veh. Code, §§ 23566, subd. (b), 13352 subd. (a)(6).)
- 8) Makes any DUI or DUI causing bodily injury (hereafter, “any DUI”) an alternate felony-misdemeanor if that person has previously been convicted of certain impaired driving crimes:
 - a) Punishes a person convicted of any DUI within 10 years of specified felonies – a DUI with three or more priors, a DUI causing bodily injury, or gross vehicular manslaughter – as an alternate-felony misdemeanor, a \$390 to \$1,000 fine, a four- or five-year license revocation (including a three-year designation as a habitual traffic offender), and a three- or four-year IID mandate. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, subd. (a)(6)-(7); 23550.5, subds. (a), (c) & (d); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)-(2).)
 - b) Punishes a person convicted of any DUI, who has a prior conviction for felony vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, as an alternate felony-misdemeanor, a fine of \$390 to \$1,000, a four- or five-year license revocation, and a three- or four-year IID mandate. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352 subd. (a)(6)-(7); 23550.5, subds. (b), (c) & (d); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)-(2).)
- 9) Requires the court, if a person is convicted of a DUI or a DUI causing bodily injury, to consider a BAC of .15 percent or more, or a person’s refusal to take a breath or urine test, as a special factor that may justify enhancing the penalties in sentencing, in determining whether to grant probation, and, if

probation is granted, in determining additional or enhanced terms and conditions of probation. (Veh. Code, § 23578.)

- 10) Requires a court to advise a person convicted of a DUI or a DUI causing bodily injury, or who pleads to a reckless driving conviction in satisfaction of, or as a substitute for an original DUI charge, of the following: “You are hereby advised that being under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, impairs your ability to safely operate a motor vehicle. Therefore, it is extremely dangerous to human life to drive while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both. If you continue to drive while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, and, as a result of that driving, someone is killed, you can be charged with murder.” (Veh. Code, § 23593, subd. (a).)
- 11) Requires the prosecutor, if the prosecution agrees to a plea of guilty or no contest to reckless driving in satisfaction of, or as a substitute for, an original charge of a DUI—also known as a wet reckless—to state for the record a factual basis for the satisfaction or substitution, including whether or not there had been consumption of an alcoholic beverage or ingestion or administration of a drug, or both, by the defendant in connection with the offense. Provides that a wet reckless is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 5 to 90 days, or by a fine of \$145-1,000, or both. (Veh. Code, §§ 23103, subd. (c), 23103.5, subd. (a).)
- 12) Provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice aforethought, in the driving of a vehicle, where the driving was driving under the influence, and the killing was either the proximate result of the commission of an unlawful act, not amounting to a felony, and with gross negligence, or the proximate result of the commission of a lawful act that might produce death, in an unlawful manner, and with gross negligence. Provides that gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for 4, 6, or 10 years. (Pen. Code, § 191.5, subds. (a), (c).)
- 13) Provides that when a defendant has one or more prior convictions for gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, gross vehicular manslaughter, or DUI (with or without injury), the punishment for gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is imprisonment in the state prison for a term of 15 years-to-life. (Pen. Code, § 191.5, subd. (d).)

- 14) Provides that vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice aforethought, in the driving of a vehicle, where the driving was driving under the influence, and the killing was either the proximate result of the commission of an unlawful act, not amounting to a felony, but without gross negligence, or the proximate result of the commission of a lawful act that might produce death, in an unlawful manner, but without gross negligence. Provides that vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for not more than one year, or imprisonment in the county jail for 16 months, 2 years, or 4 years. (Pen. Code, § 191.5, subd. (b).)
- 15) Defines gross vehicular manslaughter as driving a vehicle in the commission of an unlawful act, not amounting to a felony, and with gross negligence; or driving a vehicle in the commission of a lawful act which might produce death, in an unlawful manner, and with gross negligence, except as provided. Provides that this type of vehicular manslaughter is punishable either by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year or by imprisonment in the state prison for two, four, or six years. (Pen. Code, §§ 192, subd. (c)(1), 193, subd. (c).)
- 16) Requires the driver of a vehicle involved in an accident resulting only in damage to property, including vehicles, to immediately stop at the nearest location that will not impede traffic or jeopardize the safety of others. Provides that failure to comply with these requirements is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or both. (Veh. Code, § 20002, subs. (a), (c).)
- 17) Requires the driver of a vehicle involved in an accident that results in injury to or the death of another person to immediately stop at the scene of the accident. Provides that a violation is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison, or in a county jail for not more than one year, or by a fine of \$1,000 to \$10,000, or both. (Veh. Code, § 20001, subs. (a), (b)(1).)
- 18) Provides that if the accident results in death or permanent, serious injury (i.e., the loss or permanent impairment of function of a bodily member or organ), a violation is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for two, three, or four years, or in a county jail for between 90 days to one year, or by a fine of \$1,000 to \$10,000, or both. (Veh. Code, § 20001, subd. (b)(2).)
- 19) Provides that if a person flees the scene of an accident after committing a vehicular manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or gross

vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, the punishment is an additional term of five years imprisonment in the state prison consecutive to the term imposed for the underlying conviction. (Veh. Code, § 20001, subd. (c).)

This bill:

- 1) Creates mandatory sentences for hit and run offenses causing injury or death when the defendant has a prior conviction for wet reckless, DUI, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or gross vehicular manslaughter within the prior 10 years.
- 2) Expands the application of the *Watson* advisement to apply in cases where the defendant pleads not guilty or no contest to a different or lesser offense as a substitute for an alleged violation of DUI. Provides that this provision is known as Braun's Law.

Comments

This bill creates mandatory sentences when a hit and run offense resulting in injury or death occurs within 10 years of a separate conviction for wet reckless, DUI (with or without bodily injury), gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or gross vehicular manslaughter. This bill also expands the application of the *Watson* advisement to apply in DUI cases where the defendant pleads not guilty or no contest to a different or lesser offense instead.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

Increased state incarceration costs (General Fund) of an unknown amount, likely minor to moderate, to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to the extent longer sentencing triads result in additional time served. This bill elevates the felony triad for an injury hit-and-run with a qualifying prior conviction from 16 months, two years, or three years to two, three, or four years, and elevates the triad for a death or permanent serious injury hit-and-run with a qualifying prior from two, three, or four years to three, four, or five years — roughly one additional year of state prison exposure per affected felony admission. The number of hit-and-run felony admissions involving a qualifying prior conviction within 10 years is likely small, and both offenses remain alternate felony-misdemeanors subject to

prosecutorial and judicial discretion; however, each additional person-year of incarceration costs approximately \$133,000 annually.

Minor cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), General Fund) to the courts to provide additional advisements at plea and to the extent increased felony exposure marginally increases contested proceedings. It generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the TCTF may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The state budget provides annual General Fund backfills to the TCTF to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

CA Safe Roads Coalition (co-source)
Los Angeles County District Attorney (co-source)
Mothers Against Drunk Driving (co-source)
Orange County District Attorney (co-source)
American Medical Response West
Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
Brea Police Association; Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
California Contract Cities Association
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Peace Officers Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
City of Glendale
City of Manhattan Beach
City of Pico Rivera
City of Thousand Oaks
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association

County of Orange
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
League of California Cities
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside County District Attorney
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Streets are for Everyone
Streets for All
Walk San Francisco Foundation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

ACLU California Action
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148
San Francisco Public Defender
Smart Justice California

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
8/30/26 20:15:43

**** END ****

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 947
Author: McNerney (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 3-1, 4/8/26

AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Cortese, Durazo

NOES: Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Laird

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 7-2, 4/20/26

AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg, Wiener

NOES: Jones, Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 29-9, 5/19/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Employment: automated decision systems

SOURCE: California Federation of Labor Unions

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits an employer from using an automated decision system (ADS) that does certain functions and limits the purposes and manner in which an ADS may be used to make disciplinary or termination decisions; 2) requires an employer to provide a written ADS postuse notice, as specified; 3) includes worker anti-retaliation provisions for the exercise of these rights; 4) authorize enforcement through the Labor Commissioner (LC) or authorized public prosecutor; and 5) prescribes penalties and remedies for violations.

Assembly Amendments revised provisions of this bill to: 1) clarify the prohibited use of an ADS to make a disciplinary or termination decision as opposed to their use to “assist” in making the decision; 2) struck provisions of this bill that would have prohibited ADS use to inform compensation or conduct predictive behavior analysis on a worker; 3) struck provisions of this bill that would have prohibited an employer from using customer ratings to assist in making employment-related decisions; 4) struck the applicability of this bill to independent contractors; 5) struck the limitation on ADS use for “deactivations”; 6) limits the information an employee can receive when making ADS data requests; 7) struck the provisions of this bill that granted a worker, or their exclusive representative, the right to bring a civil action for violations; and 8) delays implementation to July 1, 2027.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

1) Defines the following terms:

- a) “Artificial intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.
- b) “Automated decision system” means a computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision making and materially impacts natural persons. “Automated decision system” does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data. (Government Code §11546.45.5)

2) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including

enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. (Civil Code §1798.100 et seq.)

- 3) Establishes the Consumer Privacy Rights Act (CPRA), which amends the CCPA and creates the California Privacy Protection Agency (PPA), which is charged with implementing these privacy laws, promulgating regulations, and carrying out enforcement actions. (Civil Code §1798.100 et seq.; Proposition 24 (2020))
- 4) Requires the Attorney General to adopt regulations governing, among other things, access and opt-out rights with respect to businesses' use of automated decision making technology, including profiling and requiring businesses' response to access requests to include meaningful information about the logic involved in those decision making processes, as well as a description of the likely outcome of the process with respect to the consumer. (Civil Code §1798.185)
- 5) Establishes within the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), various entities including the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE) under the direction of the Labor Commissioner (LC), and empowers the LC with ensuring a just day's pay in every workplace and promotes economic justice through robust enforcement of labor laws. (Labor Code §79-107)

This bill:

- 1) Defines, among others, the following terms:
 - a) "Automated decision system" or "ADS" means any computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision making and materially impacts natural persons. An automated decision system does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.
 - b) "ADS output" means any information, data, assumptions, predictions, scoring, recommendations, decisions, or conclusions generated by an ADS.

- c) “Employer” means a person who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, employs or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person.
 - i) “Employer” includes all branches of state government, including all cities, counties, charter counties, municipalities, charter municipalities, cities and counties, special districts, transit districts, the University of California upon agreement by the regents, the California State University, community college districts, school districts, or any other governmental entity.
 - ii) “Employer” includes a labor contractor of a person defined as an employer under subparagraph (A).
 - iii) “Employer” includes a farm labor contractor as defined in Section 1682 or foreign labor contractor as defined in Section 9998.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
 - d) “Employee data” means any information that identifies, relates to, or describes an employee, regardless of how the information is collected, inferred, or obtained.
- 2) Beginning July 1, 2027, prohibits an employer from using an ADS to do any of the following:
- a) Prevent compliance with or violate any federal, state, or local labor, occupational health and safety, employment, or civil rights laws or regulations.
 - b) Infer employee’s protected status under Government Code Section 12940.
 - c) Predict and take adverse action against a worker for exercising their legal rights, including, but not limited to, rights guaranteed by state and federal employment and labor law.
- 3) Prohibits an employer from relying solely on an ADS when making a disciplinary or termination decision.
- 4) If an employer primarily relies upon an ADS output to make a disciplinary or termination decision, requires the employer to direct a human to corroborate the decision using data that was collected or used to produce the ADS output or other relevant corroborating or supporting information. “Corroborating or supporting information” may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) Supervisory or managerial evaluations.
 - b) Personnel files.
 - c) Work product of employees.
 - d) Peer reviews.
 - e) Witness interviews, that may include relevant online customer reviews.
- 5) Prohibits an employer from using the ADS output to discipline or terminate an employee if the employer cannot corroborate the ADS output, or the human reviewer has concluded that the ADS output is inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading.
- 6) Grants employees the right to request, and requires an employer to provide, a meaningful, objective description of the employee's own data used by the ADS when an employer has primarily used an ADS to make disciplinary or termination decisions.
- a) For purposes of safeguarding the privacy rights of consumers, employees, and individuals, requires description of employee data to be provided in a manner that anonymizes the customer's, other employee's, or individual's personal information.
- 7) Requires an employer that primarily relied upon an ADS to make a disciplinary or termination decision to provide the affected employee with a written postuse notice at the time the employer informs the employee of the decision.
- a) Requires the notice to comply with all of the following:
 - i) It shall be written in plain language as a separate, stand-alone communication.
 - ii) It shall be in the language in which routine communications and other information are provided to employees.
 - iii) It shall be provided via a simple and easy-to-use method, including an email, hyperlink, or other written format.
- 8) Requires the postuse notice to contain all of the following information:
- a) That the employer primarily relied upon an ADS to make a disciplinary or termination decision with respect to the employee.

- b) That a human reviewed the decision and corroborated the ADS output.
 - c) Contact information for a human that the worker may contact for more information about the decision and the employee's right to access a description of the employee's own data used by the ADS when an employer primarily used an ADS to make a disciplinary or termination decision.
 - d) That the employer is prohibited from retaliating against the employee for exercising their rights under this part.
- 9) Prohibits an employer from discharging, threatening to discharge, demoting, suspending, or in any manner discriminating or retaliating against any employee for using or attempting to use their rights under these provisions, including the filing of a complaint with the LC, as specified.
- 10) Authorizes the LC to enforce these provisions, including by investigating an alleged violation, ordering appropriate temporary relief to mitigate a violation or maintaining the status quo pending the completion of a full investigation or hearing through the procedures set forth in existing law, as specified, including by issuing a citation against an employer who violates these provisions and filing a civil action.
- a) If a citation is issued, the procedures for issuing, contesting, and enforcing judgments for citations and civil penalties issued by the LC shall be the same as those set forth in existing law, as specified.
- 11) Authorizes public prosecutors to enforce these provisions pursuant to existing Labor Code Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 180) of Division 1.
- 12) Specifies that in any civil action or administrative proceeding brought, once it has been demonstrated that an ADS was used to make a disciplinary or termination decision, requires the employer to demonstrate that the employer did not primarily rely upon an ADS or that the employer complied with Sections 1522 and 1524 of this bill when making the disciplinary or termination decision.
- 13) Specifies that in any action brought, the petitioner may seek appropriate temporary or preliminary injunctive relief, including punitive damages, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs in addition to other remedies, as specified.
- 14) Subjects an employer who violates these provisions to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500) per violation.

- 15) Specifies that it does not preempt any city, county, or city and county ordinance that provides equal or greater protection to employees who are covered by these provisions.
- 16) Provides that an employer who complies with the requirements related to notice in this bill is not required to comply with any substantially similar notice provisions related to ADS' used for employment-related decisions required under any other state law, except as specified.
 - a) Notwithstanding the above, specifies that an employer that is a business subject to the CCPA is subject to any privacy-related automated decisionmaking technology regulation duly adopted by the California Privacy Protection Agency, as specified.
- 17) Exempts from its provisions, parties covered by a valid collective bargaining agreement if the agreement explicitly waives these provisions in clear and unambiguous terms, expressly provides for the wages or earning, working conditions, and other terms and conditions of work, and provides protection from algorithmic management.
- 18) Provides that this bill's provisions do not apply to the use of an ADS to the extent its use is required by, or reasonably necessary to comply with, a federal statute, federal regulation, or binding federal contract, as specified, relating to either of the following:
 - a) The development of aircraft for use in the national airspace.
 - b) The development of products or services for national security, military, space, or defense purposes.
- 19) Finds and declares that these provisions address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair, therefore, the provisions apply to all cities, including charter cities.
- 20) Declares that its provisions are severable and if any provision or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

Background

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Automated Decision Systems. Automated decision systems (ADS) are computer programs that analyze data (in employment settings, this can be anything from tracking attendance to work product delivery or even worker behavior) to find patterns or correlations and produce outputs for employer use. The use of ADS can pose several challenges including bias and discrimination in its development and use. Over the last several years, the Legislature has considered several bills aimed at regulating AI and its use to ensure that the privacy rights of Californians continue to be protected.

Need for this bill? According to the author: “Employers are increasingly using automated decision-making systems to surveil, manage, and replace workers in pursuit of maximizing productivity and reducing costs. While the passage of AB 701 (Chapter 197, Statutes of 2021) has prohibited employers from setting productivity demands at the expense of health and safety, "robo-bosses" continue to pose a threat to workers. Unregulated employer use of ADS leaves workers vulnerable to discrimination, lower pay, dangerous working conditions, and high risk of unjust termination. SB 947 requires human oversight and independent verification for discipline, termination, or deactivation decisions. The bill provides notice and access to data to a worker when ADS has been used to support a discipline, termination, or deactivation decision. It also prohibits the use of ADS for predictive behavior analysis of workers.”

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 7 (McNerney) of 2025 attempted to regulate the use of ADS’ in the employment setting by, among other things, 1) requiring employers to provide a written notice (pre introduction and post use) that an ADS is in use at the workplace to all workers and job applicants directly affected by the ADS; 2) prohibiting in some instances and in others limiting the use of an ADS, as specified; 3) providing worker anti-retaliation protections for exercising these rights; and 4) specifying enforcement mechanisms that included penalties and relief for violations. SB 7 was vetoed by Governor Newsom.

[NOTE: Please see the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee analysis on this bill for more background information and information on more prior and related legislation.]

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- 1) Costs of an unknown, but likely significant amount, in excess of \$150,000, to the state as an employer to ensure compliance with this bill's human review, notice, and data provision requirements for allowable ADS uses (General Fund (GF) or special fund). The magnitude of costs depends the state's existing ADS disclosure and use policies.
Similarly, likely significant costs to local government employers, which the state would not need to reimburse because this bill's new requirements for local agencies equally apply to the private sector.
- 2) Costs ranging from approximately \$600,000 to the low millions of dollars annually to the Division of Labor Standards and Enforcement (DLSE, also known as the LC) to enforce this bill's ADS use and workers' rights provisions, partially offset by penalty revenue (Labor Enforcement and Compliance Fund). DLSE's primary mission is enforcement of the state's wage and hour laws, whereas this bill regulates employer conduct broader than the usual scope of enforcement for DLSE. As such, DLSE anticipates needing additional staff positions to provide technical expertise and accommodate a sharp increase in complaints and investigations. DLSE notes the number of complaints filed is likely to be as high as 4,000 per year, given this bill's broad scope, application to both employees and independent contractors, and role for DLSE as the primary enforcement body. DLSE estimates costs to reach approximately \$5.1 million annually if DLSE investigates an additional 285 cases per year as a result of this bill.
- 3) Annual cost pressures of an unknown amount to the courts in additional workload by authorizing a new civil action against an employer that violates this bill's ADS use and workers' rights provisions (GF or Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)). It is unclear how many civil actions may be filed statewide and how much court time may be needed to resolve each case, but it generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on staff and the TCTF may create a demand for increased court funding from the GF. The state budget provides annual GF backfills to the TCTF to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in fiscal year 2025-26.
- 4) The Department of Justice (DOJ) reports no significant impact from this bill, indicating DOJ is unlikely to experience an increase in litigation representing state agencies for alleged violations of this bill's prohibitions or pursue civil actions to enforce this bill's provisions as a public prosecutor.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/26/26)

California Federation of Labor Unions (Source)
Alameda Labor Council
American Federation of Musicians, Local 7
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees California
Association of California State Employees with Disabilities
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Community Foundation
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Nurses Association
California Professional Firefighters
California School Employees Association
California State Legislative Board of the SMART Transportation Division
(SMART-TD)
California Teachers Association
California Working Families Party
Center on Policy Initiatives
Central Coast Labor Council
Communications Workers of America, District 9
County Employees Management Association
Fresno-Madera-Tulare-Kings Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Inland Empire Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Kapor Center Advocacy
National Union of Healthcare Workers
NextGen California
North Bay Labor Council
North Valley Labor Federation
Oakland Privacy
Orange County Employees Association
Orange County Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
San Mateo County Central Labor Council
SEIU California
State Building & Construction Trades Council of California
TechEquity Collaborative
Tech Oversight California
The Greenlining Institute

UAW Region 6
What We Will

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/26/26)

American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association
American Staffing Association
Apartment Owners Association of California
Associated Equipment Distributors
Associated General Contractors California
Associated General Contractors San Diego
Association of California Healthcare Districts
Association of California School Administrators
Bay Area Council
Brea Chamber of Commerce
Business Software Alliance
CalAsian Chamber of Commerce
California Alliance of Small Business Associations
California Apartment Association
California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Bankers Association
California Broadband & Video Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Coalition on Worker's Compensation
California County Superintendents
California Distributors Association
California Farm Bureau
California Food Producers
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Grocers Association
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Hospital Association
California Landscape Contractors Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Multicultural Business Alliance
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association

California School Boards Association
California Special Districts Association
California Staffing and Recruiting Association
California Staffing Professionals
California State Association of Counties
California Trucking Association
California's Credit Unions
Chamber of Progress
Cinema Association of California
Citizens Against Lawsuit Abuse
Civil Justice Association of California
County of Fresno
County of Kern
County of Ventura
DoorDash
Family Business Association of California
Fresno County Board of Supervisors
Gaslamp Quarter Association
Greater Irvine Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Insights Association
Leading Age California
League of California Cities
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Restaurant Association
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Lyft, Inc.
Moorpark Chamber of Commerce
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Orange County Business Council
Orange County Fire Authority
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Protect App-Based Drivers and Services Coalition
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management
Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce
Regional Cal Black Chamber San Fernando Valley
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
Rural County Representatives of California
Sacramento Metro Chamber

San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
Santa Cruz County Chamber of Commerce
Self Storage Association
SHRM California
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Southwest California Legislative Council
TechNet
Tri-County Chamber Alliance
Uber Technologies, INC.
Urban Counties of California
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Western Growers Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the sponsors of the measure, the California Federation of Labor Unions: “To prevent algorithmic firings and discipline, SB 947 ensures human oversight of automated decision-making systems when making decisions that impact workers’ working conditions and livelihoods... SB 947 will prevent the outsourcing of decisions that impact workers’ lives to machines. It allows for the use of technology and tools to make workplaces more productive and efficient but ensures human oversight to prevent abuse and mistakes. New technologies like artificial intelligence are powerful tools with the potential to either improve work for workers and employers or to exacerbate and increase existing exploitation and inequality. SB 947 ensures that technology remains a tool controlled by humans.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition of employer associations, including the California Chamber of Commerce, are opposed arguing, among other things, that “SB 947 will drive up costs for consumers and employers because it would impose significant compliance burdens and any misstep would lead to costly litigation for even the smallest of employers. While we appreciate concerns over employees being unfairly disciplined or terminated solely based on automated tools, SB 947 is not tailored to those scenarios and does not consider the benefits of ADS technology. Unfortunately, we believe SB 947 will have an undesired chilling effect on the technology and make it that much harder to develop the very tools that can help combat bias in decision making.”

Opposition from various local government and educational agencies, including the League of California Cities, “For public employers with represented workforces, collective bargaining agreements already provide mechanisms for appealing personnel decisions. This bill’s enforcement provisions overlay appeal rights for public employees that could create confusion, workload redundancy, and legal

uncertainty...With the state and local agencies grappling with a substantial and growing decline in support from the federal government for a variety of programs and services, now is not the time for additional unfunded mandates, particularly without a clearly demonstrated need...”

Prepared by: Alma Perez-Schwab / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556
8/30/26 19:55:06

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1009
Author: Becker (D), et al.
Amended: 8/17/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 4-1, 3/17/26

AYES: Arreguín, Pérez, Reyes, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto

NO VOTE RECORDED: Caballero

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 27-9, 5/27/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Grove, Jones, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Hurtado, Rubio, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Juveniles: detention

SOURCE: California Youth Defender Center; Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice; Fresh Lifelines for Youth

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a court from ordering a minor detained in the juvenile hall unless it makes a finding that a less restrictive alternative to detention in the juvenile hall is unsuitable; requires a court to reconsider whether continued detention in the juvenile hall is necessary whenever the court orders a minor

detained in the juvenile hall; and prohibits a minor from being removed from the physical custody of the minor's parent or guardian as the result of an order of wardship unless the court finds that a less restrictive alternative disposition for the ward is unsuitable.

Assembly Amendments remove specific types of evidence that the court must consider prior to removing a minor from the physical custody of their parent or guardian as a result of a wardship order and delete specific requirements related to the court's statement of reasons when it orders the minor's removal.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that a peace officer may, without a warrant, take into temporary custody a minor when there is reasonable cause for believing that the minor will be adjudged a ward of the court or charged with a criminal action, or that the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court or escaped from any commitment ordered by the juvenile court, or the minor is found in any street or public place suffering from any sickness or injury which requires medical treatment, hospitalization, or other remedial care. (Welfare (Welf.) & Institutions (Inst.) Code, § 625.)
- 2) Requires, except as provided, that a minor taken into custody be brought before a judge or referee of the juvenile court for a hearing to determine whether the minor must be further detained as soon as possible and no later than the next judicial day after a petition has been filed. Provides that such a hearing be referred to as a "detention hearing." (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 632, subd. (a).)
- 3) Requires, upon the minor's appearance before the court at the detention hearing, the minor and the minor's parent or guardian, if present, to be informed of the reasons why the minor was taken into custody, the nature of the juvenile court proceedings, and the right of the minor to be represented at every stage of the proceedings by counsel. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 633.)
- 4) Provides that the court examine the minor, his or her parent, legal guardian, or other person having relevant knowledge, hear relevant evidence the minor, his or her parent, legal guardian, or counsel desires to present, and, unless it appears that the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court or has escaped from the commitment of the juvenile court or that it is a matter of immediate

and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor or reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that he or she be detained or that the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court, the court must make its order releasing the minor from custody. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subd. (a).)

- 5) Provides that the circumstances and gravity of the alleged offense may be considered, in conjunction with other factors, to determine whether it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor or reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that the minor be detained. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subd. (b)(1).)
- 6) Requires the court to order the release of the minor from custody unless a prima facie showing has been made that the minor will be adjudged a ward of the court or charged with a criminal action. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subd. (c)(1).)
- 7) Provides that if it appears upon the hearing that the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court or has escaped from a commitment of the juvenile court, or that it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor or reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that the minor be detained or that the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court, and that continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare, the court may make its order that the minor be detained in the juvenile hall, or other suitable place designated by the juvenile court for a period not to exceed 15 judicial days. Requires the court to enter the order together with its findings of fact in support in the records of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (a).)
- 8) Requires the court to determine whether continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare and whether there are available services that would prevent the need for further detention. Requires the court to make that determination on a case-by-case basis and to make reference to the documentation provided by the probation officer or other evidence relied upon in reaching its decision. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (d).)
- 9) Requires the court to release the minor to the physical custody of the minor's parent or legal guardian if the minor can be returned to the custody of the minor's parent or legal guardian at the detention hearing through the provision of services to prevent removal. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (d)(1).)

- 10) Requires the court to state the facts upon which the detention is based if the minor cannot be returned to the custody of the minor's parent or legal guardian at the detention hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (d)(2).)
- 11) Requires the court, in all cases in which a minor is adjudged a ward or dependent child of the court, to limit the control to be exercised over the ward or dependent child by any parent or guardian and requires the court, in its order, to clearly and specifically set forth all those limitations. Prohibits a ward or dependent child from being taken from the physical custody of a parent or guardian unless the court finds one of the following facts: that the parent or guardian is incapable of providing or has failed or neglected to provide proper maintenance, training, and education for the minor; that the minor has been tried on probation while in custody and has failed to reform; or that the welfare of the minor requires that custody be taken from the minor's parent or guardian. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 726, subd. (a).)
- 12) Requires, if the minor is removed from the physical custody of the minor's parent or guardian as the result of an order of wardship, the order to specify that the minor may not be held in physical confinement for a period in excess of the middle term of imprisonment which could be imposed upon an adult convicted of the offense or offenses which brought or continued the minor under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 726, subd. (d)(1).)
- 13) Authorizes the court, if a minor or nonminor is adjudged a ward of the court, to make any reasonable orders for the care, supervision, custody, conduct, maintenance, and support of the minor or nonminor, including medical treatment, subject to further order of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 727, subd. (a).)
- 14) Authorizes the court, when a minor is adjudged a ward of the court, to order one of several specified types of treatment. Provides that as an additional alternative, the court may commit the minor to a juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp. Specifies that if there is no county juvenile home, ranch, camp, or forestry camp within the county, the court may commit the minor to the county juvenile hall. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 727, subd. (a).)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits the court from ordering a minor detained in the juvenile hall unless it makes a finding that a less restrictive alternative to detention in the juvenile hall is unsuitable.
- 2) Requires the court, whenever it orders a minor detained in the juvenile hall, to, upon request, reconsider whether continued detention in the juvenile hall is necessary based on current information and consistent with existing law. Specifies that this provision shall not be construed to affect a minor's rights, as specified.
- 3) Provides that a minor may not be removed from the physical custody of the minor's parent or guardian as the result of an order of wardship unless the court finds by that a less restrictive alternative disposition for the ward is unsuitable.
- 4) Requires the court, when considering an order of removal or continued removal based on the evidence, to consider all of the following: whether reasonable efforts were made to prevent or eliminate the need for removal, or continued removal, of the child from the home, and whether services could be provided to enable the child's parent or legal guardian to effectively provide the care and control necessary for the child to return home.
- 5) Requires the court, if it orders the removal of the minor, to state on the record the reasons for its decision.
- 6) Includes several legislative findings and declarations.

Background

Detention Hearings. When a minor is taken into custody, the minor must be taken before a juvenile court judge or referee for a hearing to determine whether the minor must be further detained. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 632, subd. (a).) The detention hearing must take place as soon as possible and no later than the next court day after a petition has been filed with the court. (*Ibid.*) However, for a misdemeanor not involving violence, the detention hearing must take place as soon as possible and no later than 48 hours after being taken into custody. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 632, subd. (b).)

At the detention hearing, the minor and the minor's parent or guardian are informed of the reasons why the minor was taken into custody, the nature of the juvenile court proceedings, and the right of the minor and the minor's parents or guardian to be represented at every stage of the proceedings by an attorney. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 633.) During the detention hearing, the court will question the minor, the minor's parent or legal guardian, or other individuals with relevant knowledge, and hear relevant evidence the minor, the minor's parent or legal guardian, or their attorney presents. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subd. (a).)

The court is required to order the release of the minor from custody unless the court finds that the prosecutor has made a prima facie case that the minor has committed a crime and that one of the following is true: (1) the minor has violated a juvenile court order; (2) the minor has escaped from the commitment of the juvenile court; (3) that it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor; (4) that it is reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that the minor be detained; or (5) that the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subds. (a), (c).) The court may consider the circumstances and gravity of the alleged offense, in conjunction with other factors, to determine whether it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor or reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that the minor be detained. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 635, subd. (b)(1).)

If the court finds that the minor has violated a juvenile court order, the minor has escaped from the commitment of the juvenile court, that it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor, that it is reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that the minor be detained, or that the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court, and continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare, the court may order the minor detained in juvenile hall or another suitable placement. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (a).) If the probation officer recommends that the minor be detained, the probation officer must submit documentation to the court that continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare or that reasonable efforts were made to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the minor from the home as well as documentation of the nature and results of the services provided. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (c).) Before detaining the minor, the court must determine whether continuance in the home is contrary to the minor's welfare and whether there are available services that would prevent the need for further detention. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 636, subd. (d).) This determination is made on a case-by-case basis and the court is required to make reference to the documentation

provided by the probation officer or other evidence relied upon in reaching its decision. (*Ibid.*) If the court finds that 24-hour supervision is not necessary, the minor must be released on home supervision. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 628.1, 636, subd. (b).)

Detention Standard. As stated above, Welfare and Institutions Code section 635 requires the court to order the release of a minor from custody at the detention hearing unless it appears that one of the following circumstances is true: the minor has violated an order of the juvenile court; the minor has escaped from the commitment of the juvenile court; it is a matter of immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of the minor; it is reasonably necessary for the protection of the person or property of another that they be detained; or the minor is likely to flee to avoid the jurisdiction of the court. (See also Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.760.)

This bill prohibits a court from ordering a minor detained in the juvenile hall unless it makes a finding that a less restrictive alternative to detention in the juvenile hall is unsuitable. This bill additionally requires a court to reconsider, upon request, whether continued detention in the juvenile hall is necessary whenever the court orders a minor detained in the juvenile hall. Finally, this bill amends Welfare and Institutions Code section 726 to prohibit a minor from being removed from the physical custody of the minor's parent or guardian as the result of an order of wardship unless the court finds that a less restrictive, alternative disposition for the ward is unsuitable.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

Court cost pressures of approximately \$100,000 to \$260,000 annually (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), General Fund (GF)) to conduct reconsideration hearings and to make and document the required findings. According to the Judicial Council, costs reflect additional hearing time as well as judicial and clerk workload associated with the new requirements the bill places on juvenile courtrooms. The magnitude of new workload depends on how frequently reconsideration is requested and whether the required findings lengthen hearings. Where proceedings are not recorded or reported, the requirement to enter reasons in a written order would create new workload. Although courts are not funded on a workload basis, an increase in workload could create a demand for increased court funding. The state budget provides annual GF backfills to the TCTF to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.

Potential costs of an unknown amount to the extent the bill results in the release of youth who cannot return to a parent or guardian and who instead enter foster care. Although these are state-mandated costs, they are not reimbursable, but are potentially required to be funded by the state General Fund pursuant to Proposition 30.

Potential costs of an unknown amount to county probation departments to identify, evaluate, and document alternatives to detention for each youth within the detention-hearing timeline of roughly 48 to 72 hours. Whether these costs are borne by counties, reimbursable, or required to be funded by the state General Fund pursuant to Proposition 30 depends on whether the workload increases the cost of a program or level of service mandated by realignment.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/20/26)

California Youth Defender Center (co-source)

Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (co-source)

Fresh Lifelines for Youth (co-source)

A New Path

A New Way of Life Reentry Project

ACLU California Action

Alianza for Opportunity

Alliance for Boys and Men of Color

Alliance for Children's Rights

Anti Police-Terror Project

Anti-Recidivism Coalition

Arts for Healing and Justice Network

Back to the Start

Brotherhood Crusade

California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

California Public Defenders Association

Californians for Safety and Justice

Californians United for a Responsible Budget

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice

Children's Advocacy Institute

Coalition of California State Tribes

Community Interventions

Community Works

Community Works West

Courage California

East Bay Community Law Center
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Empowering Women Impacted by Incarceration
Fair Chance Project
Families Inspiring Reentry & Reunification 4 Everyone
Families United to End Life Without the Possibility of Parole
Freedom 4 Youth
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide Foundation
Haywood Burns Institute
In Our Care San Mateo County
Jesse's Place Organization
Justice2Jobs Coalition
LA County Public Defenders Union, Local 148
La Defensa
Legal Aid At Work
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office
Milpa Collective
National Center for Youth Law
Peace and Justice Law Center
Restore 180
Restoring Hope California
Rubicon Programs
San Francisco Public Defender's Office
Silicon Valley De-Bug
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California
Starting Over Strong
Success Stories Program
The California Youth Justice Project
The Place4Grace
Underground Grit
Unlocked Futures
Urban Peace Institute
Urban Peace Movement
Western Center on Law & Poverty
Youngsters for Change
Youth Alliance
Youth Empowerment

Youth Leadership Institute

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/20/26)

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs
California District Attorneys Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California
Los Angeles County Deputy Probation Officers, AFSCME Local 685
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
Sacramento County Probation Association
San Diego County Probation Officers Association
San Joaquin County Probation Officers Association
State Coalition of Probation Organizations
Supervising Deputy Probation Officers Union, Teamsters Local 986

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
8/30/26 18:30:11

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1087
Author: Cabaldon (D)
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/8/26

AYES: Blakespear, Allen, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar

NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares, Dahle

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 9-1, 4/21/26

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

NOES: Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Menjivar, Seyarto, Valladares

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

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 31-3, 5/27/26

AYES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear,
Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado,
Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes,
Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson,
Wiener

NOES: Choi, Niello, Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Grove, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Valladares

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Transportation planning: sustainable communities strategies:
transportation funding programs

SOURCE: Metropolitan Transportation Commission & Association of Bay
Area Governments

Sacramento Area Council of Governments
San Diego Association of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments

DIGEST: This bill changes existing Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) guidelines and requirements including processes for setting greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) reduction targets, timelines, and evaluation of GHG reduction strategy. Extends GHG reduction targets to 2045 and makes changes to certain transportation funding programs to support implementation of the strategies.

Assembly Amendments established interim progress report requirements, reinstated the existing California Environmental Quality Act review of RTP/SCSs, established requirements for the California Transportation Plan, and made numerous technical changes to the development of RTP/SCS targets and plans.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

- 1) Requires any urbanized area with a population greater than 50,000 to establish a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that, among other things, is responsible to ensure that regional transportation planning is cohesive across local jurisdictions. (23 United States Code (U.S.C.) §134–135)
- 2) Requires MPOs to prepare long-range (i.e. at least 20-year) regional transportation plans (RTPs) to establish regional goals, identify present and future needs, deficiencies, and constraints, analyze potential solutions, estimate available funding, and propose investments. (23 U.S.C. §134)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Air Resources Board (CARB) as the air pollution control agency in California and requires CARB, among other things, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources and coordinate, encourage, and review the efforts of all levels of government as they affect air quality. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) §39500 et seq.)
- 2) Requires transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt regional transportation plans (RTPs) that, with specifications, achieve a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system. (Government Code (GOV) §65080 et seq.)

- 3) Requires, as a part of the regional transportation plan, a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) with specifications, to be prepared by each MPO. (GOV §65080)
- 4) Establishes a process for, and requires, CARB to provide regional transportation planning agencies with GHG emissions reductions targets that must be included in their SCS. (GOV §65080)

This bill makes substantial changes to numerous transportation programs and planning processes, including but not limited to, briefly:

- 1) Expands the scope of the California Transportation Plan to include planning, progress on projects, and performance metrics;
- 2) Changes the processes surrounding how CARB sets SB 375 emission reduction targets, including but not limited to:
 - a) Moving from a four- to an eight-year cycle;
 - b) Prescribing many details about how CARB sets GHG emission reduction targets;
 - c) Requiring CARB to set updated targets for 2035 and 2045; and
 - d) Specifying factors CARB must consider;
- 3) Changes how RTP/SCS plans are prepared by MPOs, including but not limited to:
 - a) Requiring the SCS take into account current and projected housing needs; and
 - b) Requiring specified enhanced public outreach activities of MPOs;
- 4) Attempts to streamline the process by which CARB reviews draft RTP/SCSs by:
 - a) Having the MPO submit their technical methodology at least 1 year before submitting the plan itself;
 - b) Setting a 60 day limit for CARB to review the plan, as specified; and

- c) Requiring CARB to adopt or update guidelines for SCS preparation, as specified, including specific stakeholder consultations and opportunities for public comment;
- 5) Requires MPOs to provide a progress report, as specified, to CARB and the Strategic Growth Council 4 years after adoption of an 8-year RTP/SCS;
- 6) Makes changes to the administration of several transportation funds and programs, generally to better align with the GHG emission reduction targets established in RTP/SCSs, including: the Public Transportation Account, the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, and the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program; and
- 7) Specifies greater detail for the preparation of an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS), and makes various conforming changes in various funds and programs to enable the use of an approved APS for eligibility purposes.

Background

Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375). In 2008, the Legislature passed SB 375 (Steinberg, Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), a first-of-its-kind law to recognize the critical role of integrated transportation, land use, and housing decisions to meet state climate goals. The law requires each of California's 18 regional MPOs to include a new element in their RTPs – a SCS.

Updated regional plan targets. In an update to the SB 375 targets originally set in 2010, CARB staff proposed new targets for 2020 and 2035, which were approved in 2018. These more stringent targets again varied by MPO, but still represented a compromise between what the MPOs believed possible, and what CARB deemed necessary to achieve SB 32 targets. Specifically, the original 2010 targets would cumulatively contribute a 13% reduction in GHG emissions, and the updated targets would get to 19%. According to the 2017 Scoping Plan update, this reduction needs to be 25% - well above even the increased targets. Program reviews prepared pursuant to SB 150 (Allen, Chapter 353, Statutes of 2017) have found that California is not on track to meet the SB 375 GHG emission reduction targets under the program as currently implemented.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, "California passed SB 375 in 2008 with a bold and necessary vision: that the way we plan our communities, where we build homes, how we connect people to jobs and services, and how we

invest in transportation, is inseparable from our ability to meet our climate goals. That vision was right then, and it is more urgent now. But nearly two decades of implementation have made one thing clear: the law as currently structured is not delivering the results Californians deserve. Our regions are still sprawling. Commutes are still growing. Families, especially those with the fewest options, are spending more and more of their incomes just to get to work and back. SB 1087 is a course correction. It aligns state dollars with regional climate plans, so that the billions California spends on transportation each year are working toward our goals, not against them. It streamlines a planning process that has become a compliance exercise rather than a tool for action, freeing our regional agencies to do what we need them to do: deliver projects, build housing in the right places, and invest in the transit and infrastructure that will determine whether California meets its climate commitments.”

- 2) *Targets with considerations.* One aspect of CARB’s authority that SB 1087 does not attempt to move to California Transportation Commission (CTC) is the GHG emission reduction target-setting process. However, this bill does propose several changes to the process, through directly amending the relevant statute and placing certain requirements upon the metrics themselves used in the targets.

Ultimately, setting a GHG emission reduction target for a region is certain to be a contentious, iterative, and consequential process. Many of the specific factors and topics included in SB 1087 are important pieces of what makes a target ambitious yet achievable, and they should remain in the legislation. By providing CARB direction in scope and discretion in implementation, SB 1087 can be more effective in achieving its stated goals without tying CARB’s hands.

- 3) *A long and bumpy road.* The four largest MPOs, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)—the sponsors of this bill—have been convening a large group of affected stakeholders for over nine months to discuss concerns regarding the implementation of SB 375 and potential reforms. The key stakeholders include climate, environmental justice, housing, transit, labor, and active transportation advocates.

As it exists today, SB 1087 represents the latest in a long line of bills attempting to improve the RTP/SCS process. While the scope of the bill is

expansive and many of its policy outcomes may be slow to manifest, it is clear that this bill approaches the original goals of SB 375 with the level of ambition necessary to address its persistent and well-documented shortfalls.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- 1) [C]ARB estimates costs of approximately \$4.9 million in fiscal year (FY) 2026-27, \$8 million in FY 2027-28, and \$9 million in FY 2028-29 and ongoing (Cost of Implementation Account) for new staff, contracts, operating expenses, equipment, travel, and translation. ARB anticipates numerous tasks related to, among other things, (a) developing the required guidelines, including forming an advisory committee, hosting public workshops, and developing examples of acceptable data sources, assumptions, and technical methodologies to estimate GHG emissions; (b) appointing and convening the RTAC; (c) updating and providing each MPO with GHG reduction targets for 2035 and 2045, which will involve hosting dozens of regional workshops and hearings within each applicable region; (d) reviewing technical methodologies submitted by MPOs to ensure consistency with ARB's most current model used to assess emissions from on-road vehicles; (e) reviewing SCSs and APSs within specified timeframes; and (f) reporting to the Legislature.

Striking [C]ARB's interim (four-year) target revision authority and extending the SCS cycle from four to eight years means [C]ARB will need to review SCSs less frequently, which might reduce [C]ARB's workload and costs. However, [C]ARB asserts these savings will be significantly offset by the new procedural requirements in the bill, including hosting 40 regional workshops and hearings on its targets, adopting guidelines via a formal rulemaking, and reconvening the RTAC.

- 2) The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) estimates ongoing annual costs of about \$2.6 million for 13 new staff distributed across Caltrans' headquarters and 12 districts to develop district-specific performance management plans every four years and update them annually to identify and prioritize projects that help meet the California Transportation Plan requirement of a multimodal transportation system that supports the state's GHG emission reduction targets and air quality standards (State Highway Account or Public Transportation Account).

- 3) [The Strategic Growth Council] SGC preliminarily estimates ongoing annual General Fund costs of around \$600,000 once MPOs begin to publish their progress reports. SGC asserts it will need three staff – one analyst and two air pollution specialists – to organize meetings and prepare meeting materials, review reports, brief councilmembers, perform public outreach and engagement, and coordinate with MPOs. SGC expects each public meeting to cost between \$5,000 and \$7,000 for meeting location, supplies, facilitation, and travel. SGC notes its actual costs may vary significantly and will depend on, among other things, when MPOs begin publishing progress reports, how many of the 18 MPOs publish reports in the same year, with each report requiring SGC to conduct a public meeting, the level of detail in each progress report, and the location of each meeting.
- 4) Potential one-time costs of an unknown amount for the CTC to incorporate changes to its TCEP and SCCP programs (Trade Corridor Enhancement Account, SHA, federal funds). CTC is in the middle of its 2026 cycle for both programs and released draft guidelines for the programs in June of this year and expects to adopt final guidelines in August. Should this bill go into effect, CTC notes it would need to revise and adopt updated guidelines, which involves, among other things, a series of public workshops with agency partners and stakeholders and which would necessitate either a redirection of staff from other programs and priorities or a delay in getting program funding out the door – potentially resulting in cost increases and delays for regional projects.
- 5) While no MPO has prepared an APS to date, by allowing projects that meet certain criteria in an MPO area with an adopted APS to qualify for TCEP and SCCP funding, this bill creates potential ongoing cost pressures on both programs to provide funding for projects that would otherwise be ineligible for such funding.

For context, TCEP – which funds projects designed to move freight more efficiently on corridors with high volumes of freight – will provide about \$1.2 billion in funding over FYs 2026-27 and 2027-28. And SCCP – which funds projects to reduce congestion in heavily traveled corridors – will provide about \$525 million in funding over FYs 2027-28 and 2028-29.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

Abundant Housing LA
Active San Gabriel Valley
Association of Bay Area Governments
Cal Asian Pacific Islander Chamber of Commerce
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
California Association of Councils of Governments
California Bicycle Coalition
California Forward (ca Fwd)
California Walks
Center for Biological Diversity
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)
Center for Progressive Reform
Citrus Heights, City of
City of El Cerrito
City of Elk Grove
City of Fairfield
City of Folsom
City of Live Oak
City of Los Alamitos
City of Martinez
City of Oakley
City of Rancho Cordova
City of Rio Vista
City of Rocklin
City of Sacramento
City of Vacaville
City of Woodland
Climate Plan
Councilmember Alice Dowdin Calvillo
County of Placer
County of Sutter
County of Yolo
County of Yuba
East Bay Yimby
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority
El Dorado County Transportation Commission
Enterprise Community Partners, INC.
Greenbelt Alliance
Greenlining Institute; the
Grow the Richmond

House Sacramento
Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability
Medical Advocates for Healthy Air
Metropolitan Transportation Commission-association of Bay Area Governments
Mountain View Yimby
Movela
Napa-solano for Everyone
Nextgen Climate Amercia, INC.
Northern Neighbors Sf
Nrde Action Fund
Peninsula for Everyone
Placer County Supervisor
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Sacramento Area Council of Governments,
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento; County of
San Diego Association of Governments
San Francisco Yimby
San Jose Yimby
San Jose; City of
San Mateo Forward
Santa Cruz Yimby
Santa Rosa Yimby
Seamless Bay Area
Sierra Club
Sloco Yimby
Sonoma County Transportation and Climate Authorities
South Bay Cities Council of Governments
South Bay Yimby
Southern California Association of Governments
Streets for All
Supervisor Brian Veerkamp, County of El Dorado
Sutter; County of
The Nature Conservancy
Valley Vision
Valley Vision, INC.
Ventura County Yimby
Wildlife Conservation Network

Yes! in Redwood City
Yimby Action
Yimby Los Angeles
Yimby Monterey Peninsula
Yimby Slo

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

Building Industry Association of Southern California
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
Coalition for Clean Air
Commercial Real Estate Development Association
Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition
Equitable Land Use Alliance
Families and Homes San Jose
Inland Empire Economic Partnership
Institute on Real Estate Management
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Orange County Business Council
Orange County Council of Governments
Rebuild Social Partnership
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Southern California Leadership Council

Prepared by: Heather Walters / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
8/30/26 22:09:22

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1130
Author: Reyes (D)
Amended: 8/26/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 3/24/26

AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 7-2, 4/20/26

AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg, Wiener

NOES: Jones, Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 30-8, 5/27/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Grove, Jones, Niello, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Ochoa Bogh

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Invasion of privacy: wearable recording devices

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes it a misdemeanor to operate a wearable recording device to capture sound or video of any other person in any area within a place of business where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, except as

provided; prohibits a person from using any technology to permanently or temporarily disable any light, sound, or other indicator on a wearable recording device that indicates that the device is capturing sound or video; prohibits a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, or holding any technology that enables a person to disable any light, sound, or other indicator on a wearable recording device that indicates that the device is capturing sound or video; and prohibits a person from purchasing, acquiring, or trading that technology.

Assembly Amendments prohibit a person or entity from manufacturing, selling, delivering, holding, or offering for sale a wearable recording device without a light, sound, or other indicator that is sufficiently prominent so that a reasonable person in the vicinity would be alerted to the recording activity; define the term “capture”; exempt peace officer body cameras and other communication devices from the provisions of this bill; and generally exempt assistive technology such as hearing aids from this bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Makes it a wobbler for any person to intentionally tap or make any unauthorized connection into a telephonic communication system (wiretapping) without the consent of all parties. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 631, subdivision (subd.) (a).)
- 2) Makes it a wobbler for a person to, intentionally and without the consent of all parties to a confidential communication, use an electronic amplifying and recording device to eavesdrop upon or record the confidential communications. (Pen. Code, § 632, subd. (a).)
- 3) Makes it a wobbler for a person to, maliciously and without the consent of all parties to the communication, intercept, receive, or assist in intercepting or receiving a communication transmitted between cell phones or between any cell phone and a landline phone. (Pen. Code, § 632.5, subd. (a).)
- 4) Makes it a wobbler for a person who, without the consent of all of the parties to a communication, intercepts or receives and intentionally records, or assists in the interception or reception and intentional recordation of, a communication transmitted between two cell phones, a cell phone and a landline phone, two

cordless phones, a cordless phone and a landline phone, or a cordless phone and a cell phone. (Pen. Code, § 632.7, subd. (a).)

- 5) Exempts specified law enforcement officers or any person acting pursuant to the direction a law enforcement officers acting within the scope of their authority from the wiretapping, eavesdropping, and unlawful recording statutes. (Pen. Code, §§ 633, subd. (a), 633.1, subd. (a).)
- 6) Makes it a misdemeanor for a person to use a concealed camcorder, motion picture camera, or photographic camera of any type, to secretly videotape, film, photograph, or record by electronic means, another identifiable person who may be in a state of full or partial undress, for the purpose of viewing the body of, or the undergarments worn by, that other person, without the consent or knowledge of that other person, in the interior of a bedroom, bathroom, changing room, fitting room, dressing room, or tanning booth, or the interior of any other area in which that other person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, with the intent to invade the privacy of that other person. (Pen. Code, § 647, subd. (j)(3)(A).)

This bill:

- 1) Makes operating a wearable recording device to capture sound or video of another person, in any area within a place of business where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, without that person's explicit consent, a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment of up to one year in county jail, a fine of up to \$1,500 per violation, or both.
- 2) Makes disabling any light, sound, or other indicator on a wearable recording device that indicates the device is capturing sound or video a misdemeanor with the same penalties.
- 3) Prohibits the manufacture, sale, delivery, holding, or offering for sale of a wearable recording device without an indicator sufficiently prominent to alert a reasonable person in the vicinity to the recording activity.
- 4) Prohibits the manufacture, sale, purchase, acquisition, or use of technology designed for the primary purpose of, marketed primarily for, or likely primarily used for disabling a recording indicator, and subjects a person who knowingly violates these provisions to a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per violation.

- 5) Specifies that recording a public officer or peace officer in a public place, or from a place the person has a right to be, does not by itself constitute a violation, reasonable suspicion to detain, or probable cause to arrest.
- 6) Exempts law enforcement body-worn cameras used in the course of official duties and hearing aids, augmentative and alternative communication devices, and similar devices used to overcome a hearing impairment or communication disorder.
- 7) Adds the new crime to the statutes exempting specified law enforcement personnel from the wiretapping and eavesdropping prohibitions and to the recidivist penalty provisions of the existing unlawful recording statutes.

Background

Smart glasses are eyewear that can correct vision and offer additional features not present in traditional eyewear, including camera functions for photography and video recording, AI capabilities, and integration with other devices. (Hornby, *What are smart glasses? Yesteryear's 'next big thing' is finally finding an audience* (Jul. 10, 2024). <<https://www.laptopmag.com/gaming/vr/what-are-smart-glasses> .)

Although smart glasses have existed for years, they began to gain popularity following Meta's release of its Ray-Ban Stories product in 2021. (Hector, *The Ray-Ban Meta smart glasses are majorly popular, which is exciting and frightening in equal measure* (Oct. 21, 2024) <<https://www.techradar.com/computing/virtual-reality-augmented-reality/the-ray-ban-meta-smart-glasses-are-majorly-popular-which-is-exciting-and-frightening-in-equal-measure> .)

The increased popularity of these products and the ability to surreptitiously record others has received a significant amount of attention in recent months. (See Greenwald, *Are You Being Secretly Recorded by Smart Glasses? Here's How to Tell* (Mar. 4, 2026) <<https://www.pcmag.com/explainers/are-you-being-secretly-recorded-by-smart-glasses-heres-how-to-tell> ; Dellinger, *Dear Meta Smart Glasses Wearers: You're Being Watched, Too* (Mar. 3, 2026) <<https://gizmodo.com/dear-meta-smart-glasses-wearers-youre-being-watched-too-2000728928> ; Chun, *How to Tell if Someone Is Filming You With Smart Glasses* (Mar. 15, 2026) <<https://www.cnet.com/tech/mobile/how-to-identify-smart-glasses/> ; Fortney, *Dinner Is Being Recorded, Whether You Know It or Not* (Feb. 16, 2026) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/16/dining/meta-ray-ban-glasses-restaurants.html> .)

One notable anecdote involved an individual who realized that her esthetician was wearing smart glasses with recording capabilities during a waxing appointment. (Prada, *Woman Accuses Tech of Wearing Meta*

Recording Glasses During Her Brazilian Wax (Sept. 2, 2025)

<<https://www.vice.com/en/article/woman-accuses-tech-of-wearing-meta-recording-glasses-during-her-brazilian-wax/> .)

This bill seeks to address privacy concerns related to surreptitious recordings using devices such as smart glasses, and contains two major components. The first component prohibits operating a wearable recording device to capture sound or video of any other person in any area within a place of business where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy unless the person operating the device has the explicit consent of that person to capture sound or video of that person, and prohibits a person from disabling any light or other device on a wearable recording device that indicates that the device is capturing sound or video. The second component prohibits the manufacture and sale of any technology that enables a person to disable any light or other device on a wearable recording device that indicates that the device is capturing sound or video, and prohibits the purchase and acquisition of that technology. This bill includes criminal and civil penalties.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

Potential court cost pressures of an unknown, but potentially significant amount (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), General Fund). This bill creates a new misdemeanor and new civil penalty provisions, each of which may generate additional criminal filings and civil actions. Because new Penal Code Section 632.8 is added to the Invasion of Privacy Act, existing Penal Code Section 637.2 authorizes any person injured by a violation to bring a civil action for the greater of \$5,000 per violation or three times actual damages, together with injunctive relief, and does not require the plaintiff to have suffered actual damages. Actual costs would depend on the number of violations prosecuted, the volume of civil actions filed, and the court time required per action. Operating a courtroom generally costs approximately \$1,000 per hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the TCTF may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The state budget provides annual General Fund backfills to the TCTF to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Consumer Reports
Oakland Privacy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

Cal Chamber
Cal Grocers Association
California Retailers Association
Computer and Communications Industry Association
TechNet

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
8/30/26 21:55:23

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1180
Author: Allen (D)
Amended: 8/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/8/26
AYES: Blakespear, Allen, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar
NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares, Dahle

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 29-5, 5/19/26
AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Grove, Ochoa Bogh, Strickland, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Caballero, Choi, Dahle, Jones, Niello, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 41-24, 8/30/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Plastic Pollution Prevention and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act: California Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill establishes new spending requirements and guidelines for the California Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund (PPMF) and expands the list of entities that are eligible for those funds.

Assembly Amendments enhance the inclusion of California Native American tribes in a number of ways, cap reimbursable indirect costs, and make other technical and conforming changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Plastic Pollution Prevention and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act SB 54 (Allen, Chapter 75, Statutes of 2022), which imposes minimum recycled content requirements and source reduction requirements for single-use packaging and plastic food serviceware, to be achieved through an extended producer responsibility (EPR) program. (Public Resources Code (PRC) § § 42070 et seq).
- 2) Stipulates, pursuant to SB 54 that:
 - a) Producers of covered material form and join a producer responsibility organization (PRO). The PRO, with approval from Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), shall carry out the requirements of SB 54 by January 1, 2024.
 - b) All covered material offered for sale, distributed, or imported into the state on and after January 1, 2032, is recyclable or “compostable” as specified.
 - c) All plastic covered material offered for sale, distributed, or imported into the state shall meet the following recycling rates:
 - a) 30% by January 1, 2028;
 - b) 40% by January 1, 2030; and,
 - c) iii) 65% by January 1, 2032.
 - d) The PRO will develop and implement a plan to achieve 25% reduction by weight and 25% reduction by plastic component for covered material sold, offered for sale, or distributed in the state, as prescribed by Jan 1, 2032, including interim targets of 10% by January 1, 2027, and 20% by January 1, 2030.
- 3) Through SB 54, Establishes the PPMF which consists of all environmental mitigation surcharges, interest, penalties, and other amounts collected under SB 54. This includes an annual (beginning in 2027) environmental mitigation surcharge paid by the PRO of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) each year.

- 4) Specifies how funds from the PPMF will be expended by state agencies after being appropriated by the Legislature.

This bill:

- 1) Subjects each expenditure from the PPMF, upon appropriation, to numerous specified requirements, including improving public or environmental health; incorporating outreach efforts that inform the public of the purpose and scope of the funded program, project, or initiative; and, prioritizing programs, projects, and initiatives that, among other things, benefit communities most burdened by the impacts of plastic pollution and California Native American tribes.
- 2) Requires each expenditure from the PPMF, upon appropriation, to achieve one or more of specified objectives, such as sustained mitigation of the potential adverse health impacts of plastics and the cleanup or restoration of lands or waterways negatively impacted by plastic pollution.
- 3) Requires each department, agency, or entity implementing a grant program funded in whole or in part by the PPMF to undertake specified actions when implementing the grant program, including providing technical assistance to eligible applicants; using a single standardized, simplified application, as specified; providing advanced payments; reimbursing the grantee's and any subgrantee's indirect costs, as specified; and requiring applicants to demonstrate a nexus between the proposed programs, projects, and initiatives and the mitigation of environmental or public health impacts associated with plastic.
- 4) Limits state administrative and program support costs, exclusive of technical assistance, to 10% of the funds allocated in any fiscal year.
- 5) Prohibits PPMF funds from being used for any obligations of a PRO or to fulfill any environmental mitigation requirements or compliance obligations imposed by any law, except as specified, and allows moneys from the PPMF to be expended, upon appropriation, to implement the bill, as specified.
- 6) In addition to the entities listed in the Plastic Pollution Prevention and Packaging Producer Responsibility Act (Act), makes the following entities eligible for PPMF grants if the programs, projects, or initiatives have the primary and direct purpose of mitigation, prevention, or remediation of plastic pollution: public agencies, nonprofit organizations, special districts, joint powers authorities, public utilities, local publicly owned utilities, mutual water

companies, and public or private universities, school districts, and community colleges.

- 7) Requires the Secretary for Environmental Protection (CalEPA) to publish, not less than annually, a list of all programs, projects, and initiative expenditures pursuant to both this bill and the Act and to post the list as a downloadable spreadsheet on CalEPA's website and specifies various requirements for what information must be included in the spreadsheet.

Background

The Problem with Plastic. In 2021, global plastics production was estimated at 390.7 million metric tons. Only 9% of all plastic ever made has been recycled, according to a United Nations Environment Programme report. Plastics production and pollution have the potential to negatively impact human health, the environment, and ecosystems.

- a) *Plastics burdened communities.* A 2025 report by the UCLA Luskin Center focuses on creating a framework to evaluate which communities are overly burdened by plastic, considering plastic extraction, manufacturing, and pollution and waste. The report finds that plastic manufacturing emits air pollutants, including volatile organic compounds and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) emissions. Both air pollutants are linked to health risks including increased cancer risk. The report further notes that plastic can also adversely impact communities when crude oil is extracted to make plastic, when plastic substrate leaches from landfills, and when humans are exposed to microplastics that occur during the useable life of the plastic or when the plastic becomes litter in the environment.
- b) *Plastics as a climate pollutant.* Plastic is also a potent contributor to climate change. Ninety-nine percent of plastic is made from fossil fuels. The plastic industry is the fastest-growing source of industrial greenhouse gases in the world: plastic generates 4% of total global greenhouse emissions but could be responsible for as much as 19% of global greenhouse emissions by 2040, under a business-as-usual scenario (according to the United Nations Development Programme) The plastic industry's greenhouse gas emissions are expected to surpass those of coal-fired power in the United States by 2030.
- c) *Plastics as litter.* Each year, roughly 11 million tons of plastic enter the ocean, which has diverse and serious impacts on marine wildlife. If the litter is small, it may be ingested by animals, leading to plasticosis—where the

rough edges of plastic cause internal injuries and scarring that reduces the ability of animals to break down nutrients. Seabirds are especially vulnerable to plastic pollution; a recent study found plastic in 90 percent of seabirds. Animals can also become entangled in plastic such as plastic bags or rings: marine mammals, birds, and turtles are commonly affected by entanglement, but terrestrial animals also can suffer entanglement or suffocate from ingesting plastic.

- d) *Microplastics*. Microplastics are defined as small plastic particles with a diameter of less than 5 mm. Because microplastics are so small, they can travel in water, air, and the bodies of living organisms. As a result, microplastics are ubiquitous in the environment and are found in some of the most remote areas on earth, including arctic sea ice, the deep ocean, mountain peaks in national parks, and human embryos. Microplastic's small size allows them to bioaccumulate up the food chain. Microplastics can also act as vectors for pollutants such as pesticides and heavy metals, effectively "piggybacking" these harmful pollutants wherever the microplastics go, including into the living tissues of plants, animals, and humans. Current studies have found microplastics in human lungs, brains, and placentas. A recent study suggests that human brains may contain an amount of microplastics equivalent to a plastic spoon. The study also indicated that microplastic levels in the brain have increased by 50% since 2016¹.

There are few studies on the impacts of microplastics on human health. However, a study from 2024 by the prestigious New England Journal of Medicine provided the first evidence of a potential link between microplastics and human reporting: "A study of more than 200 people undergoing surgery found that nearly 60% had microplastics or even smaller nanoplastics in a main artery. Those who did were 4.5 times more likely to experience a heart attack, a stroke or death in the approximately 34 months after the surgery than were those whose arteries were plastic-free...The team tracked 257 people undergoing a surgical procedure that reduces stroke risk by removing plaque from an artery in the neck."²

SB 54. One strategy to reduce waste generation is to put responsibility on producers to oversee the safe end-of-life of their products through an EPR program. EPR programs rely on industry, formalized in a PRO, to develop and implement approaches to create a circular economy that makes business sense,

¹ [Bioaccumulation of microplastics in decedent human brains | Nature Medicine](#)

² Marfella, R., Prattichizzo, F., Sardu, C., Fulgenzi, G., Graciotti, L., Spadoni, T., ... & Paolisso, G. (2024). Microplastics and nanoplastics in atheromas and cardiovascular events. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 390(10), 900-910.

with oversight and enforcement provided by the government. EPR programs require producers to factor in costs associated with disposal. In doing so, EPR programs incentivize industry to design products with waste minimization in mind. In 2022, the Legislature passed SB 54 (Allen, Chapter 75, Statutes of 2022). SB 54 uses an EPR approach to reach ambitious targets to reduce single-use serviceware and packaging through source reduction and postconsumer recycled content. These goals include:

- a) Requiring all covered material sold in the state to be recyclable or compostable by January 1, 2032;
- b) Requiring that all plastic-covered material sold in the state meet a recycling rate of 65% by Jan 1, 2032, with interim goals beginning in 2028; and
- c) Prohibiting producers of expanded polystyrene (EPS) from selling EPS food serviceware unless they meet a 65% recycling rate by January 1, 2032.

SB 54 also requires the PRO to pay \$500 million per year from January 1, 2027, through January 1, 2037 to fund the program, and authorizes the PRO to collect up to \$150 million from plastic manufacturers.

The PPMF. SB 54 establishes the PPMF and provides some structure for how the Legislature will appropriate funding. In broad strokes, the money is awarded by state agencies to grant projects that (1) reduce environmental impacts of plastics pollution, and (2) reduce the public health impacts of plastics and disadvantaged communities. The funding will be allocated into two main buckets:

- a) 40% of the money in the PPMF will be allocated by agencies that oversee natural resources to reduce environmental impacts of plastic on the environment. 50% of the money shall provide benefits to residents living in a disadvantaged or low-income community or rural area.
- b) 60% of the money in the PPMF will be spent to reduce the public health impacts of plastics and mitigate the disproportional impacts of plastics on low-income communities or rural areas. 75% of this money will directly and primarily benefit residents living in disadvantaged or low-income communities.

Eligible grant awardees include tribes, nongovernmental organizations, community-based organizations, local jurisdictions, and in the case of grants for natural resource protections, land trusts.

Comments

Purpose of Bill. According to the author, “SB 54 (Allen, 2022) was landmark legislation to require producers of single use packaging and food service ware to address the growing waste crisis and plastic pollution through a producer funded and implemented program to source reduce and recycle material, and ensure material on the market was truly recyclable or compostable. As part of this legislation, the California Plastic Pollution Mitigation Fund (PPMF) was created to address environmental and public health impacts of plastic pollution. The fund consists of at least \$5 billion over the next 10 years, funded by producers. However, while existing statute establishes general goals for the PPMF, additional operational specificity is crucial for successful implementation. SB 1180 provides the detailed framework necessary to effectively administer the PPMF, including defining the required purposes achieved by expenditures, providing guidelines for implementing agencies, and establishing reporting and transparency measures for fund operations.”

Guiding principles for allocating the PPMF. SB 1180 provides more guidance for agencies on how to award PPMF money to grantees. These include naming big-picture policy goals such as shifting the impacts of plastic on human health, to get plastics out of the environment for the long haul, and to restore and protect natural lands from plastics pollution. It also includes some good best-principals for how to expend the money, requiring agencies to prioritize programs and projects that implement community solutions, engage with communities and tribes, and fund grants that provide multiple benefits, among other criteria.

Overall, these new requirements for spending PPMF money will prioritize communities’ input and help address historic inequities facing plastics burdened communities in ways that will have far reaching or long-term impacts.

More seats at the table, same sized pie. This bill expands the list of entities that are eligible for the half a million dollars a year from the PPMF to include special districts, joint power authorities, public utilities, and mutual water companies. Opening up PPMF money to these large-scale entities can open up large-scale opportunities (for example, engaging mutual water companies could be essential to getting microplastics out of water systems). However, these large scale entities could also be more prepared to apply for grant funding than smaller organizations, and could be eligible for larger grants proportional to larger projects. As such, it is worth contemplating how the addition of these new entities may affect funding to the existing eligible grantees: tribes, NGO’s, community-based organizations, local jurisdictions, and in some cases, land trusts.

To address this concern, this bill specifies that newly added agencies (utilities, JPAs, etc.) are eligible for PPMF grants only if they collaborate with tribes, NGO, CBO, local jurisdiction, or land trust, and the newly added agencies (utilities, JPAs, etc.).

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- 1) Likely ongoing costs of an unknown amount (PPMF, other funds) to SGC, DOJ, and several boards, departments, conservancies, and commissions under CalEPA and NRA to comply with the requirements of this bill in their expenditure of funds from the PPMF. The bill limits state administrative and program support costs, exclusive of technical assistance, to 10% of the PPMF funds allocated in any fiscal year.
- 2) Unknown, potentially significant ongoing cost pressures (PPMF) due to expanded eligibility for entities able to receive PPMF funds as a result of this bill.
- 3) Ongoing costs to CalEPA of an unknown amount to implement the additional guidance and grand expenditure parameters for the PPMF, including workload associated with the expansion of eligible entities, technical assistance, execution of agreements, and ensuring compliance with administration of funds.
- 4) The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, OPC, DOJ, and SGC anticipate minor and absorbable costs.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generation
 A Voice for Choice Advocacy
 Access to Thrive, INC
 Azul
 Beyond Plastics
 Black Fiber & Textile Network
 Black Women for Wellness
 California Environmental Justice Alliance
 California Environmental Justice Coalition
 California Nurses for Environmental Health & Justice
 California State Association of Counties
 Californians Against Waste

Ceja
Center for Coalfield Justice
Central California Environmental Justice Network
Cherokee Concerned Citizens
City of Sacramento Department of Utilities
City of Thousand Oaks
Clean Water Action
Climate Health Now Action Fund
Communities for a Better Environment
Contra Costa County
Ecology Center
Environmental Justice Communities Against Plastics
Environmental Justice Ministry of Emerson UU Church
Esperanza Community Housing
Extinction Rebellion Los Angeles
Food and Water Watch
Gaia (global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives)
Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice
Greenlatinos
Greenpeace USA
Heal the Bay
Just Transition Alliance
League of California Cities
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust
Monterey Bay Aquarium
Ocean Conservancy
Oceana
Pacoima Beautiful
Parents Against Santa Susana Field Lab
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco Bay
Plastic Free Future
Port Arthur Community Action Network
Protect Playa Now
Richmond Shoreline Alliance
Sacramento Environmental Justice Coalition
San Antonio Bay Waterkeeper
Sierra Club of California
Socal 350 Climate Action
South Bayside Waste Management Authority (sbwma) DbA Rethinkwaste

Stopwaste
Sunflower Alliance
Surfrider Foundation
The 5 Gyres Institute
The Nature Conservancy
The Watershed Project
Valley Improvement Projects
West Berkeley Alliance for Clean Air and Safe Jobs
West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
Zero Waste USA

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

American Chemistry Council
Cal Chamber
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Retailers Association
Consumer Brands Association
Dairy Institute of California
Flexible Packaging Association
Foodservice Packaging Institute
Household and Commercial Products Association
Plastics Industry Association
Rural County Representatives of California
Western Growers Association
Western Plastics Association

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 41-24, 8/30/26

Ayes: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Arambula, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Papan, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Stefani, Ward, Wicks, Zbur, Rivas

Noes: Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Pacheco, Patterson, Michelle Rodriguez, Sanchez, Soria, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

No Vote Recorded: Bains, Calderon, Carrillo, Gipson, Krell, McKinnor, Nguyen, Patel, Petrie-Norris, Ransom, Blanca Rubio, Solache, Valencia, Wilson

Prepared by: Brynn Cook / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108

8/31/26 0:06:02

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1246
Author: Cortese (D)
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 8-3, 4/7/26

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

NOES: Strickland, Seyarto, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Wiener

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 9-3, 4/21/26

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

NOES: Niello, Valladares, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Stern

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 27-9, 5/27/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson

NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Jones, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon, Dahle, McNerney, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Autonomous vehicles

SOURCE: SEIU

DIGEST: This bill provides a number of requirements for autonomous vehicle (AV) operators pertaining to remote assistants, drivers, and local incident technicians, and further provides requirements relating to emergency response procedures involving AVs, as specified.

Assembly Amendments modified certain provisions of this bill and revised them with new provisions regarding the duties and responsibilities of autonomous vehicle manufacturers when interacting with emergency responders involving commercial autonomous vehicles, including the creation of new civil penalties for the violation of these requirements. Further directs the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) with implementing new training and guidelines for emergency responders regarding these requirements specified in this bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the operation of AVs on public roads for testing purposes under certain circumstances specified in DMV regulations.
- 2) Defines “autonomous vehicle” to mean vehicle equipped with technology that makes it capable of operation that meets the definition of Levels 3, 4, or 5 of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) International's Taxonomy and Testing of Autonomous Vehicles Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles, standard J3016 (APR 2021).
- 3) Defines “autonomous technology” to mean technology that has the capability to drive a vehicle without the active physical control or monitoring by a human operator.
- 4) Prohibits the operation of AVs on public roads for non-testing purposes unless the manufacturer of the vehicles submits an application to DMV that is approved pursuant to DMV regulations.
- 5) Requires DMV to approve an application submitted by a manufacturer for the operation of AVs for non-testing purposes if DMV finds that the applicant has submitted all information and completed testing necessary to satisfy that the AVs are safe to operate on public roads and the applicant has complied with all

requirements specified in DMV regulations.

- 6) Authorizes DMV to impose additional requirements it deems necessary to ensure the safe operation of AVs if those vehicles are capable of operating without the presence of a driver inside the vehicle.
- 7) At the regulatory level, DMV administers the Autonomous Vehicles Program and issues permits to manufacturers that test and deploy autonomous vehicles on California public roads, as specified.
- 8) Requires, commencing July 1, 2026, manufacturers of AVs that operate without a human operator physically present in the vehicle, except as provided, to comply with certain requirements, including, among other things, to maintain a dedicated emergency response telephone line that is available for emergency response officials, as defined, and to equip each autonomous vehicle with a two-way voice communication device that enables emergency response officials that are near the vehicle to communicate effectively with a remote human operator, as specified.
- 9) Authorizes the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to supervise and regulate every charter-party carrier of passengers.
- 10) Defines a charter-party carrier of passengers as every person engaged in the transportation of persons by motor vehicle for compensation over any public highway in this state. A charter-party carrier of passengers includes any person, corporation, or other entity engaged in the provision of a hired driver service when a rented motor vehicle is being operated by a hired driver.

This bill:

- 1) Makes findings and declarations in regard to protecting public safety for Californians as the operation of AVs continues to grow throughout the state, as specified.
- 2) Requires POST, in consultation with appropriate groups and individuals with expertise in autonomous vehicles, to implement volunteer training courses and guidelines for law enforcement officers on commercial autonomous vehicles, including:
 - a) Existing state regulatory standards;

- b) Standardized protocols for interaction with autonomous vehicles during an emergency;
 - c) Process for the issuance of a notice of autonomous vehicle noncompliance; and,
 - d) Input from companies operating commercial autonomous vehicles.
- 3) For provisions specified in this bill, provides various definitions relating to emergency, emergency response, remote assistants, and remote drivers, as specified.
- 4) Requires an autonomous vehicle manufacturer operating autonomous vehicles without a human operator, under penalty of having their autonomous vehicle operations permit revoked, to:
- a) maintain a dedicated emergency response telephone line that is continuously staffed by a remote human operator that can respond to calls within 30 seconds and has the ability to immobilize or move the autonomous vehicle, unless the vehicle has a gross weight over 10,000 pounds;
 - b) Equip each autonomous vehicle with a two-way voice communication device that enables communication with a remote human operator;
 - c) Equip each autonomous vehicle with an override system that allowed someone physically present to move the vehicle, and provide training on this system to law enforcement and emergency responders, unless the vehicle has a gross weight over 10,000 pounds;
 - d) Provide all necessary information to emergency response officials so that the manufacturer can appropriately receive an emergency geofencing messaging that contains specified content; and,
 - e) Within two minutes of receiving an emergency geofencing message, issue a direction to its fleet to leave or avoid the identified area.
- 5) Requires a remote driver to be located within the United States and hold a driver's license that is valid for vehicle operation in California, as specified.
- 6) Requires an autonomous vehicle manufacturer to ensure that local incident technicians are immediately dispatched upon receiving a notice of a crash or incident involving an autonomous vehicle, or upon receiving a request from an emergency response official.

- 7) Requires an autonomous vehicle manufacturer to immediately notify affected local jurisdictions in the event of a fleetwide emergency or system failure.
- 8) Authorizes emergency response officials to request that an autonomous vehicle manufacturer dispatch a local incident technician when a remote driver or assistant is unable to reasonably address a request.
- 9) Authorizes a local incident technician to coordinate with emergency response officials on behalf of the autonomous vehicle manufacturer.
- 10) Requires DMV to adopt guidelines, as specified, establishing reasonable response time standards for local incident technicians to be present at the scene of an incident involving an AV.
- 11) Requires a local incident technician to be able to relocate, turn off, or relocate an AV.
- 12) Requires an autonomous vehicle manufacturer to tow any AV which cannot be relocated when required.
- 13) Requires POST to develop uniform guidelines and requirements for the manual override guidance provided by autonomous vehicle manufacturers and authorizes POST to charge autonomous vehicle manufacturers a fee sufficient to cover their regulatory costs.
- 14) Requires autonomous vehicle operators to maintain records of response times of local incident technicians to various emergencies, and provide these records quarterly to DMV, as well as publish statistics on its website.
- 15) States that a violation of these provisions is not a crime, and instead establishes a civil penalty of up to \$5,000 for each violation.
- 16) Further establishes a civil penalty of up to \$10,000 for each commercial autonomous vehicle that causes an obstruction that interferes with emergency response for at least 30 minutes.
- 17) Requires a court to consider various factors, as specified, when deciding whether or not to institute a penalty.
- 18) Delays implementation until July 1, 2028.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, "Autonomous vehicles (AV) are operating on California's roads every day. When these vehicles stall in our streets, they do not just block traffic or public transit - they also interfere with first responders and other emergency operations. Currently, AV remote operators are not required to have a California driver's license and are responsible for dozens of vehicles at a time. Our firefighters, law enforcement, and first responders cannot afford to wait on understaffed remote operators to respond to dynamic situations. SB 1246 puts common-sense standards in place to ensure AV companies act quickly, trained personnel are accountable, and our first responders have the resources they need to keep the public safe."
- 2) *AV regulation in California.* Under California law, AVs are defined as being vehicles that meet SAE Level 3, 4, or 5 standards. This includes any vehicle that, at a minimum, can conduct most driving tasks by itself under certain environmental conditions without human intervention. Importantly, Level 3, 4, and 5 vehicles do not include common vehicle safety features such as automatic breaking, lane keep assist, or adaptive cruise control. Vehicles with these systems are considered Level 2 vehicles under SAE standards, and thus do not qualify as AVs. This extends to what are commonly referred to as "Level 2+" or "Level 2 ADAS" vehicles, that package many of these features together to offer AV-like services.

In 2012, the Legislature passed SB 1298 (Padilla, Chapter 570) which permitted AVs to operate on public roads for testing by a driver under certain conditions. Since that time, AVs have been regulated by two state government entities. DMV regulates the testing, operation, and deployment of AVs, while CPUC regulates commercial robotaxi services. In order for any AV manufacturer to apply for CPUC robotaxi permits, they must first have full DMV permits.

- 3) *DMV offers two different types of AV permits.* The first type is a testing permit, which allows manufacturers to test AVs on California roads for internal research purposes. The second type of permits are deployment permits, that allow manufacturers to deploy AVs on California roads more broadly for both private and commercial use. Like DMV, CPUC currently offers two different permit types. The Pilot Program allows for non-commercial service for testing purposes, while the Phase I Program is what permits full, commercial robotaxi service.

Currently, both DMV and CPUC have undergone several rounds of AV rulemaking. At DMV, current regulations are aimed at authorizing new permit types and tackling existing safety concerns. Primarily, these rules add a new

permit type for heavy-duty vehicles, over 10,000 pounds in gross weight, for commercial purposes. The rules are also focused on expanding data reporting, especially for deployment permits, improving law enforcement interactions with AVs, and requiring proper licensure for safety drivers. At CPUC, the proposed rules will address the regulation of partnerships between AV manufacturers and regulated passenger carriers, the use of personal AVs in regulated passenger carrier service, appropriate regulations for Level 2 vehicles, and broader issues of passenger safety, including unaccompanied minors in AVs and shared passenger service.

- 4) *Remote assistants and remote drivers.* All SAE Level 3 and 4 vehicles (which include all AVs deployed in California), despite high degrees of autonomy, still require some level of human input. One form of this intervention is performed by remote drivers. Remote drivers take full operational control of a vehicle from a remote location, driving the vehicle as if they were physical present. However, the far more common type of intervention in California is done by remote assistants. These individuals do not directly control or drive the vehicle. Rather they provide guidance or assistance to the vehicle, often by answering queries or prompts from the vehicle itself. This is most commonly done when the vehicle encounters a situation the AV system is not fully confident about how to navigate. For example, remote assistants may help the vehicle route around an obstacle or check if objects were left inside the vehicle.

Waymo, as the company with the most widespread AV deployment, currently makes large use of remote assistants. Notably, according to Waymo, they do not use any remote drivers. That is, all remote operators simply respond to requests sent to them by the vehicles. According to Waymo, these assistants do not passively monitor the cars, but only respond when a vehicle is in an “ambiguous situation.” Waymo maintains that the AV system remains in full control of the vehicle at all times, and that the vehicle is not “stalled” while waiting for input from the remote assistant.¹

Earlier this year, during a federal Senate hearing, Waymo revealed that it has about 70 remote assistants working at any given time. However, that hearing also revealed that about half of these workers are located in two different cities in the Philippines. The other half are located in Arizona and Michigan. This revelation has raised concerns that these assistants may not be fully familiar with California rules of the road. Concerns have also been raised that their extreme distance from the physical vehicle could cause latency issues in

¹ <https://www.pcmag.com/news/waymo-has-70-remote-agents-but-they-cant-drive-the-robotaxis>

communicating with the vehicles, potentially jeopardizing safety. SB 1246, in part, seeks to address this concern by requiring that all remote assistants working with AVs operating in California must be physically located in the United States and hold a valid California driver's license.

- 5) *Emergency responder interactions with AVs.* Since the initial deployment of AVs in California, interactions between emergency responders and AVs has been a major point of contention. Primarily firefighters and police officers, but EMTs and other first responders, have reported numerous issues with AVs, including an inability to direct them in emergency situations, AVs interrupting emergency response activities, and AVs freezing up and blocking vital roadways. Most of these reports come from San Francisco, where AVs have been operating the longest, but issues have been documented in all areas where AVs are deployed. Specific incidents have included an AV driving towards an active fire situation; an AV driving over a firehose and stopping, rendering the hose inoperable; AVs blocking narrow roadways preventing the passage of firetrucks²; and an AV driving into the middle of an active shooter incident³. Beyond these issues, AVs that have frozen in place have also caused significant traffic disruptions by blocking streets and roadways. Most notably this occurred in San Francisco in December 2025 when a city-wide power outage disabled traffic lights, causing over a thousand Waymo vehicles to freeze.⁴

In an attempt to resolve these issues, Waymo has begun operating a hotline for emergency responders. If emergency responders are dealing with an issue with a Waymo vehicle, they can call the hotline and speak to a remote assistant who can help resolve the situation. However, first responders have reported difficulty using the hotline, citing extremely long wait times and an inability for remote assistants to rectify the situation on the ground. Waymo has also begun to make use of local incident technicians, who are individuals who can physically respond to the scene of an incident. However, little information is available about these individuals, including how many there are, their average response time, or even if they are direct Waymo employees or third-party contractors.

In response to these concerns, in 2024, the Legislature passed AB 1777 (Ting, Chapter 682), which required that all AVs operated in California be equipped

² <https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/cruise-waymo-autonomous-vehicle-robot-taxi-driverless-car-reports-san-francisco/>

³ <https://www.ksat.com/news/texas/2026/03/10/questions-about-self-driving-cars-amplify-after-one-blocked-ambulance-responding-to-austin-shooting/>

⁴ <https://sfstandard.com/2026/03/03/waymo-san-francisco-december-blackout-stalled-cars-hearing/>

with a 2-way voice communication device enabling emergency responders to directly contact a remote operator. The provisions enacted in AB 1777 went into effect on July 1, 2026.

SB 1246 goes further in addressing the concerns of first responders and builds off of DMV's most recent regulations by requiring that remote assistants and operators can quickly respond to emergency responder calls and that local incident technicians be rapidly deployed. SB 1246 also establishes clear civil penalties on autonomous vehicle manufacturers for failing to meet these standards, and institutes training programs and guidelines to ensure autonomous vehicle manufacturers and emergency responders can effectively cooperate in an emergency situation. Finally, the bill also establishes a wide-reaching framework to allow emergency responders to communicate with remote operators, remote assistance, and local incident technicians when AVs are involved in emergency situations.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- DMV will incur one-time costs, likely of about \$115,000, to develop and adopt regulations related to new requirements imposed on AV operators (Motor Vehicle Account (MVA)). DMV projects MVA will have a structural deficit as of fiscal year 2027-28.
- POST will need to develop a training course or courses, develop guidelines and establish a process to review and certify AV manufacturers' manual override training and written guidance. POST estimates one-time costs of \$250,000 (GF). POST may be able to recover these costs through a fee on AV manufacturers.
- Potential court cost pressures of an unknown, but potentially significant amount (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), GF). Although courts are not funded on a workload basis, increased workload creates pressure on the GF to backfill the TCTF. The Budget Act of 2025-26 included \$117.3 million GF to backfill the TCTF for trial court operations.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

California State Council of Service Employees International Union (Sponsor)
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety
California Association of Highway Patrolmen

California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union
California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio
California Labor Federation, Afl-cio
California Police Chiefs Association
California Professional Firefighters
California Safety and Legislative Board, Smart – Transportation Division (smart –
Td)
California School Employees Association
Center for Auto Safety
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumers for Auto Reliability & Safety
Impact Teen Drivers
Kids and Car Safety
National Safety Council
Teamsters California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

Abate-a-weed
Alliance for Automotive Innovation
Aurora Innovation, INC.
Autonomous Vehicle Industry Association
Avrs Group
Bay Area Council
Bot Auto
Calasian Chamber of Commerce
Calchamber
California Alliance for Freight Innovation
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
Chamber of Progress
Einride
Flasher Barricade Association
Gatik
Honda
International Motors LLC
International Motors, LLC
Kodiak Robotics, INC.
Moia America
Mountain View Chamber of Commerce
National Federation of Independent Business
Nuro, INC.

Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
Plus Ai
Sf.citi
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Stack Av
Technet
Tesla
Tier Iv
Torc
Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association
United Spinal Association
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Waabi

Prepared by: Manny Leon / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121, Samuel Myers / TRANS.
/ (916) 651-4121
8/30/26 20:40:34

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1342
Author: Durazo (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 4/7/26
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 27-9, 5/27/26
AYES: Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Grove, Jones, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta, Dahle, Hurtado, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Criminal records: relief

SOURCE: Californians for Safety and Justice

DIGEST: This bill expands automatic record relief to include felony arrests and convictions, as specified, beginning October 1, 2029, and requires courts to provide individuals granted automatic conviction record relief with a register of action confirming such relief.

Assembly Amendments impose additional requirements for someone to be eligible for automatic felony arrest record relief, delay the operative date for all provisions to October 1, 2029, and make clarifying changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines “state summary criminal history information” as the master record of information compiled by the Attorney General pertaining to the identification and criminal history of a person, such as name, date of birth, physical description, fingerprints, photographs, dates of arrests, arresting agencies and booking numbers, charges, dispositions, sentencing information, and similar data about the person, but does not refer to records and data compiled by criminal justice agencies other than the Attorney General, nor does it refer to 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 (DOJ). (Penal [Pen.] Code, § 11105, subd. (a).)
- 2) Defines “local summary criminal history information” as the master record of information compiled by any local criminal justice agency pertaining to the identification and criminal history of any person, such as name, date of birth, physical description, dates of arrests, arresting agencies and booking numbers, charges, dispositions, and similar data about the person, but does not refer to records and data compiled by criminal justice agencies other than that local agency, nor does it refer to records of complaints to or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of, the local agency. (Pen. Code, § 13300.)
- 3) Requires the DOJ, on a monthly basis, to review the records in the statewide criminal justice databases, and based on information in the state summary criminal history repository, to identify persons with records of arrest that meet specified criteria and are eligible for arrest record relief. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subd. (a)(1).)
- 4) Provides that a person is eligible relief pursuant to the above provision if the arrest occurred on or after January 1, 1973, and meets any of the following conditions:
 - a) The arrest was for a misdemeanor offense and the charge was dismissed.

- b) The arrest was for a misdemeanor offense, there is no indication that criminal proceedings have been initiated, at least one calendar year has elapsed since the date of the arrest, and no conviction occurred, or the arrestee was acquitted of any charges that arose, from that arrest.
 - c) The arrest was for a felony offense punishable by a term of imprisonment under 8 years, there is no indication that criminal proceedings have been initiated, at least 3 calendar years have elapsed since the date of the arrest, and no conviction occurred, or the arrestee was acquitted of any charges arising, from that arrest.
 - d) The arrest was for an offense punishable by imprisonment in state prison or county jail for eight years or more, there is no indication that criminal proceedings have been initiated, at least 6 years have elapsed since the date of arrest, and no conviction occurred, or the arrestee was acquitted of any charges arising from that arrest.
 - e) The person successfully completed one of several specified diversion programs relating to that arrest, including a prefilng diversion program, a drug diversion program, or a pretrial diversion program, as provided. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subd. (a)(2).)
- 5) Requires that the DOJ grant relief to a person who falls into one of the foregoing categories without requiring a petition or motion by a party for that relief if the relevant information is present in the DOJ's electronic record. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subd. (b)(1).
- 6) Requires that the summary criminal history information include, directly next to or below the entry or entries regarding the person's arrest record, a note stating "arrest relief granted," listing the date that the DOJ granted relief, and this section. Requires this note to be included in all statewide criminal databases with a record of the arrest. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subd. (b)(2).)
- 7) Specifies that except as otherwise provided, an arrest for which arrest relief has been granted is deemed not to have occurred, and a person who has been granted arrest relief is released from any penalties and disabilities resulting from the arrest, and may answer any question relating to that arrest accordingly. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subd. (b)(3).)
- 8) Requires the DOJ to submit a notice to the superior court having jurisdiction over the criminal case, informing the court of all cases for which a complaint was filed in that jurisdiction and for which relief was granted pursuant to the

above provisions, and to publish on its OpenJustice web portal statistics for each county regarding the total number of arrests granted relief, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subds. (c),(f).)

- 9) Imposes several conditions on record relief granted for arrests pursuant to the above, including that a district attorney may still prosecute the underlying offense within the applicable statute of limitations, that relief does not relieve the person from obligations to disclose the arrest in response to a direct question in an application to be a peace officer, and that relief does not affect a persons authorization to own or possess firearms, among others. (Pen. Code, § 851.93, subds. (d).)
- 10) Allows individuals who have a specified prior conviction and who have successfully participated in certain incarcerated hand crew or firehouse programs to petition the court to dismiss their convictions and seek early termination of post-conviction supervision. (Pen. Code, § 1203.4b.)
- 11) Allows individuals who were convicted of certain crimes and sentenced to state prison terms prior to AB 109 Realignment or Proposition 47 (2014) to have their convictions dismissed, subject to specified conditions. (Pen. Code, § 1203.42.)
- 12) Allows individuals with a prior conviction who have completed a deferred entry of judgement program but entered the program without actual knowledge of the consequences of making a plea to petition to the court to dismiss their convictions. (Pen. Code, § 1203.43.)
- 13) Allows individuals convicted of solicitation or prostitution who have completed their term of probation for that conviction and who can show that the conviction was the result of their status as a victim of human trafficking to petition the court to have their conviction dismissed. (Pen. Code, § 1203.49.)
- 14) Requires, commencing October 1, 2024 and subject to an appropriation in the annual Budget Act, the DOJ to review the records in the statewide criminal justice databases on a monthly basis, and based on information in the state criminal history repository and the Supervised Release File, identify persons with convictions that meet the specified criteria and are eligible for automatic conviction record relief. (Pen. Code, § 1203.425, subd. (a)(1)(A).)
- 15) Provides that a person is eligible for automatic conviction relief if they meet several specified conditions and the conviction meets specified criteria. (Pen. Code § 1203.425, subd. (a)(1)(B).)

- 16) Requires, except as specified, DOJ to grant relief, including dismissal of a conviction, to identified persons without requiring a petition or motion for that relief if relevant information is present in DOJ's electronic records. (Pen. Code, § 1203.425, subd. (a)(2)(A).)
- 17) Provides, however, that the prosecuting attorney or probation department may, no later than 90 calendar days before the date of a person's eligibility for relief, file a petition to prohibit DOJ from granting automatic record conviction relief, based on a showing that granting that relief would pose a substantial threat to the public safety. (Pen. Code, § 1203.425, subd. (b)(1).)
- 18) Requires the state summary criminal history information for a person who has been granted this relief to include, directly next to or below the entry or entries regarding the person's criminal record, a note stating "relief granted," listing the date that DOJ granted, the relief, and the section authorizing relief. Requires this note to be included in all statewide criminal databases with a record of the conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1203.425, subd. (a)(2)(B).)

This bill:

- 1) Mandates that, beginning October 1, 2029, the Department of Justice (DOJ) review felony arrests on a monthly basis for possible clearance if:
 - a) All charges arising from the arrest were dismissed;
 - b) One year has elapsed since the date on which the most recent charge arising from the arrest was dismissed; and
 - c) There are no charges arising from the original arrest that were from the arrest were refiled or are pending during that period.
- 2) Provides that, beginning October 1, 2029, for the purposes of determining whether there are pending criminal charges during a review for automatic conviction record relief, the DOJ must conclude there are no pending criminal charges if at least three years have elapsed, there is no indication that any criminal proceedings have been initiated, and there is no new activity related to that arrest.
- 3) Provides that, beginning October 1, 2029, for the purpose of determining whether someone is serving a sentence during a review for automatic conviction record relief, the DOJ must conclude that the person is no longer serving that sentence if they are unable to determine whether a sentence is complete and at least seven years have passed since the date of conviction.

- 4) Prohibits the court, commencing October 1, 2029 from disclosing any information concerning a conviction granted relief pursuant to the above provisions on any conviction dismissal for individuals who serve on fire crews, individuals who successfully complete deferred entry of judgement programs, and qualified individuals who were convicted of solicitation or prostitution to any person or entity except the person whose conviction was granted relief or to a criminal justice agency.
- 5) Requires the court, commencing October 1, 2029, upon the request of the subject of a record granted relief, to furnish a register of action confirming the court's receipt of notification and compliance with a grant of relief for a specified record.
- 6) Requires any conviction cleared by DOJ and still on a person's record be considered to be inaccurate, irrelevant, untimely, or incomplete for any purpose.

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

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- Costs of up to \$950,000 (General Fund) to DOJ to implement this bill. DOJ's California Justice Information Services Division would plan, design, and implement business and system changes to identify and qualify the expanded universe of criminal records for automatic relief, including time-limited business analysis, project management, and SQL development consultants and three permanent information technology positions for systems analysis, development, quality assurance, and ongoing maintenance. DOJ indicates the system changes would require a minimum of one year to complete, that the department cannot absorb these costs within existing budgeted resources, and that implementation would be dependent upon an appropriation of funds. DOJ's estimate is contingent on the author adopting an exemption from California Department of Technology project approval requirements.

Whether DOJ's estimate captures ongoing staff workload to review the substantially expanded universe of arrest records and apply the new temporal presumptions to older records lacking disposition data remains unclear; actual ongoing costs may be higher if manual review is required at volume.

- Potential court cost pressures of an unknown, but potentially minor to moderate amount (Trial Court Trust Fund) for the recordkeeping duties this bill imposes on the courts. Although trial courts are not funded on the basis

of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a need for increased General Fund support. The 2025-26 budget includes \$117.3 million General Fund to backfill the Trial Court Trust Fund.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Californians for Safety and Justice (source)
ACLU California Action
All of US or None (HQ)
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Public Defenders Association
Courage California
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union
Peace and Justice Law Center
Rubicon Programs
San Francisco Public Defender
San Quentin Skunkworks
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart Justice California, a Project of Beyond Impact

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

Peace Officers Research Association of California

Prepared by: Alex Barnett / PUB. S. /
8/30/26 20:28:32

**** END ****

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1360
Author: Cervantes (D), et al.
Amended: 8/20/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/21/26
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-1, 5/14/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 28-0, 5/22/26
AYES: Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Ochoa Bogh, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Becker, Dahle, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Niello, Padilla, Seyarto, Stern, Strickland

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Elections: translation of election materials

SOURCE: The California Democracy Partnership

DIGEST: This bill increases language access services and the types of translated election-related materials for voters

Assembly Amendments added coauthors, made various changes to required language services, and addressed chaptering issues with SB 715 (Allen) of 2026.

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law, pursuant to Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA):

- 1) Requires a state or a political subdivision of a state to provide voting materials in the language of a minority group when that group within the jurisdiction has an illiteracy rate higher than the national illiteracy rate, and the number of United States citizens of voting age in that single language group within the jurisdiction either:
 - a) Numbers more than 10,000;
 - b) Makes up more than 5% of all voting age citizens; or
 - c) On an Indian reservation, exceeds 5% of all reservation residents.
- 2) Defines language minorities or language minority groups, for the purposes of the above provisions, to mean people who are American Indian, Asian American, Alaska Native, or of Spanish heritage.

Existing state law:

- 1) Declares the intent of the Legislature that non-English-speaking citizens be encouraged to vote and appropriate efforts should be made to minimize obstacles to voting by citizens who lack sufficient skills in English to vote without assistance.
- 2) Requires election officials to make reasonable efforts to recruit poll workers who are fluent in a language used by at least 3% of citizens of the voting-age residents of a precinct and in English.
- 3) Requires two facsimile ballots and related instructions to be available at a polling place in Spanish or other languages for which the Secretary of State (SOS) has determined at least 3% of the voting age residents in a county or precinct are members of a single language minority and lack sufficient skills in English to vote without assistance. Four facsimile ballots and related instructions must be available at a polling place in Spanish or other languages in which the SOS has determined more than 20% of voting age residents in a

county or precinct are members of a single language minority and lack sufficient skills in English to vote without assistance.

- 4) Requires a county that conducts elections using vote centers pursuant to the California Voter's Choice Act (VCA) to provide language assistance, translated election materials, and information regarding the availability of language assistance in all languages required in the jurisdiction.
- 5) Requires VCA counties to establish language accessibility advisory committees (LAAC).
- 6) Provides a county elections official is not required to provide facsimile copies of the ballot in a particular language if they are required to provide translated ballots in that language pursuant to federal law.
- 7) Requires the SOS to establish a statewide LAAC to help it implement federal and state laws relating to access to the electoral process by limited English proficiency voters.

This bill:

- 1) Requires the SOS, on or before December 15, 2031, and on or before December 15 of each year ending in 1 or 7, to determine which counties meet one or more of the following criteria below, and to publish a list of the counties and the languages determined for each county on the SOS' website:
 - a) 10,000 or more citizens of voting age in a county are limited English proficient (LEP) individuals and are either members of a single language minority group or speak a shared language.
 - b) 5% or more of the citizens of voting age in a county are LEP individuals and are either members of a single language minority group or speak a shared language.
 - c) In the case of a political subdivision that contains all or any part of an Indian reservation, the number of voting-age American Indian or Alaska Native citizens within the Indian reservation who are LEP individuals is more than 5% of all residents of the reservation.
- 2) Requires the SOS, if interested citizens or entities provide a preponderance of evidence that a language group in a county meets any of the criteria in 1) of this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the SOS did not identify that language as

applying to that county, to include that language among those listed for the county.

- 3) Requires an elections official to provide translated election materials, including ballots, sample ballots, voter registration forms, voter education and outreach publications, election notices and signage, and a sufficient number of bilingual election workers at each election for each language identified by the SOS pursuant to 1) or 2) of this bill. The SOS or any state agency must provide election-related forms, materials, or services to an identified political subdivision to translate those materials into those languages.
- 4) Requires an elections official, from January 1, 2027, until the SOS makes the determinations pursuant to 1) of this bill, to provide translated election materials in languages pursuant to existing determinations made under Section 203 of the federal VRA, and in any language identified pursuant to 2) of this bill.
- 5) Requires an elections official, for newly covered languages in a county, to begin providing assistance in a language no later than 180 days after the date that a language is determined to be a covered language. A county must begin providing translated ballots no later than 18 months from the date the determination was made, if compliance to provide a translated ballot requires certification or recertification of a county's voting system or related election technology.
- 6) Requires an elections official, beginning January 1, 2027, to provide facsimile copies of the ballot and related instructions in a language for a precinct when the SOS determines that 3% or more of the voting-age residents in a single language minority group lack sufficient English proficiency to vote without assistance in more than two precincts within the county, instead of in any precinct in the county
- 7) Permits the SOS to adopt any rules or regulations necessary to implement this bill.
- 8) Includes legislative findings and declarations, and addresses chaptering issues between this bill and SB 715 (Allen) of 2026.

Background

Census Data. On December 8, 2021, the United States Census Bureau released its most recent determination of minority language requirements under Section 203 of the VRA. California is required to provide bilingual voting assistance to Spanish

speakers in all elections throughout the state, and nine counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) are required to provide voting materials in at least one language other than English and Spanish.

State law requires the SOS, in each gubernatorial election year, to determine the precincts where 3% or more of the voting age residents are members of a single language minority group and lack sufficient skills in English to vote without assistance. According to a memo from the SOS of December 31, 2021, the office contracted with the California Statewide Database at the University of California, Berkeley to determine which precincts have reached the 3% threshold for single language minorities.

Due to stricter census privacy disclosure rules, counties saw a major reduction in populations that met the 3% threshold, meaning ballots and other election materials needed to be translated into fewer languages. The memo encouraged counties to work with community groups to determine if a need exists for any of the previously covered languages before eliminating the use of materials in languages.

On March 1, 2022, the SOS essentially reversed course and reinstated the prior precinct minority language determinations. The SOS found sufficient reason to believe it was necessary to reinstate the 2017 and 2020 minority language assistance determinations to ensure communities have access to language assistance services. In December 2025, the SOS issued new language determinations for elections in 2026.

California Voting for All Act & Previous Legislation. In 2017, in an effort to reduce barriers and improve language access and assistance for voters who identify as LEP voters, the Legislature approved, and Governor Brown signed AB 918 (Bonta, Chapter 845, Statutes of 2017). AB 918 expanded the availability and accessibility of facsimile ballots in languages other than English in situations where such facsimile ballots are required to be made available pursuant to existing law.

AB 884 (Low) of 2024 would have required the SOS to make additional language determinations and would have required the translation of additional election-related materials, such as forms and ballots. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 884 for fiscal reasons.

SB 266 (Cervantes) of 2025 would have provided a similar framework as AB 884 by expanding the number of applicable languages and the types of election-related materials needing to be translated. Depending on the language, this could have

been various voter-related forms or instructions and voteable ballots. The bill was held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations' Suspense File.

Comments

Author's Statement. Section 203 of the federal VRA guarantees language access assistance to lawfully registered voters in the United States who speak Spanish, an Asian language, or a native language if the population in a jurisdiction exceeds certain thresholds. However, barring congressional action to reauthorize it, Section 203 is set to expire in 2032. Whatever might happen in Washington, D.C. in the future, lawfully registered voters in California should have a voice in our government, regardless of whether they are fluent in English or have limited English proficiency. This bill will help the more than 3.2 million lawfully registered voters in California who self-identify as limited-English proficient cast a ballot by making translated election materials more available and accessible. It will accomplish this by codifying Section 203 protections in state law and expanding on Section 203 to provide language access assistance beyond the group of languages required by federal law.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 266 (Cervantes) of 2025 would have expanded the number of applicable languages and the types of election-related materials needing to be translated, including voteable ballots. The bill was held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations' Suspense File.

AB 72 (Jackson) of 2025 would have required election officials to provide registration notices, forms, instructions, assistance, ballots, and other materials or information relating to the electoral process in Bengali, if requested by a voter. The contents of the bill was removed and now reflects another legislative subject.

AB 884 (Low) of 2024 would have required the SOS to make additional language determinations and the translation of additional election-related materials, such as forms and ballots. AB 884 was vetoed by Governor Newsom for fiscal reasons.

AB 1631 (Cervantes, Chapter 552, Statutes of 2022) required a county elections official to post on their website a list of all polling places where multilingual poll workers will be present and the language or languages in which they will provide assistance. It also required county election officials to use the internet in their efforts to recruit multilingual poll workers.

AB 918 (Bonta, Chapter 845, Statutes of 2017) expanded the availability and accessibility of facsimile ballots in languages other than English.

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

According to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations:

- 1) Costs of approximately \$22.2 million in the first year and \$14.7 million annually thereafter to the SOS to expand translation requirements to include approximately 30 additional languages (General Fund). Such translation costs include contracted translation services, procurement, website translations, Voter Hotline voicemail updates, printing, and working with vendors to recertify systems (including VoteCal, the statewide voter registration database) with the new language requirements.
- 2) One-time costs in the low millions of dollars to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for information technology updates to include covered languages when a person registers to vote at the DMV and ongoing costs in the mid-to-high hundreds of thousands of dollars to update covered languages quarterly by voter district and provide quality assurance (General Fund). The California Motor Voter program automatically registers eligible applicants to vote, unless the applicant chooses to opt-out, and forms currently allow an applicant to select one of 10 languages in which to receive election materials.
- 3) By increasing the translation duties of local elections officials, this bill may create a state-mandated local program. If the Commission on State Mandates determines the provisions of this bill create a new program or impose a higher level of service for which the state must reimburse local costs, counties may seek reimbursement from the state (General Fund). The magnitude of costs depends on language diversity and concentration within each county, with the County of Los Angeles anticipating costs in excess of \$12 million per election, other counties estimating costs in the mid-hundreds hundreds of thousands of dollars per election, and some counties estimating no additional costs.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

The California Democracy Partnership (source)

AAPIs for Civic Empowerment

ACLU California Action

Asian Law Caucus

California Black Power Network

California Common Cause

California Environmental Voters

California Native Vote Project
Catalyst California
CHIRLA
Inland Empire United
League of Women Voters of California
Legal Defense Fund
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
Partnership for the Advancement of New Americans
Power California
SEIU California
UCLA Voting Rights Project
American Association of University of Women of California
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Law Alliance
Black Leadership Council
California Clean Money Campaign
California Domestic Workers Coalition
California School Employees Association, AFL-CIO
CFT – A Union of Educators and Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Courage California
Disability Rights California
Dēmos
Dolores Huerta Foundation
FairVote Action
Hmong Innovating Politics
NextGen California
Public Citizen’s Democracy Campaign
Starting Over Inc.
Starting Over Strong
UDW/AFSCME Local 3930
Viet Rainbow of Orange County
VietRISE
Western Center on Law and Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

None received

Prepared by: Scott Matsumoto / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106

8/30/26 20:22:25

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Bill No: SB 1369
Author: Reyes (D)
Amended: 7/2/26
Vote: 21

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 4/7/26

AYES: Wiener, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

NOES: Choi

SENATE FLOOR: 30-9, 5/19/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Hurtado, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares

NO VOTE RECORDED: Niello

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Passed, 8/30/26

SUBJECT: Recall petitions

SOURCE: California and Hawaii Chapters of the American Board of Trial Advocates

DIGEST: This bill requires a person who is being paid to gather signatures to qualify an initiative, referendum, or recall for the ballot to disclose orally to potential signers that they are being paid. For the recall of a superior court judge, this bill sets the time period for getting the required number signatures on a recall petition at 120 days in jurisdictions with 50,000 or more registered voters.

Assembly Amendments of 7/2/26 restore the time periods in existing law for circulating petitions to recall superior court judges in jurisdictions of fewer than 50,000 registered voters and establish a 120-day petition circulation period for jurisdictions of 50,000 or more registered voters.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Declares in the California Constitution that “recall is the power of the electors to remove an elective officer.”
- 2) Provides in the California Constitution for superior court judges to be elected in their counties to six-year terms. These elections are nonpartisan and occur during the general election in November of even numbered years. When a vacancy occurs, the governor shall appoint a judge to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term.
- 3) Creates in the California Constitution the Commission on Judicial Performance to investigate allegations of judicial misconduct and, when warranted, impose discipline, including removal from office.
- 4) Prescribes the processes for qualifying a recall to appear on a ballot and for scheduling the election resulting when a recall qualifies through the collection of signatures on a recall petition. State law specifically prescribes the form, content, and presentation of a recall petition, including disclosure of the top funders of the recall.
- 5) Requires on a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition above the space for voters’ signatures a public notice in 11-point font that reads: “THIS PETITION MAY BE CIRCULATED BY A PAID SIGNATURE GATHERER OR A VOLUNTEER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO ASK.”
- 6) Sets the number of days that a recall petition for a local officer may circulate for signature gathering based on the number of voters in the jurisdiction, as follows:
 - a) Forty days if the electoral jurisdiction has less than 1,000 registered voters.
 - b) Sixty days if the electoral jurisdiction has less than 5,000 registered voters but at least 1,000.
 - c) Ninety days if the electoral jurisdiction has less than 10,000 registered voters but at least 5,000.
 - d) One hundred twenty days if the electoral jurisdiction has less than 50,000 registered voters but at least 10,000.

- e) One hundred sixty days if the electoral jurisdiction has 50,000 registered voters or more.

This bill:

- 1) Requires those who are being paid to gather signatures on a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition to tell each person, without being asked and before providing the petition, that they are being paid to circulate the petition.
- 2) Sets the signature gathering period for a recall petition for a superior court judge at 120 days, if the number of voters in the electoral jurisdiction is 50,000 or more.

Comments

Author's statement. California is one of eight states in the country that allows judges to be recalled. This system of checks and balances for judges is meant to be a tool of direct democracy allowing voters to hold corrupt judges accountable, but there is growing concern the recall process is increasingly being used in ways for which it was not intended, including targeting judges politically based on unfavorable rulings.

Judges serve a unique role in our democracy. Unlike other elected officials, they are prohibited from campaigning or publicly defending their rulings. That ethical constraint protects impartiality, but it also makes judges uniquely vulnerable to politically motivated recall efforts. When recall efforts are driven by disagreement with case outcomes, rather than ethical misconduct, they raise serious concerns about attempts to influence judicial decision-making through political pressure instead of the established appellate process.

At the same time, gaps in our current recall process can leave voters without the information they need to make informed decisions. Individuals gathering signatures are not required to disclose that they are being paid, and recall petitions may lack sufficient accountability regarding the stated reasons for the recall. Recent recall campaigns targeting multiple sitting judges and the rise in threats and harassment surrounding judicial decisions highlight the need for reasonable safeguards.

This bill preserves the constitutional right of recall while strengthening transparency and accountability. It establishes a 120-day signature-gathering period for most superior court judges and requires paid circulators to disclose they

are being compensated. Together, these measures ensure that judges can decide cases based on law and evidence, and not on fear of organized political retaliation.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/31/26)

California and Hawaii Chapters of the American Board of Trial Advocates (source)
American Board of Trial Advocates
Association of Defense Counsel of Northern California and Nevada
Association of Southern California Defense Counsel
California Defense Counsel
California Judges Association
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Consumer Attorneys of California
San Bernardino – Riverside Chapter of the American Board of Trial Advocates

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/31/26)

California Chamber of Commerce
Family Business Association of California
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Judges Association writing in support of this bill notes that judicial recall petitions are exceedingly uncommon and asserts that this reflects the long-standing recognition that the judiciary plays a distinct constitutional role. The Judges Association additionally points out that:

...complaints about judicial actions are referred to and heard by the Commission on Judicial Performance, which holds judicial officers accountable for their actions and has the authority to discipline or remove them. This is unlike any other elected official in California. Maintaining appropriate safeguards in the recall process helps ensure that judges are able to make decisions based solely on the law and the facts presented in each case, without fear that routine or unpopular rulings will trigger politically motivated recall campaigns.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Chamber of Commerce, Family Business Association of California, and the Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce oppose this bill because the bill's "oral disclosure requirement is unnecessary, duplicative, and fraught with practical and constitutional concerns." Specifically, they note:

Requiring an oral disclosure before every single interaction imposes a substantial logistical burden on petition circulators. Petition gathering is inherently fast-paced and dependent on brief, momentary interactions (often occurring in crowded public spaces where circulators have only seconds to engage a passerby). Mandating a verbal script before each engagement slows the process, reduces efficiency, and increases costs. In high-traffic public settings, where circulators may engage hundreds of individuals in a short period, this requirement would substantially diminish productivity and undermine the viability of lawful petition efforts.

The opponents further raise constitutional concerns, noting that petition circulation is core political speech protected by the First Amendment. They point out that courts have recognized burdens on petition circulation, which reduce the size of the audience proponents can reach, as restrictions on political expression.

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
8/30/26 20:07:31

**** END ****

THIRD READING

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

SUBJECT: Mental Health Peer Appreciation Week

SOURCE: Author

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

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

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

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

Related/Prior Legislation

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 3/16/26)

None received

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: SR 139
Author: Becker (D)
Introduced: 8/11/26
Vote: Majority

SUBJECT: County Welfare Directors Association of California's Centennial Anniversary

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution honors the California Welfare Directors Association for its Centennial Anniversary.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The County Welfare Directors Association, known as CWDA, has, for 100 years, represented county human services agencies throughout California. CWDA has worked at the local, state, and federal level advocating for the social safety net and the Californians served by its programs.
- 2) In 2010, CWDA cosponsored legislation that expanded foster care from 18 years of age to 21 years of age so that young adults in the foster care system would have access to housing, education, and employment supports to improve their outcomes as they moved into adulthood.
- 3) CWDA played an integral role in implementing the federal Affordable Care Act in 2013, and ensured that millions of new clients could enroll and access health care through the state Medi-Cal program.

This resolution honors the California Welfare Directors Association for its Centennial Anniversary.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/19/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/19/26)

None received

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
8/20/26 9:23:24

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 664
Author: Alvarez (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes
NO VOTE RECORDED: Pérez

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-1, 1/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Community colleges: baccalaureate degree program: Southwestern
Community College District

SOURCE: Southwestern Community College District

DIGEST: This bill authorizes the California Community Colleges (CCC) Chancellor to allow Southwestern Community College District to offer four workforce-aligned baccalaureate degree programs, outside of the existing CCC baccalaureate degree approval process. It further requires an interim and final report from the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), and sunsets the provisions of the bill on January 1, 2037.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 make the provisions of the bill inoperative if AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026), SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026), or both bills are enacted and take effect by January 1, 2027.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Differentiates the missions and functions of public and independent institutions of higher education. Under these provisions:
 - a) The primary mission of the California State University (CSU) is to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional education, including teacher education. The CSU is authorized to establish two-year programs only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees and the CCC Board of Governors. The CSU is also authorized to jointly award the doctoral degree with the University of California (UC) and with one or more independent institutions of higher education.
 - b) The UC provides undergraduate and graduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over graduate instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. The UC is also the primary state-supported academic agency for research.
 - c) The independent institutions of higher education provide undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in accordance with its respective mission.
 - d) The mission and function of the CCCs are to offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level, and the CCCs are authorized to grant the associate degrees. The CCCs are also required to offer learning supports to close learning gaps, English as a Second Language instruction, and adult noncredit instruction, and support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level. (Education Code (EC) § 66010.4)
- 2) Authorizes the CCC Board of Governors, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish baccalaureate degree programs that do not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program offered by the CSU or UC. Allows for the approval of 30 CCC baccalaureate degree programs per academic year. Current law further requires the CCC Chancellor to consult with and seek feedback from the CSU Chancellor, the UC President, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities on proposed baccalaureate degree programs, as specified, and establishes a mechanism for the assessment, consultation, and approval of programs where duplication is identified, as specified. (EC § 78040 et seq.)
- 3) Requires the CSU Trustees to ensure that any changes in the admission criteria for campus admission comply with specified consultation, public meeting,

notification, and disclosure requirements, and prohibits any change from becoming effective until one year has elapsed, or six months, if the change is based upon the resources of the local service area of the affected campus. Applies these requirements to all changes in the admission criteria that affect eligibility of local service area applicants, including changes to transfer requirements and determinations regarding impact of majors. (EC § 89030.5)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the CCC Chancellor to authorize the Southwestern Community College District to offer no more than four workforce-aligned baccalaureate degree programs, one in each of the following fields:
 - a) Forensic Studies.
 - b) Allied Health Education and Leadership.
 - c) Interaction Design.
 - d) Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).
- 2) Requires that the CCC Chancellor ensure that the application and review procedures and requirements related to the application period and timelines are met for any authorized program.
- 3) Requires the Southwestern Community College District to submit proposals for baccalaureate degree programs to be authorized pursuant to the bill's provisions to the CCC Chancellor and requires that the proposals include all of the following:
 - a) Data supporting the regional labor market demand for the proposed degree program.
 - b) Data demonstrating the lack of availability of the proposed degree program at the regional public universities or the inability of a degree program offered at a regional public university to meet the demand for the skilled degree workforce in the region.
 - c) Evidence of collaboration that prioritizes structured partnerships

between the Southwestern Community College District and regional public universities to avoid unnecessary duplication and to expand access to baccalaureate degrees. The structure of partnerships may include, but not be limited to, any of the following:

- i) Guaranteed transfer agreements.
 - ii) 2 + 2 articulation agreements.
 - iii) Dual enrollment pathways with high school and public university partners such as 1+1+2 models.
 - iv) Credit for prior learning.
 - v) Shared use of facilities to support co-location or cross-location delivery models.
- d) Evidence of program approval through the appropriate accreditation body, if necessary.
- 4) Specifies that full-time equivalent students enrolled in a baccalaureate program authorized by this bill's provisions will be included in the existing funding model developed and adopted consistent with the fee provisions for community college baccalaureate degree programs, as specified.
- 5) Requires the LAO to conduct and present to the Legislature and to the Governor an interim evaluation by July 1, 2031, and a final evaluation by July 1, 2035, of any baccalaureate degree programs offered under this bill that includes information about completion rates and program impact on underserved and underprepared students, among other things.
- 6) Requires the Southwestern Community College District to provide the information necessary to conduct the evaluations, as determined by the LAO, to the CCC Chancellor and requires the Chancellor to provide that information to the LAO upon request.
- 7) Sunsets this bill's provisions on January 1, 2037.

- 8) Makes the provisions of the bill inoperative if AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026), SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026), or both bills are enacted and take effect by January 1, 2027.
- 9) States that a special statute is necessary and that a general statute cannot be made applicable because of the unique position of the Southwestern Community College service area, being in an underserved college desert area.

Comments

Need for the bill. According to the author, “South County San Diego is one of the largest regions in California without a public university offering bachelor’s degrees, leaving many residents, particularly working adults, place bound students, and transit dependent families, without realistic access to the credentials required by today’s regional economy. While Southwestern College has long standing partnerships with UC San Diego, San Diego State University, CSU San Marcos, and the City of Chula Vista, existing public university capacity and proximity are not sufficient to meet local bachelor’s level workforce demand.

“AB 664 is a targeted, place based pilot grounded in years of faculty led, regionally driven research and intersegmental collaboration. The workforce aligned bachelor’s degree programs contemplated by the bill were identified through sustained academic planning, labor market analysis, and program mapping conducted by faculty in coordination with regional UC and CSU partners. These efforts were undertaken to ensure that any proposed programs respond to documented workforce needs while avoiding unnecessary duplication.

“The bill authorizes Southwestern College to offer a limited number of bachelor’s degree programs in fields not adequately served by regional universities, requires collaboration with UC, CSU, and local partners, and includes evaluation and sunset provisions to ensure accountability. AB 664 is not intended to predetermine future university governance or siting decisions. Instead, it serves as a near term, collaborative step within the broader intersegmental strategy already endorsed by the Legislature and Governor to expand higher education access in South County.

“By allowing the region to address immediate access and workforce gaps while generating data on demand, program viability, and intersegmental coordination, AB 664 supports informed, evidence based planning for the future of higher education in South County San Diego.”

Mission differentiation. The state has four segments of higher education: three public and one private. Each plays a vital and unique role for the state and its students. Their mission statements are outlined in state statute. The CCCs are to have an open admission policy and bear the most extensive responsibility for lower-division undergraduate instruction. Its primary area of mission includes academic and vocational instruction leading to associate degrees and university transfer, career technical education, and remedial education. The primary mission of the CSU is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree. The UC was granted the sole authority to offer doctoral degree programs and is the state's primary research institution. Despite the differentiation of mission, the Legislature has authorized the CSU and CCCs to go beyond their original mission to offer doctoral degrees and baccalaureate degree programs, respectively, so long as programs do not duplicate those offered by the other segments with primary jurisdiction. Further expansion of CCC baccalaureate degree authority, as proposed in this bill, would signal the Legislature's willingness to allow CCCs to potentially deviate further from their core mission, duplicate programs offered by a segment with primary jurisdiction, and bypass the existing CCC baccalaureate approval process.

Existing CCC Baccalaureate degree program. SB 850 (Block, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2014) authorized the Board of Governors, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish a CCC baccalaureate degree pilot program. The pilot program included 15 participating CCC Districts to offer one baccalaureate degree program each to meet local workforce needs, as long as it did not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program already offered by the CSU or the UC. The original pilot led to the statewide authorization established by AB 927 (Medina, Chapter 565, Statutes of 2021), which allows the CCC Board of Governors to approve qualifying programs twice a year on an ongoing basis. Today, as reported on the CCC Chancellor's website, there are more than 50 approved CCC baccalaureate programs statewide, primarily in applied and workforce-related fields such as health care, industrial technology, and public safety. Specific degree offerings include respiratory care, mortuary science, industrial automation, and public safety management. These programs are intended to address unmet regional workforce needs rather than broad expansion into traditional academic fields of study. Since 2017, approximately 1,893 students have attained a CCC bachelor's degree, with 293 completed in the 2023-2024 academic year. Rather than expanding access through that existing statewide process, this bill establishes a separate statutory pathway applicable only to Southwestern Community College District.

District specific authorizations could result in a patchwork of district specific statutes. As mentioned, existing law establishes a uniform process for approving community college baccalaureate degree programs that applies equally to all community college districts. This bill instead creates a district-specific exception authorizing Southwestern Community College District to seek approval from the CCC Chancellor for four specified programs under separate statutory authority. The District would be required to demonstrate regional workforce demand, show that existing public universities cannot adequately meet that demand, and provide evidence of collaboration with regional public universities before programs could be authorized. This bill also requires interim and final evaluation by the LAO before the authority sunsets in 2037. While this bill attempts to address the higher education needs of South San Diego County, creating regional exceptions based on the circumstances of a single community college district could encourage similar requests from other regions and result in a patchwork of district-specific statutes rather than a consistent statewide policy. Targeting underserved regions, workforce shortages, or limited access to nearby public university programs may warrant additional flexibility for community college baccalaureate degrees. However, those policy questions may be better addressed through statewide changes that establish objective criteria applicable to all community college districts, rather than through legislation tailored to a single community college district.

TESOL degree. Under this measure, Southwestern Community College District may seek approval to offer baccalaureate degree programs in Forensic Studies, Allied Health Education and Leadership, Interaction Design, and TESOL. According to the Southwestern Community College District, the proposed bachelor's degree in TESOL is intended to prepare graduates for careers in adult education, workforce English training, instructional coordination, and other settings that do not require a California teaching credential. The Southwestern Community College District further states that the program is not intended to serve as a K-12 teacher preparation program or satisfy California's credentialing requirements. Rather, graduates interested in becoming K-12 teachers would pursue a post-baccalaureate credential program offered through the applicable four-year university. While this explanation provides helpful context, this bill does not specify the intended scope or purpose of the proposed TESOL degree. Because "Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages" could reasonably be interpreted by prospective students as preparation to teach in California public schools, the absence of clarifying language may create uncertainty regarding the careers for which the degree is designed.

Alternative solutions include intersegmental collaboration. This bill requires the Southwestern Community College District to demonstrate that it has explored partnership opportunities with the CSU and the UC before seeking approval to offer a baccalaureate degree program. This requirement recognizes the state's goals for intersegmental collaboration where feasible. If it is the desire of the Legislature to expand access to baccalaureate degree programs, arguably, more effective and efficient alternatives do not require a departure from the CCC's mission but instead could focus on expanding and streamlining bachelor's degree pathways between CCCs and public or nonprofit universities. There are numerous examples of successful CCC/CSU pathway partnerships across the state, including Sonoma State University's (SSU) liberal studies bachelor's degree completion program, which provides upper-division instruction to transfer students taught by SSU faculty on the Mendocino Community College campus. This model brings the university to CCC students, building on the strengths of each segment. Further, in its recommendation for alternatives to the original CCC baccalaureate degree pilot program, the LAO's evaluation of the original pilot notes that improving alignment between CCC and the universities could increase the number of CCC students who ultimately obtain a bachelor's degree and reduce the amount of time students take to obtain a bachelor's degree. The LAO report asserts that CCCs and university pathways could not only be more cost-effective but also benefit more students (including place-bound students), thereby having a more widespread impact. Additional state efforts to strengthen intersegmental partnerships could provide another pathway for expanding bachelor's degree access without having to expand independent CCC programs.

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

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

- The Chancellor's Office indicates that the estimated one-time Proposition 98 General Fund costs of \$80,000 to \$138,000 for the Southwestern Community College District to implement up to four new workforce-aligned baccalaureate degree programs could be absorbed within existing resources, while the ongoing costs of providing these programs would be offset by state apportionments and student fee revenues. These costs would include the design of academic standards and student learning outcomes, updates to existing curriculum, and implementation of new courses.

- The Chancellor's office estimates one-time General Fund workload costs of up to \$33,000 to develop the application for the college, issue guidance, and provide technical assistance.
- This bill could result in one-time General Fund costs, potentially in the high tens of thousands to low hundreds of thousands of dollars, for the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) to complete the report and submit it to the Legislature each year. It may also impact the ability of the LAO to fulfill other existing or future legislative mandates and requests, as the LAO's budget is subject to the Legislature's constitutional spending cap.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/24/26)

Southwestern Community College District (source)
 Associated Student Organization - Southwestern College
 California School Employees Association
 Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce
 City of Chula Vista
 HomeFed Corporation
 Los Angeles Regional Consortium
 National University
 San Bernardino Community College District
 San Diego's Building and Construction Trades
 South County Economic Development Council
 Southwestern College Academic Senate
 Student Senate for California Community Colleges

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/24/26)

California Faculty Association
 California State University, Office of the Chancellor
 University of California

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Southwestern Community College District argues, in part, "AB 664 addresses only the bachelor's-level workforce gaps that remain even with University Center partnerships in place; programs where no local public university offers a pathway to placebound students in South San Diego County, even with co-located university partners on campus. No more than four programs may be authorized, collaboration with university partners is required first, and every authorization runs through the Chancellor's established review process. AB 664 does something a broader access bill cannot: it generates documented, independently assessed evidence of what regional intersegmental

collaboration looks like when it works. We built this pilot to be evaluated; not just the programs, but the entire collaboration model. We want the LAO's findings to give the Legislature an honest picture of what this model produced and what it would take to build on it."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The CSU argues, in part, that "The CSU supports the author's intent to expand access to higher education in South San Diego County and the City of Chula Vista. In the past year, San Diego State University and California State University San Marcos have worked to address the region's workforce needs as identified by Southwestern College through the development of various "2+2" programs. This has included work toward establishing in-person baccalaureate degree programs in nursing, psychology, business administration, computer information systems and cyber security at Southwestern College's campus in Chula Vista. However, AB 664 would undermine the collaboration at the heart of these partnerships. We encourage Southwestern Community College District to pursue their baccalaureate degree proposals through the AB 927 process that is prescribed in state law. As noted earlier, there have been 52 baccalaureate degree programs created at community colleges throughout the state. If there are problems with the AB 927 process, we welcome conversations on how to improve, rather than circumvent, the process. The CSU is willing to engage in conversations that improve the AB 927 process to provide better outcomes for the students we serve."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-1, 1/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, 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, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: DeMaio

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Castillo, Ellis, Flora, Johnson, Macedo, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Ta

Prepared by: Olgalilia Ramirez / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/24/26 13:00:39

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 817
Author: Mark González (D), et al.
Amended: 8/27/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 4-2, 8/24/26
AYES: Durazo, Arreguín, Cervantes, Laird
NOES: Choi, Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

SENATE REVENUE AND TAXATION COMMITTEE: 3-1, 8/25/26
AYES: McNerney, Becker, Grayson
NOES: Alvarado-Gil
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-2, 8/27/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle
NO VOTE RECORDED: Richardson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-0, 5/8/25 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Cold storage facilities

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a city or county from approving a building permit for a cold storage facility unless the owner or operator of the facility establishes and maintains a contingency fund, and excludes from gross income settlement for claims relating to the 2026 Boyle Heights fire incident, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 limit, until July 1, 2028, the requirement for a contingency fund to only facilities within the boundaries of the Boyle Heights Community Plan in the City of Los Angeles. Beginning July 1, 2028, the amendments apply the contingency fund requirements statewide. The amendments

also add an insurance policy as an option for satisfying the contingency fund requirement and make other clarifying changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Allows, pursuant to the California Constitution, cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.”
- 2) Provides additional powers and duties for cities and counties regarding land use under the Planning and Zoning Law, including to require every county and city to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area covered by the plan. A general plan must include specified mandatory “elements,” including a circulation element consisting of the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, any military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities.
- 3) Establishes minimum requirements that must be met for local agencies to approve development of new or expanded logistics uses (warehouses) on or after January 1, 2026 that have loading bays within 900 feet of schools, homes, daycares, nursing homes, hospitals, and parks or playgrounds (“sensitive receptors”), pursuant to AB 98 (Carrillo, Chapter 931, Statutes of 2024) and SB 415 (Reyes, Chapter 316, Statutes of 2025).
- 4) Establishes stricter standards, as specified, in the warehouse concentration region, which includes unincorporated areas of the Counties of Riverside and San Bernardino and the Cities of Chino, Colton, Fontana, Jurupa Valley, Moreno Valley, Ontario, Perris, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, Rialto, Riverside, and San Bernardino.

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a city or county from approving a building permit for a cold storage facility unless the owner or operator of the cold storage facility establishes and maintains a contingency fund. This bill defines a cold storage facility to mean a facility that has at least 20,000 square feet that is artificially refrigerated to a temperature of 45 degrees or lower and participates in a specified state program to prevent accidental releases of toxic chemicals.

- 2) Limits the application of this requirement to the area covered by the Boyle Heights Community Plan until July 1, 2028. Beginning July 1, 2028, the requirements apply statewide.
- 3) Provides that the contingency fund can only be used if there is a local, state, or federal emergency declaration, as specified, and the department or the local jurisdiction either:
 - a) Publishes a formal notification of a health advisory or health alert and either the cold storage facility is the subject of the health advisory or health alert, or the cold storage facility has caused the conditions which created the health advisory or health alert; or
 - b) Issues the owner or operator of the cold storage facility a notice that a violation or a citation is unresolved and caused the emergency declaration.
- 4) Requires the contingency fund to be used to provide support during the declared state of emergency or local emergency for affected communities in order to provide:
 - a) Food assistance;
 - b) Housing assistance, rental assistance, and housing relocation assistance;
 - c) Air quality monitoring, as specified;
 - d) Vector control; and
 - e) Health care to address adverse health outcomes.
- 5) Provides that the contingency fund can include any of the following, up to a maximum of \$20 million:
 - a) A dedicated account managed by the city or county, funded by a fee or charge on the development or operation of the facility;
 - b) A dedicated account managed by the owner of the facility in an amount required by the city or county;
 - c) A surety bond; or
 - d) An insurance policy that provides coverage for the uses described above.

- 6) Requires an owner of a cold storage facility to provide evidence of the contingency fund at the discretion of the city or county to substantiate the existence or maintenance of the contingency fund.
- 7) Allows the owner to require the operator to establish or maintain the fund.
- 8) Enacts Personal Income and Corporation Tax exclusions for any amount received in settlement by a qualified taxpayer from a settlement entity in connection with the 2026 Boyle Heights fire incident, for taxable years 2027 through 2032, as specified.
- 9) Includes findings and declarations to support its purposes.

Background

Lineage Fire and aftermath. On June 17, 2026, a structure fire began at a 491,000 square foot cold storage facility in the densely populated Boyle Heights neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles. The Boyle Heights facility contained an estimated 85 million pounds of frozen food and spanned an entire city block. The operator of the facility, Lineage, Inc., is the world's largest temperature-controlled warehouse real estate investment trust, with a total of 88 million square feet of storage space across over 500 facilities and total revenue of \$5.4 billion in 2025.

The fire burned for eight days before it could be extinguished. It generated smoke that subjected tens of thousands of people to pollution levels that exceeded those during the 2025 Palisades and Eaton Fires, prompting shelter-in-place orders for nearby residents. On June 20, the City of Los Angeles declared a local emergency, followed by a gubernatorial declaration of a state of emergency for Los Angeles County.

After the fire was extinguished, the rotting frozen food stored at the facility caused additional health hazards. By early August, residents had lodged more than 4,000 odor complaints with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), leading the agency to issue over two dozen violation notices against Lineage for creating a public nuisance. The decomposing organic matter served as an extensive breeding ground for pests: severe infestations of flies and other vermin occurred at the site and migrated into the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Lineage began cleanup efforts at the site, including the removal of the rotting food waste, following the extinguishment of the fire on June 25th. As of August 18th, nearly all of the food waste had been removed, but additional cleaning and

disinfecting must occur. Lineage estimates that it will spend over \$100 million on cleanup.

Report on health impacts. Among other responders to the health hazards posed by the Lineage fire and its aftermath was St. John's Community Health (St. John's), which is a network of community health centers serving over 150,000 people in Los Angeles. St. John's deployed 3 mobile health clinics to the area and distributed thousands of air purifiers and tens of thousands of masks. St. John's recently issued a report on the health impacts that their clinics treated between the start of the fire and July 31st. While far from exhaustive because it is limited to data from St. John's Clinics and not other places that individuals may have been treated, this report noted that:

- 348 patients were diagnosed with toxic effects of smoke;
- 320 patients were diagnosed with contact or exposure to hazardous substances;
- 46 patients were diagnosed with eye disorders; and
- 20 patients were diagnosed with respiratory conditions due to inhalation of chemicals.

Other conditions treated included anxiety and other behavioral health conditions arising from environmental exposure, sleep disruption and insomnia, housing instability, lease termination requests, relocation concerns, ongoing uncertainty regarding environmental safety, and psychosocial distress associated with displacement and recovery.

Rebuilding the facility. On July 28th, as cleanup was ongoing, Lineage filed an application with the City of Los Angeles to rebuild the Boyle Heights facility. Mayor Bass responded by issuing a third executive order on July 31st to prohibit processing of the application.

The author wants to ensure that the potential community impacts of cold storage facilities are addressed.

Comments

Purpose of the bill. According to the author, "AB 817 is necessary to tackle several pressing issues brought about from the June 2026, Lineage Facility Fire in Boyle Heights. More needs to be done to address the aftermath of this fire and the impact it has already had on the community. That is what AB 817 will do by

ensuring Lineage won't receive permits before setting up a contingency fund to be accessed in times of emergency to help the community, and by tax-exempting all future settlements that residents who have been affected might receive. This bill is the least the state can do to protect the health and safety of my community."

Freezing out cold storage? Cities and counties have broad discretion to approve, deny, or impose conditions and mitigation fees on new development to ensure that those uses don't create unreasonable community impacts. These conditions can include, among many others, specifying aspects of the design of the project (such as setbacks from homes and other places where people congregate), identifying suitable locations for a given type of development, or imposing fees to fund measures to address the impacts. AB 817 applies additional standards to cold storage facilities. It establishes a requirement for a contingency fund prior to approving a building permit for a cold storage facility, but grants discretion to cities and counties regarding the amount and means of establishing such a fund so long as it doesn't exceed \$20 million. Some might establish high contingency fund requirements, which could have the effect of limiting or prohibiting the development of cold storage warehouses in those jurisdictions. Since these facilities can be important to ensuring timely delivery of perishable goods to grocery stores, large contingency fund requirements could impair food access. Other cities or counties might establish only nominal contingency fund amounts or leave the amount of the fund up to the cold storage facility owner or operator, which could fail to fully mitigate future impacts should an incident occur. The overall effect of AB 817 on the development of cold storage facilities and mitigation of future impacts is unclear.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) estimates that, for every \$50 million in qualified settlement amounts received, the General Fund revenue loss would be \$1.5 million. FTB's implementation costs would be minor and absorbable.
- By imposing specified requirements on cities and counties, this bill creates a state-mandated local program. However, any resulting local government costs are not state-reimbursable because cities and counties have the authority to charge fees or assessments that are sufficient to cover the cost of providing the required program or services.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/29/26)

California Community Foundation
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Housing Equity & Advocacy Resource Team
Inclusive Action for the City
Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass
St. John's Community Health

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/29/26)

African American Farmers of California
Agricultural Council of California
Almond Alliance
American Chemistry Council
American Frozen Foods Institute
American Pistachio Growers
Association of California Egg Farmers
California Apple Commission
California Blueberry Association
California Blueberry Commission
California Business Properties Association
California Cherry Board
California Citrus Mutual
California Cotton Ginners & Growers Association
California Food Producers
California Fresh Fruit Association
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Grain & Feed Association
California Grocers Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Olive Oil Commission
California Olive Oil Council
California Pear Growers Association
California Seed Association
California Strawberry Commission
California Tomato Growers Association
California Walnuts
Commercial Real Estate Development Association, NAIOP of California
Consumer Brands Association
Dairy Institute of California

Global Cold Chain Alliance
Grower-shipper Association of Central California
Healthcare Distribution Alliance
Nisei Farmers League
Pacific Egg & Poultry Association
Western Growers Association
Western Plant Health Association
Western Tree Nut Association

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: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
8/30/26 13:05:30

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 904
Author: Aguiar-Curry (D)
Amended: 8/27/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

Prior votes not relevant.

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 7-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Allen, Dahle, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Menjivar

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-4, 5/19/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Carpet recycling

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes numerous substantive changes to the carpet extended producer responsibility program, including adding reporting requirements to grants allocated to apprenticeship programs, requiring \$2 million be allocated to apprenticeship programs, and requiring that the carpet assessment be external.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/2026 double the amount of funding allocated from the carpet recycling program to apprenticeship programs, from \$1 million to \$2 million dollars per year and removes the changes from the previous floor amendments that give the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) authority to make a producer responsibility organization ineligible to operate the program if the agency disproves the producer responsibility organization (PRO)'s annual report three or more times, and removes a clarification that any unfixed or repeated violation is presumed to be knowing or intentional for purposes of enforcement.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Carpet Producer Responsibility Program (PRP) (Public Resources Code (PRC) §42968 et seq.) and the Product Stewardship for Carpets Program (PRC §42970 et seq.) to promote the collection and recycling of carpet. The program's provisions:
 - a) Establish the Carpet America Recovery Effort (CARE) as the producer responsibility organization (PRO) used in California (PRC §42971).
 - b) Require carpet manufacturers and distributors to publish on their internet websites an environmental product declaration identifying the components and the percentage of each component used in the carpet (PRC §42968.4).
 - c) Require the PRO to create a funding mechanism that equitably distributes the PRO's costs among participating producers, based proportionally on their California sales volumes (PRC §42968.23).
 - d) Require that by January 1, 2029, anyone who removes carpet from a home or business as part of a carpet installation project to have that old carpet taken to an approved collection site (PRC §42968.40).
 - e) Require the PRO to submit an annual report to CalRecycle and make it available on the PRO's internet website by July 1 of each year (PRC §42968.62).
 - f) Require a PRO organization formed under (a) above to include nonvoting board members with representatives.
 - g) Allow CalRecycle to impose a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per day for any violation that is intentional, knowing, or negligent or a civil penalty of up to \$10,000 for other violations (PRC §42978).
 - h) Beginning July 1, 2025, requires that the program allocate 8 percent of assessments on covered products per year, as determined by CalRecycle, to grants for apprenticeship programs.

This bill:

- 1) Pushes back the timeline requiring CalRecycle to finalize regulations from January 1, 2028, to January 1, 2029.
- 2) Expands the definition of an approved carpet collection site to include a carpet recycling center, a municipal facility that accepts carpet, a retailer that sells carpet, and a producer's regional distribution center.

- 3) Eliminates the requirement for carpet manufacturers and distributors to publish on their internet websites an environmental product declaration identifying all of the components and the percentage of each component used in the carpet. Instead, this bill requires them to only publish the components that constitute more than 1% of the carpet by weight and any intentionally added component listed by the Department of Toxic Substances Control as a Candidate Chemical pursuant to Section 69502.2 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 4) Replaces the current PRO funding mechanism based proportionally on the California sales volumes of participating producers with one that leaves it up to the PRO to decide how to fund the organization.
- 5) Eliminates the requirement for the PRO to submit amendments to its PRP to conform the plan to California law by July 1, 2026, and eliminates a requirement that the PRP include an explanation of how the PRO will be funded based on an assessment tied to each participating producer's California sales volume.
- 6) Replaces the requirement that a PRP explain how carpet makers will provide a visual mark on the back of carpet that is a synthetic material to allow carpet to be sorted quickly with a requirement to provide the name of the carpet maker, the date of manufacture, and a listing of the carpet's face fibers and backing materials.
- 7) Replaces the requirement that 8% of assessments go to grants for apprenticeship programs and instead specifies that \$2 million annually shall go to grants for apprenticeship programs, with funding allocated between apprenticeship programs in northern and southern California.
- 8) Specifies reporting requirements for the apprenticeship grants, including among other provisions
 - a) The amount of each grant and incentive payment, with grant amounts broken down by category and by recipient.
 - b) The number of applicants and recipients of a grant broken down by category.
 - c) A detailed description of the criteria used to evaluate applications and to award the grants.

- 9) Replaces the governing board composed of non-voting members in existing law with a governing board of voting members, and specifies the makeup of the governing board.
- 10) Establishes certain exemption for the requirement that, on and after January 1, 2029, any person who removed a covered product from a residence of business transport the products to an approved collection site.
- 11) Changes the due date for the PRO's annual report from July 1 of each year to September 1 of each year.
- 12) Revises the types of violations that are subject to a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per day to only include those that are intentional or knowing, rather than intentional, knowing, or negligent, and specifies what can count as intentional or knowing for the PRO.

Background

How The Carpet Stewardship Program Is Organized. Generally speaking, California's carpet stewardship program operates in the following manner:

- a) State law requires California – through CalRecycle – to contract with Carpet America Recovery Effort (CARE), a third-party nonprofit PRO in Georgia.
- b) CARE has a board of directors, which is made up primarily of representatives from carpet mills.
- c) CARE's board of directors created a stewardship planning committee consisting of some members of the CARE board of directors and non-board of director members. This committee – which also includes some non-voting members – makes all the decisions about what to do with and how to spend the money collected from California consumers. The committee shares its decisions with the board of directors, but it appears from CARE's annual reports that only some of that information is made public.

Where Does The Money Go? According to CARE's 2023 annual report, it spent \$30.4 million collected from California carpet buyers in the following fashion:

- a) \$23.2 million in subsidies:
 - i. \$10 million to seven Tier 1 Processors that essentially take apart collected carpets so the materials can be used to make other products;

- ii. \$9.8 million to ten Tier 2 Manufacturers that take the recycled output generated by Tier 1 Processors and turn it into other projects; and
- iii. \$3.4 million to 10 carpet collectors and sorters that provide the materials to Tier 1 Processors.
- b) \$4 million in expenses, which includes collecting carpet (\$2.1 million), education & outreach (\$1.1 million) and grants (\$601,000); and
- c) \$3.1 million in administrative costs, which includes \$2.4 million to CARE and \$688,000 in fees paid to CalRecycle.

CARE's new assessments fees – which were increased by 37%-54% on February 1, 2025 – are:

- a) Broadloom carpet: \$1.05/square yard (sy) (up from \$0.70/sy) for carpet with less than 10% recycled content, and \$0.96/sy (up from \$0.62/sy) for carpet with 10% or more recycled content.
- b) Carpet tile: \$1.49/sy (up from \$0.99) for carpet with less than 10% recycled content, and \$1.40/sy (up from \$0.91) for carpet with 10% or more recycled content.

Comments

Purpose of Bill. According to the author, “While AB 863 (Aguiar-Curry, 2024) strengthened accountability requirements for the statewide consumer-funded carpet recycling program, CARE continues to lack a representative model of governance, and perfectly recyclable carpet is currently being landfilled due to a lack of convenient collection sites and proper sorting. This bill improves accountability and representation within CARE's governance structure by adding additional nonvoting members across different manufacturers to the governing board. To improve recyclability, this bill increases collection site density, heightens product composition and backstamping standards, and ensures effective implementation in AB 863 to encourage more sustainable production practices.”

Starting Over...again. In 2024, the state's original carpet stewardship program was overhauled by AB 863 (Aguiar-Curry, Chapter 675, Statutes of 2024), but for reasons explained below, the changes will likely not take effect until January 1, 2027, at the earliest. Among other provisions, AB 863:

- a) Set explicit goals that must be accomplished in the PRP;
- b) Required 8% of all assessments collected be spent on union apprenticeship programs;

- c) Increased penalties for program violations from up to \$5,000 per day to up to \$10,000 per day for most violations, and from up to \$10,000 per day to up to \$25,000 per day for knowing, intentional, and negligent violations; and

Overhauling the 2010 carpet stewardship law was intended to create a fresh start for a program that has somewhat of a checkered history. However, it's important to note the changes mandated by AB 863 – even though the bill became law on January 1, 2025 – will not take effect until CalRecycle:

- a) Adopts new regulations, which AB 863 required CalRecycle to complete by December 31, 2026;
- b) Approves a new PRP submitted by the PRO;
- c) Notifies the PRO 90 days before notifying the Legislature that it is prepared to implement the new requirements of AB 863; and
- d) Submits to the relevant committees of the Legislature a letter indicating the conditions in a), b), and c) above have been met, that CalRecycle is prepared to implement the new law, and that the PRO is prepared to implement the new PRP.

In 2025, AB 80 (Aguiar Curry) was introduced to make further significant changes to the carpet program. AB 80 was held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense file. AB 904 picks up where AB 80 left off, including most of the changes proposed in AB 80. However, AB 904 differs from AB 80 in some ways:

- a) *Allocations for grants to apprenticeship programs.* Instead of dedicating 8% of assessments for grants to apprenticeship program, AB 904 allocates \$1 million annually for these grants. It also establishes reporting requirements, where the grant awardees must report on how the money is being spent and how it is advancing the goals of the carpet stewardship program.
- b) *Governing board member allocation.* Changes the composition of the voting board, and specifically reduces the apprenticeship representation from two members (one northern and one southern) to just one apprenticeship representative, with the position changing every two years between a northern and southern representative.
- c) *External vs. internal fees.* Reverts to existing law's external fee, when an internal fee had been contemplated under AB 80.
- d) *Prescribing collection site criteria.* Establishes collection requirements, to be met through the stewardship program, for carpets. This includes requirements that at least a quarter of collection facilities be open on Saturdays in areas with populations of 25,000 people or more.

- e) *Other*. Makes technical changes to the definition of non-profit (a PRO must be a nonprofit) and ‘carpet’, strikes provision that CalRecycle’s adjustment of performance standards be subject to the APA, and clarifies that violations and fines apply to knowing and intentional, not negligent, violations of the program, among others.

Some of these changes add transparency (reporting on allocation of funding to apprenticeship programs; keeping the fee external), and others address nuts-and-bolts issues with the program that were not contemplated in AB 80 (adding concrete requirements to collection site requirements, changing the exact composition of the governing board). Altogether, AB 904 makes changes to a program that was heftily amended in 2024: those 2024 changes have not yet been implemented, making it unclear how this will change existing law in practice.

Pushing paper In 2021, prior to AB 863 and updates to the carpet stewardship program, the carpet stewardship program PRO reported that they budgeted \$100,000 per year for incentives and grants to support state-approved apprenticeship programs for training apprentice and journey-level carpet installers in proper carpet recycling practices. AB 904, like AB 80 and existing law through AB 863, provides significantly more funding for apprenticeship programs. AB 904 allocates a whopping \$2 million per year to apprenticeship programs.

Unlike existing law and attempts to update the carpet stewardship program, AB 904 requires that apprenticeship programs provide detailed reports on how they are spending that grant funding; however, AB 904 does not authorize these reports to be used to inform subsequent grants, meaning that if the gains to the program were miniscule or a grantee spent funds inefficiently, that information would be known, but not considered when allocating them another grant.

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

The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) estimates ongoing costs of \$439,000 in 2027-28 and \$575,0000 annually thereafter (special fund) to develop and promulgate regulations, provide ongoing legal technical expertise, conduct investigations, inspections, and verify compliance with requirements regarding product composition, and conduct audits of the producer’s return process.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/26/26)
Alameda County Waste Management Authority
California Product Stewardship Council

Carpet & Rug Institute

Child Action, INC.

District Council 16, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades

District Council 36, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades

Los Angeles Unified School District

Silicon Valley Community Foundation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/26/26)

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: Brynn Cook / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108

8/28/26 11:28:53

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1018
Author: Bauer-Kahan (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-2, 7/15/25

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

NOES: Niello, Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/29/25

AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 50-16, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Automated decision systems

SOURCE: TechEquity Action

DIGEST: This bill regulates the use of “automated decision systems” (ADS). It places obligations on developers and deployers of such systems designed or used to help make “consequential decisions.”

Senate Floor amendments of 8/28/26 change various definitions, remove state agencies from the scope of the bill, alter the transparency requirements, exempt smaller employers from some provisions, narrow enforcement authority to only the Attorney General, insert a right to cure, add a number of exemptions, and make clarifying and technical changes.

Senate Floor amendments of 8/21/26 add various exemptions and significantly narrow the bill by, among other things, removing requirements to conduct risk assessments and audits, and limiting certain rights to “adverse outcomes.”

Senate Floor amendments of 9/5/25 narrow the scope of this bill by, in part, carving out certain generative artificial intelligence (AI) systems and adding several exemptions. The amendments also reduce the burden on developers and deployers by, in part, reducing the document retention timeline and including factors for courts to consider in assessing civil penalties.

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 Consumer Privacy Rights Act (CPRA), which amends the CCPA and creates the California Privacy Protection Agency (PPA), which is charged with implementing these laws, promulgating regulations, and carrying out enforcement actions. (Civ. Code § 1798.100 et seq.; Proposition 24 (2020).)
- 3) Establishes the Civil Rights Department, and sets forth its statutory functions, duties, and powers. (Government (Gov.) Code § 12930.)
- 4) Establishes the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). (Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.)
- 5) Establishes the Unruh Civil Rights Act. (Civ. Code § 51.)
- 6) Defines “trade secret” under the Uniform Trade Secrets Act as information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that meets specified criteria. (Civ. Code § 3426.1(d).)
- 7) Requires the California Department of Technology (CDT) to conduct a comprehensive inventory of all high-risk ADS that have been proposed for use, development, or procurement by, or are being used, developed, or procured by, any state agency. It defines the relevant terms. (Gov. Code § 11546.45.5.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires a developer that sells, licenses, or otherwise transfers a covered ADS to a potential deployer to provide the deployer with specified information.
- 2) Dictates the process and form that any documentation required to be provided to a deployer by a developer must take.
- 3) Requires a deployer, before it finalizes a consequential decision made or facilitated by a covered ADS, and after it finalizes such a decision that results in an adverse outcome, to provide any subject of that decision with specified disclosures and the ability to request further information. A deployer that employs more than 25 employees must also provide the subject with an opportunity to correct any incorrect personal information used and to appeal the adverse consequential decision according to specified processes. Dictates the process and form that documentation required to be provided to a subject by a deployer must take.
- 4) Provides that a deployer's collection, use, retention, and sharing of personal information from a subject of a consequential decision shall be reasonably necessary and proportionate to achieve the purposes for which the personal information was collected and processed, or for another disclosed purpose that is compatible with the context in which the personal information was collected, and not further processed in a manner that is incompatible with those purposes.
- 5) Provides the conditions under which a deployer assumes the responsibilities of a developer.
- 6) Imposes retention requirements on developers and deployers with respect to specified documentation.
- 7) Allows for the redaction of certain information revealing trade secrets, as provided, but requires disclosure of such withholding and the basis for it.
- 8) Authorizes enforcement actions against developers or deployers to be brought solely by the Attorney General. It further provides a limited right to cure until January 1, 2030.
- 9) Authorizes a court to award a prevailing plaintiff in such actions specified remedies, including a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per violation. It provides courts with relevant circumstances to be considered in assessing the civil penalty.

- 10) Provides certain exemptions from specified requirements, including for deployers subject to the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, the federal Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act; entities regulated by HIPAA; a developer subject to the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act; medical devices; laboratory testing; ADS used to support development of drugs, biological products, and medical devices; and ADS to the extent they are used to protect against things such as spam or money laundering.
- 11) Clarifies the relevance of compliance, or the failure to comply, with these provisions in actions pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act and FEHA.
- 12) Defines AI, ADS, trade secret, adverse outcome, and personal information in accordance with existing law and defines other relevant terms.

Background

ADS, especially those powered by AI, are being increasingly deployed in a multitude of contexts, including employment, housing, education, and health care. Major transparency and fairness concerns have been raised about the use of ADS to make consequential decisions, essentially determinations with significant legal or other material effect on people's lives.

This bill seeks to regulate the development and deployment, by both public and private actors, of "covered ADS," essentially ADS designed for or used by a deployer to help make "consequential decisions," defined broadly to include decisions, determinations, or any other actions made about a person that *relates to* the provision of, access to, or the eligibility, selection, or compensation for, certain specified goods, services, or decisions, as provided. Developers are required to provide deployers certain information, and deployers are required to provide certain notices to subjects of consequential decisions and afford certain rights to them.

This bill is sponsored by TechEquity Action. It is supported by a variety of labor, consumer, privacy, and other advocacy groups, including Common Sense Media and Consumer Reports. It is opposed by a number of industry associations, including the Consumer Technology Association and the American Staffing Association. For a more thorough discussion, please see the Senate Judiciary Committee analysis of this bill, which is incorporated by reference herein.

Comments

According to the author:

The use of automated decision systems (ADS) has become prevalent among Californian's daily lives and used within various sectors – including, housing, employment, and even in criminal justice sentencing and probation decisions. However, the algorithms that power ADS are often vulnerable to issues such as unrepresentative data, faulty classifications, and flawed design. These shortcomings can result in biased, discriminatory, or unfair outcomes. Rather than solving systemic problems, poorly designed ADS can worsen the very harms they aim to address—ultimately hurting the people they are meant to help. AB 1018 provides the necessary guardrails by regulating the development and deployment of an ADS used to make consequential decisions. Additionally, the current role that an ADS plays in a consequential decision is hidden from consumers. Fundamentally, consumers should have the right to be well informed of how these ADS are used in life altering decisions. AB 1018 calls for transparency on the usage of ADS by requiring notice to consumers by deployers before and after a consequential decision. It is crucial that we take the necessary steps to ensure the technology is used responsibly and can be trusted. Well-intentioned but flawed technology is a matter of state concern. Guardrails and accountability are needed to ensure that technology does not further marginalize communities or broaden inequities.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Unknown, potentially significant costs (local funds, General Fund) to local agencies that deploy ADS to make consequential decisions and must comply with the above-described requirements, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually statewide. For example, counties will be required to review all of their systems for compliance—including tools used for online testing, hiring, permitting, case management, risk assessments, and property management. They will also incur costs of audits, training, staffing, disclosures, appeals process, data retention, sending out notices, and potential legal exposure. If developers raise their cost as a result of this bill, these costs will be passed onto the counties. Counties may claim reimbursement of those costs if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this bill creates a new program or imposes a higher level of service on local agencies.

- The State Controller’s Office (SCO) reports that it, and all other state governmental entities would be considered a “deployer,” of an ADS, as defined in the bill. If SCO implemented one or multiple ADS systems that meet the criteria for oversight in AB 1018, SCO would anticipate needing the following General Fund Resources:
 - 2025-26: \$1,408,000 for 7.0 two-year limited-term positions and one-time costs;
 - 2026-27: \$1,384,000 for 7.0 two-year limited-term positions; and,
 - 2027-28 and ongoing: \$761,000 for 4.0 permanent positions.

SCO indicates that these estimates reflect the requirements for a large, complex agency such as the SCO managing sensitive personal and financial data across automated systems. Actual staffing may be adjusted depending on the complexity and scale of the deployed ADS. Some functions may overlap or be handled by existing staff with appropriate upskilling, while external contractors could augment capacity for short-term surges, such as during initial implementation or major audits. If AB 1018 becomes law, the SCO would need 5–7 information security staff—including a dedicated supervisor—for the initial implementation of AB 1018, with 3–4 (including the supervisor) required for ongoing security and compliance operations related to automated decision systems.

- Costs (special fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the Labor Commissioner to enforce Labor Code violations, possibly in the millions of dollars, annually. Actual costs will depend on the number of enforcement actions and the amount of workload associated with each action.
- The Department of Justice (DOJ) estimates a fiscal impact of \$2.5 million or less (General Fund, Unfair Competition Law Fund). The DOJ notes that implementation of this bill will be dependent upon the appropriation of funds. The DOJ will be unable to absorb the costs to comply with or implement the requirements of the bill within existing budgeted resources. The Consumer Protection Section (CPS), Civil Rights Enforcement Section (CRES) and Healthcare Rights & Access Section (HRA) within the Public Rights Division of the DOJ anticipate increased workloads in enforcing this bill beginning on January 1, 2026, and ongoing. The workload includes investigating and prosecuting violations. The Sections will require the following additional resources:

- CPS: 1.0 Deputy Attorney General (DAG); 1.0 Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA); 1.0 Legal Secretary (LS); and, \$250,000 for External Consultant for expert witness services to support investigation and prosecution;
 - CRES: 1.0 Deputy Attorney General (DAG); 1.0 Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA); 1.0 Legal Secretary (LS); and, \$250,000 for External Consultant for expert witness services to support investigation and prosecution; and,
 - HRA: 1.0 Deputy Attorney General (DAG); 1.0 Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA); 1.0 Legal Secretary (LS); and, \$250,000 for External Consultant for expert witness services to support investigation and prosecution.
- The Civil Rights Department (CRD) estimates a fiscal impact over \$2 million (General Fund). CRD notes that this bill places requirements on ADS developers and deployers. It also provides the CRD with the authority to bring a civil action to enforce compliance with this bill. CRD anticipates requesting eight positions, including researchers/ research data specialists, associate governmental program analysts, and attorneys, approximately \$2.2 million for FY 26-27, and \$2.1 million for FY 27-28 and ongoing. In addition to covering the costs of the new positions, these resources would also fund an ongoing contract with an expert consultant, IT and other administrative costs, and a one-time job analysis that would be required for one of the research positions. These resources would be necessary to support the complex legal and technological analysis required to enforce the components of this bill.
 - The State Water Board estimates a significant fiscal impact (General Fund, special funds) likely in the millions of dollars per year. The State Water Board reports, as written, this bill's definition of automated decision system is vague, ambiguous, and could encompass many current tools used, like excel workbooks. These tools are used broadly across Water Boards programs, and many are used to inform actions that could be considered consequential actions under the bill. To meet the bill's provision, the State Water Board estimates significant cost pressures, likely in the millions of dollars per year. Costs would allow the State Water Board to fulfill several requirements regarding each of these covered systems. This would include facilitating and conducting a performance evaluation, contracting with an independent third party to perform audits on any systems the Water Boards

develops, notifying those impacted by the consequential decision about the use of the ADS, and providing an appeal process. Taking these steps for each covered system, if feasible at all, would require significant additional staff and contract resources in the millions of dollars annually, impacting all Water Boards' fund sources. Alternatively, State Water Board programs would need to find ways to store, process, and analyze data to make decisions without using any tool which would qualify as an automated decision system. Costs would be incurred from all eligible State Water Board fund sources.

- UC Health estimates a fiscal impact of \$42 million in one-time costs and approximately \$24 million in ongoing costs to implement AB 1018. Compliance costs for the University's health systems include expenses related to implementing required audits, administrative processes, staff training, and system modifications.
- The California Department of Health and Human Services (CalHHS) reports a significant fiscal impact (General Fund, special funds). The Office of Technology and Solutions Integration (OTSI) estimates costs, across the 12 CalHHS departments, in the low millions up to low tens of millions (Total Fund) annually as solutions applicable under the bill are expected to grow in use over the coming years. These costs are estimated and attributable due to legal and security resources for monitoring and enforcement, compliance oversight, IT development and staffing necessary for governance and appeals management. This bill could impact many of the Agency's information systems and data solutions as Generative AI solutions are being built into many of the tools used. Evaluation and governance will become ongoing cost-pressure as it becomes necessary to review not just risk/compliance related to AI components of solutions, but applicability to the requirements of this bill. This bill would require programming and processing revisions, stakeholder engagement, development and operation of an appeal process in all cases, along with a third-party audit (beginning in 2030). The costs to implement this bill depends on the number of solutions and complexity of developing and resourcing the appeals processes that are yet to be determined. This estimate does not include potential increased contracting costs due to vendors including costs for conducting the assessment and other requirements.
- The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) reports that it does not currently use platforms it considers to be Automated Decision Systems (ADS). As a result, CDCR does not anticipate immediate

costs associated with the requirements in AB 1018. However, should the department choose to implement or develop systems in the future that meet the bill's definition of an ADS, there could be costs associated with compliance. These may include but are not limited to performance evaluations, third-party audits, disclosure and documentation requirements, and staff oversight responsibilities outlined in the bill. It should be noted that CDCR uses several risk assessment tools, including, but not limited to, the Static-99R to assess every eligible sex offender prior to release on parole, the California Static Risk Assessment tool to assess the risk of reoffending, the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) to assess an incarcerated individuals needs and target those needs, and the Automated Reentry Management System (ARMS). If this bill is interpreted to apply to these tools, CDCR, and other correctional agencies, could potentially incur a significant fiscal impact.

- The Department of Finance (DOF) reports potential unknown costs (General Fund) and indicates that that this bill may apply to its ongoing pilot using generative artificial intelligence to assist with bill analyses.
- Unknown, potentially significant costs to the Judicial Council, likely in the hundreds of millions annually. This bill could hamper the ability of trial courts and their justice partners to use several tools, including SARATSO for sex offenders, and many others, such as pretrial risk assessment tools minimize bias in pretrial detention situations. Developers of these tools, including nonprofits, universities, and even the state of Virginia, are unlikely to make any adjustments as would be required under this bill. As such, the entire judicial branch could potentially lose the use of all pretrial risk assessment tools, as their developers do not necessarily have a strong financial incentive to adhere to this bill's stringent requirements. Courts also use tools such as MyCitation, which would also be affected. MyCitation is a tool created by the Judicial Council pursuant to AB 143 (Committee on Budget) Stats. 2021, ch. 79, designed as an easy-to-use option for defendants to provide relevant financial information for the court to consider reductions in infraction fines and fees owed.
- Unknown, potentially significant costs to the state funded trial court system (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund). By authorizing a new civil penalty with statutory damages, this bill will likely lead to additional case filings that otherwise would not have been commenced, with attendant workload and resource costs to the court. This bill may result in additional trial court costs to the extent that cases are brought to litigate its constitutionality. The fiscal

impact of this bill to the courts will depend on many unknowns, including the number of cases filed and the factors unique to each case. 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. If court days exceed 10, costs to the trial courts could reach hundreds of thousands of dollars. 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.

- Costs (General Fund, special funds) of an unknown but significant amount to each state agency that deploys ADS to make or contribute to consequential decisions and must comply with this bill's notice, opt-out, correction, appeal, and, if applicable, audit requirements. In the aggregate, for all affected state agencies, costs may be in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually ongoing.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

TechEquity Action (source)

ACCE Action (Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment)

American Federation of Musicians, Local 7

Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California

California Center for Movement Legal Services

California Civil Liberties Advocacy

California Community Foundation

California Employment Lawyers Association

California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO

California Immigrant Policy Center

California Initiative on Technology and Democracy

California National Organization for Women

California Professional Firefighters

California School Employees Association

California Women's Law Center

CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO

Child Care Law Center

Citizen's Privacy Coalition

Common Sense Media

Consumer Attorneys of California

Consumer Federation of America
Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Reports
Courage California
East Bay Community Law Center
Economic Security California Action
Electronic Privacy Information Center
End Child Poverty California Powered by Grace
Equal Rights Advocates
Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Greenlining Institute
Housing Now!
Justice2jobs Coalition
Kapor Center
LA Defensa
LAANE (Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy)
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
Mujeres Unidas Y Activas
Northern California District Council of the International Longshore and
Warehouse Union
Oakland Privacy
Parent Voices
Powerswitch Action
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse
Public Citizen
Restoring Hope California
Rubicon Programs
SEIU California
Smart Justice California
Surveillance Resistance Lab
Tech Oversight Project
UDW/AFSCME Local 3930
UFCW - Western States Council
Vision Y Compromiso
Women's Foundation California
Working Partnerships USA
Worksafe

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

Advanced Medical Technology Association
Aerospace and Defense Alliance of California
American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists - District IX
American Financial Services Association
American Innovators Network
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
American Staffing Association
America's Physician Groups
Associated General Contractors of California
Association of California Life and Health Insurance Companies
Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Association of National Advertisers
Business Software Alliance
Business Software Association
Calbroadband
Calcom Association
California Association of Clerks & Election Officials
California Association of Health Plans
California Chamber of Commerce
California Community Banking Network
California Credit Union League
California Dental Association
California Department of Insurance
California Financial Services Association
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Hospital Association
California Land Title Association
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Medical Association
California Mortgage Bankers Association
California Radiological Society
California Retailers Association
California Staffing Professionals
Chamber of Progress
Civil Justice Association of California
College Board
Computer and Communications Industry Association
Connected Commerce Council
Consumer Data Industry Association

Consumer Technology Association
Contra Costa County
County of Ventura
CTIA
Delta Dental of California
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce
Family Business Association of California
Financial Technology Association
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Innovative Lending Platform Association
Internet Works
Internet.works
Judicial Council of California
Kaiser Permanente
Lincoln Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Mortgage Bankers Association
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Ochin, INC.
Orange County Business Council
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Psinapse Technology
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management
Rancho Cordova Chamber of Commerce
Receivables Management Association International
Rocklin Area Chamber of Commerce
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce
Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association
Security Industry Association
Shingle Springs/cameron Park Chamber of Commerce
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Society for Human Resource Management
Software Information Industry Association
STAR Staffing
Sutter Health

Techca
Technet
The Payments Coalition
United Chamber Advocacy Network Ucan
University of California
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Yuba Sutter Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: A broad coalition, including the sponsor, TechEquity Action, write: While the advent of generative AI and large language models has been a new piece of the puzzle, ADS have long existed in our communities. ADS have been woven into the daily lives of our community members—increasingly these tools are dictating access to and the quality of housing, healthcare, employment, credit, and many other critical services Californians need. The potential harms and biases of these systems have been well documented—from banks using lending models that were twice as likely to deny Black applicants compared to White applicants with the same financial profile,¹ to healthcare providers using ADS that significantly underestimated the healthcare needs of Black patients compared to White ones.² Technology should not be a pass to violate our civil and labor rights, this legislation regulates the misuse of automated systems.

AB 1018 would enact common-sense guardrails to help ensure that developers and deployers of these tools are testing for discriminatory outcomes prior to utilizing the tool and ensuring that consumers have the information they need to understand the role that an ADS is playing in critical decisions and what rights they have when these systems impact critical areas of their lives.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The Chamber of Progress writes:

While the recent amendments are a small step in the right direction, businesses that deploy covered automated decision systems would still be subject to significant costs in the form of time, energy, and money for the following: identify covered systems, determine which decisions and outcomes trigger the statute, implement pre-decision and adverse-outcome notices, establish correction and appeal processes, modify IT and operational workflows, train personnel, maintain documentation, and manage ongoing legal and compliance risk.

¹ <https://themarkup.org/denied/2021/08/25/the-secret-bias-hidden-in-mortgage-approval-algorithms>.

² <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/oct/25/healthcare-algorithm-racial-biases-optum>.

AB 1018 as written still mandates that online platforms inform any “natural person” who is affected by a consequential decision when an automated decision tool is employed to make such a determination. However, the bill does not define this term, despite referencing it continually for the sake of applicability. Such ambiguity risks stifling consumer welfare-enhancing innovations.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 50-16, 6/2/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Ahrens, Alanis, Bains, Carrillo, Flora, Pacheco, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Soria, Valencia, Wallis

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548
8/30/26 15:50:18

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1156
Author: Wicks (D)
Amended: 8/27/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

Prior Senate Votes not Relevant pursuant to Senate rule 29.10(d)

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 5-1 , 8/28/26

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-5, 6/3/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Williamson Act contracts: cancellation fees: photovoltaic solar facilities

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill allows additional Williamson Act cancellations that facilitate the development of a solar facility located within a critically-overdrafted basin or subbasin to qualify for reduced or eliminated cancellation fees provided they include a community-benefits agreement.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 rewrite the bill by removing provisions expanding the parcels that qualify for conversion of Williamson Act contracts into SUEs, replace those provisions with expands the ability for landowners to cancel a Williamson Act contract without a fee for use as a solar facility if the landowner meets specified requirements, including regarding community benefits.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Creates the Williamson Act also known as the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, which authorizes cities and counties to enter into agricultural land preservation contracts with landowners who agree to restrict the use of their

land for a minimum of 10 years in exchange for lower assessed valuations for property tax purposes.

- 2) Creates Farmland Security Zones which authorizes cities and counties to allow agricultural land preservation contracts with landowners who agree to restrict the use of their land for a minimum of 20 years in exchange for lower-assessed valuations for property tax purposes
- 3) Provides three options for ending a Williamson Act contract:
 - a) Either the landowner or local officials give "notice of nonrenewal," which stops the automatic annual renewals and allows the contract to run down over the next 10 years.
 - b) Local officials can cancel a contract at the request of the landowner. To do so, local officials must make findings that cancellation is in the public interest and that cancellation is consistent with the purposes of the Williamson Act. The owner must pay a cancellation fee based on the "cancellation value" of the land. If the land under contract is covered by a Farmland Security Zone, the Department of Conservation (DOC) must approve the cancellation.
 - c) Local officials can cancel a Williamson Act contract, but the landowner simultaneously puts an agricultural conservation easement or open space easement on other land of equal or greater value.
- 4) Authorizes a city or county and a landowner to simultaneously rescind a Williamson Act contract on marginally productive or physically impaired lands and enter into a SUE that restricts the use of land to photovoltaic solar facilities, as specified.
- 5) Defines a SUE as a legal agreement, held by a city or county, which restricts land use to solar photovoltaic energy generation and related incidental uses, such as open space or agriculture. The easement may be permanent, fixed-term, or self-renewing, and applies only to parcels deemed eligible by the DOC. It prohibits any commercial, industrial, or residential uses and requires a recorded covenant that limits future development to uses consistent with solar energy production.
- 6) Enacts The Jobs and Economic Improvement through Environmental Leadership Act of 2021, which authorizes the Governor, until January 1, 2032, to certify certain projects, including solar projects, to be Environmental Leadership Development Projects (ELDPs). These projects qualify for

streamlined review under the California Environmental Quality Act. To qualify as an ELDP, the project must meet specified requirements for mitigating greenhouse gas emissions.

- 7) Establishes the policy that all of the state's retail electricity be supplied with 100% clean energy resources by December 31, 2045, and 100% of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2035.

This bill:

- 1) Allows additional Williamson Act cancellations that facilitate the development of a solar facility for the purpose of collecting, storing, and distributing solar energy for electricity generation that is located within a critically-overdrafted basin or subbasin to qualify for reduced or eliminated cancellation fees.
- 2) Requires, to qualify for reduced or eliminated cancellations, the landowner to enter into a community benefits agreement with the local government where the facility will be located that meets all the following requirements:
 - a) Benefits community organizations, local agencies, tribal governments, or other groups that represent community interest and may include topics such as workforce development, job quality, and job access provisions and funding;
 - b) The community benefits provided supplement, not supplant, resources that other laws require the developer to provide;
 - c) The community benefits provided begin no later than the start of construction of the solar facilities;
 - d) The developer must engage in meaningful outreach and engagement, including mailing notice to landowners, noticing the proposed community benefits in a newspaper, and conducting a public meeting on the proposed community benefits in the jurisdiction; and
- 3) Provides that the community benefits agreement does not limit the authority or remedies a city or county has under other laws to require the developer to provide community benefits.
- 4) Shifts responsibility for extinguishing Williamson Act contracts with a reduced or eliminated cancellation fee from the city or county to the Secretary of

Natural Resources (Secretary). It also requires the landowner to apply to the Secretary for the reduced or eliminated fee.

- 5) Requires, until January 1, 2037, the Secretary to approve a completed application for extending cancellation payments for solar use contracts when the landowner includes specified information demonstrating that the local government has approved the cancellation and that the land is located in a critically-overdrafted basin. The Secretary must extend the payment time for 10 years. If, prior to end of the extended time, the landowner attests and provides proof that they have constructed a solar facility on the property, the Secretary must waive the payment of the cancellation fee.
- 6) Allows the cancellation of Williamson Act contracts on land in critically-overdrafted basins for solar use projects that qualify as ELDPs if they enter into a community benefits agreement as described above in (2).
- 7) Provides that if, after the approval of a certified solar ELDP where the Williamson Act contract was cancelled, the project owner determines that it will not actually locate a solar project on the land, it must notify the local jurisdiction and have the land reenrolled in a new Williamson Act contract, or an enforceable deed restriction, with terms at least as restrictive as existing Williamson Act contracts. The local agency must determine the duration of the restriction by subtracting the length of time the land was approved for solar project development from the years remaining on the original contract at acquisition. The measure also provides that the owner can seek reenrollment after the end of the useful life of the solar project.

Background

Solar use easements. In 2011, the Legislature enacted SB 618 (Wolk, Chapter 596, Statutes of 2011) to modify the Williamson Act to encourage the development of solar panels on marginally productive or physically impaired farmland by creating a method for terminating a Williamson Act contract to use for solar panel development.

Under this measure, the landowner of a parcel that the Department of Conservation (DOC) has determined to be eligible can restrict the use of that land to solar facilities to collect and distribute solar energy, and any subordinate agricultural, open-space, or renewable facilities. This solar use easement can be in perpetuity, for a set number of years, or subject to annual self-renewals. Once restricted, the landowner cannot use the land for other commercial, industrial, or residential uses. This means the landowner cannot construct improvements unless expressly

Upon request from the city or county, DOC, in consultation with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), can, but is not required to, determine that a parcel is eligible for rescission of the existing Williamson Act contract and place the parcel into a solar-use easement. To assist DOC in assessing whether the land is eligible, the landowner must provide the specified information, and must also provide DOC with a proposed management plan describing soil management plans, how they plan to minimize impacts on adjacent agricultural operations, and how the landowner will restore the land to previous condition once the solar use easement terminates. If approved, the city or county must require implementation of the management plan including any recommendations from DOC.

Cities or counties can require any necessary or desirable restrictions, conditions, or covenants to restrict the land to solar facilities, which can include mitigation measures, or financial assurances to ensure the landowner restores the land to its original state when the easement terminates.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of this bill.* According to the author, “California must reckon with an uncomfortable truth: we face a significant lack of access to water across many rural counties, with up to one million acres of farmland possibly being fallowed. AB 1156 provides a voluntary, locally driven option to communities and farmers that are wrestling with this stark reality, accelerating solar energy deployment on farms currently under the Williamson Act in critically overdrafted basins. The legislation balances our state’s renewable energy and food production needs while prioritizing the repurposing of agricultural lands that don’t have adequate have access to groundwater. As amended, AB 1156 reduces barriers associated with exiting Williamson Act contracts, helping to overcome a cumbersome and lengthy cancellation process and prohibitively high cancellation fees. The bill provides two pathways to address these challenges. The first path permits Solar Environmental Leadership Development Projects in critically overdrafted basins with a streamlined exit from a Williamson Act contract or Farmland Security Zone contract, if they have entered into a qualifying community benefits agreement. The second path extends the authority of the Secretary of Natural Resources to waive Williamson Act cancellation fees for solar projects in critically overdrafted basins or subbasins, if those projects have entered into a qualifying community benefits agreement. AB 1156 will not be the Williamson Act’s undoing. It will provide private landowners and local governments in water-constrained regions of the state, with a choice—entirely voluntary—to adapt to a harsh economic

reality: either let land sit fallow because it's not agriculturally viable or generate clean energy and revenue for landowners and local governments. California's nexus between clean energy goals, water sustainability, and land scarcity present a rare opportunity to craft a policy that achieves multiple statewide goals. AB 1156 can help fulfill the promise of a carbon free future and mitigate the worst impacts of climate change on our communities and economy."

- 2) *Shot through the heart.* For decades, the Williamson Act has provided an incentive for landowners to preserve land for agricultural use instead of converting it for other purposes. The landowner benefits from reduced property taxes while it uses the land for agriculture, but has the opportunity to convert the land into other uses if it pays a fee. Some solar projects are eligible for reduced or eliminated cancellation fees if the local agency determines it is the public's interest to do so. AB 1156 expands the types of Williamson Act contracts that qualify for reduced or eliminated cancellation fees to include land in critically-overdrafted basins proposed for solar projects. This means a landowner could convert their agricultural land into a solar farm without the consequence of paying a cancellation fee so long as it is in a critically overdrafted basin. Critically-overdrafted basins cover a significant portion of the state, including most of the Central Valley south of Sacramento. AB 1156 does not require the land to have any site-specific water constraints to qualify for a reduced or eliminated cancellation fee. Removing financial consequences for cancelling a Williamson Act contract for solar use provides an incentive to landowners to take land that could still serve agricultural uses out of service. According to the opponents of the bill, like the California Farm Bureau, this could significantly impair the effectiveness of the Williamson Act and other agricultural restrictions, removing the incentive for continuing to use land for agricultural uses.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Almond Alliance

American Clean Power- California

CA & Nv State Association of Electrical Workers (IBEW)

Independent Energy Producers Association

Large Scale Solar Association

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)

Solar Energy Industries Association

The Nature Conservancy

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

American Farmland Trust
California Alliance With Family Farmers
California Cattlemen's Association
California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)
California Climate & Agricultural Network (CALCAN)
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Farmland Trust
California Farmlink
California Rangeland Trust
County of Fresno
County of Kern
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-5, 6/3/25

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

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
8/30/26 13:58:56

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1307
Author: Ávila Farías (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 10-0, 6/15/26

AYES: Wahab, Choi, Archuleta, Caballero, Grayson, Menjivar, Niello,
Smallwood-Cuevas, Strickland, Umberg

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arreguín

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-4, 6/2/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Licensed Dentists from Mexico Pilot Program

SOURCE: Clinica de Salud del Valle de Salinas

DIGEST: This bill revises and recasts the statutory framework for the Licensed Dentists from Mexico Pilot Program (Mexico Dentists Program) and updates various requirements of the existing pilot program relating to temporary state licensure of licensed dentists from Mexico who work for a federally qualified health facility that has at least one health professional shortage area or dental professional shortage area within its service area in California.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 restore Mexico Dentists Program evaluation requirements; strike the requirement for program participants to pass the ADEX Dental Examination and; strike Legislative intent that DBC implement the Mexico Dentists Program within six months of receiving philanthropic funds of \$200K or more and that DBC administer the program without adopting regulations

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 eliminate Mexico Dentists Program evaluation requirements; update orientation program subjects and specify that the subjects must be taught by an instructor affiliated with a California dental school

accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation; authorize the Dental Board of California (DBC) to terminate a license if a participant is denied a visa; decrease the license fee; update license timeframes; impose a new requirement for program participants to pass the ADEX Dental Examination and; state Legislative intent that DBC implement the Mexico Dentists Program within six months of receiving philanthropic funds of \$200K or more and that DBC administer the program without adopting regulations.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Dental Practice Act (Act). (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 1600 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the Dental Board of California (DBC or Board) within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to administer and enforce the Dental Practice Act (Act). (BPC § 1601.1)
- 3) Establishes the Mexico Dentists Program which requires the Board to issue a three-year non-renewable permit to practice dentistry to no more than 30 dentists from Mexico who meet specified criteria. (BPC § 1645.4)
- 4) Requires dentists in the pilot program to meet specified criteria to qualify for participation. (BPC § 1645.4(e))
- 5) Limits employment of dentists in the Mexico Dentists Program to nonprofit community health centers. (BPC § 1645.4(f))
- 6) Requires dentists in the Mexico Dentists Program to apply for a three-year visa and Social Security number (SSN) within 14 days of receiving a permit, provide the SSN within 10 days of obtaining it, and prohibits participants from engaging in the practice of dentistry until these are met. (BPC § 1645.4(i))
- 7) Provides that all applicable employment benefits, salary, and policies provided by nonprofit community health centers to their current employees shall be provided to medical and dental practitioners from Mexico participating in the Mexico Dentists Program and that nonprofit community health centers must provide malpractice insurance coverage. (BPC § 1645.4(j))
- 8) Requires an evaluation of the program to commence 12 months after implementation, performed by a California dental school or independent

consultant, and requires the evaluation to include specified issues, e.g. quality of care and impact on cultural and linguistic services. (BPC § 1645.4(k))

- 9) Requires costs for administering the Mexico Dentists Program to be secured from philanthropic entities. (BPC § 1645.4(l))
- 10) Requires Mexico Dentists Program applicants to work with the governments of Mexico and the United States in order to obtain the necessary three-year visa required for program participation. (BPC § 1645.4(m))

This bill:

- 1) Repeals the existing Mexico Dentists Program and replaces it with a revised Mexico Dentists Program that still requires the Board to issue a three-year non-renewable permit to practice dentistry to no more than 30 dentists from Mexico who meet specified criteria and submit documents to the Board establishing evidence of meeting that criteria, as specified. Authorizes DBC to terminate a license if a participant is denied a visa.
- 2) Sets the Mexico Dentists Program operative date at six months after funds to administer the program are secured.

Background

Licensed Dentists in California. To obtain a dental license in California, applicants to the Dental Board are required to: furnish satisfactory evidence of having graduated from a board-approved dental college; successfully pass a written license examination (National Board of Dental Examination of the Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations); successfully take an examination in California Law and Ethics; successfully pass a practical exam of dental skills and diagnosis-treatment planning; submit fingerprints for the purposed of conducting a background check; and furnish evidence of liability insurance for any injuries sustained as a result of the applicant's taking of the practical licensure examination, among other requirements.

Out-of-country unlicensed applicants may be issued a license to practice in California if they have been issued a diploma from a foreign dental school accredited by a body that has a reciprocal accreditation agreement with any commission or accreditation organization whose findings are accepted by the board so long as the applicant has been issued a degree of Doctor of Dental Medicine or Doctor of Dental Surgery and provides evidence of completion of the full number

of academic years of undergraduate courses required for graduation and that the applicant has been issued a dental diploma or degree to the Board (BPC § 1628). Additionally, if an out of country applicant holds a valid and unrestricted license from another U.S. state or territory, and meets the clinical practice requirements, or can secure a two-year full-time contract with an approved dental school or community/public clinic, they may qualify for licensure through the Licensure by Credential pathway (BPC § 1635.5).

This bill builds upon the existing pathway to licensure in California for a very limited number of currently licensed dentists from Mexico to allow these licensed professionals to serve limited term tenures in critically underserved areas where cultural competency is severely needed.

Licensed Physicians and Dentists from Mexico Pilot Program. The Mexico Pilot Program, established by AB 1045 (Firebaugh, Chapter 1157, Statutes of 2002), was designed to bring licensed physicians and dentists from Mexico with rural experience, who speak the language, understand the culture, and know how to apply this knowledge in serving the large Latino communities in rural areas who have limited or no access to primary health care services. AB 1045 authorized up to 30 licensed physicians specializing in family practice, internal medicine, pediatrics, and obstetrics and gynecology and up to 30 licensed dentists from Mexico to practice medicine or dentistry in California for up to three years, and required the individuals to meet certain requirements related to training and education. Proponents of the measure were concerned about addressing primary care physician and dentist shortages while maintaining a high quality of care. The bill specified that any funding necessary for the implementation of the Mexico Pilot Program, including the evaluation and oversight functions, was to be secured from nonprofit philanthropic entities and further stated that implementation of the program could not move forward unless appropriate funding was secured from nonprofit philanthropic entities.

The Medical Board of California (MBC) received the necessary philanthropic funding in 2018 to initiate the program and began taking the necessary steps for implementation. As of April 2019, MBC began accepting applications for the Mexico Pilot Program. MBC received the required funding commitments necessary for program implementation in December 2020. In August 2022, the Center for Reducing Health Disparities (CRHD) at the University of California, Davis released its first annual progress report of the Mexico Pilot Program. In 2024, AB 2860 (Garcia, Chapter 246) created two distinct programs, the Licensed Physicians from Mexico Program (Mexico Physicians Program) in the

Medical Practice Act, and the Mexico Dentists Program in the Dental Practice Act, and made various updates and conforming changes.

Despite the statutory framework for the Mexico Dentists Program being in existence for over 20 years, DBC has not implemented a program. The Mexico Physicians Program was implemented after appropriate funding was secured and appears successful in meeting the needs of medical patients in areas where cultural competency is a factor in health care outcomes, as described by an independent evaluation conducted by the University of Davis School of Medicine Center for the Study of Health Disparities.

Comments

The August 21 amendments authorize DBC to terminate a program participant's license if the participant is denied a visa. This provision raises separate concerns because it ties continued eligibility for a state professional license to a federal immigration determination that does not necessarily reflect the dentist's professional qualifications, competency, or ability to practice safely.

The experience of the corresponding Licensed Physicians from Mexico Program is instructive. MBC previously reported to the Legislature that physician applicants encountered difficulty obtaining the visa necessary to participate in the program because they had not yet been issued their California license. In response, the Legislature established a process under which MBC may issue a program license to an otherwise qualified applicant before the applicant obtains the necessary visa and Social Security number. The physician must then promptly seek the appropriate visa and may not begin practicing until the applicable federal immigration requirements have been satisfied. The statutory framework in the Medical Practice Act does not, however, make an initial visa denial an independent basis for terminating the physician's professional license.

This sequencing recognizes the practical relationship between professional licensure and federal immigration authorization. A visa determination may depend upon the visa classification sought, documentation presented, the individual's employment circumstances, or changes in federal immigration requirements or policy. A participant may need to pursue a different or corrected immigration pathway without any corresponding change in the individual's professional qualifications. Treating a visa denial as grounds for terminating a professional license conflates two distinct governmental determinations: whether an individual is professionally qualified to practice dentistry, which is within DBC's regulatory jurisdiction, and whether that individual is authorized to enter or remain in the

United States for that employment, which is determined under federal immigration law.

This bill now authorizes DBC to terminate the license of a dentist who has otherwise satisfied the state's professional and program-specific requirements based on an immigration determination that may be unrelated to the dentist's clinical qualifications, and that may be subject to correction or reconsideration. Notably, the bill does not provide a subsequent process for a participant to appeal or otherwise challenge the termination, or address circumstances in which a visa denial is subsequently reconsidered, corrected, or reversed.

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

According to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, DBC estimates a one-time cost of \$300,000 to contract with a vendor to conduct the required program evaluation. The Board will also experience a one-time workload impact to promulgate regulations, as well as ongoing workload to process applications and issue licenses. Although this bill will create a non-absorbable fiscal impact to implement and regulate the program, all costs will be covered by donations from philanthropic foundations. Workload will not begin until all required funding is received, and the bill becomes operative six months after these funds are secured. DBC will establish a new, dedicated account specifically for the Mexico Pilot Program to track all program-related revenues (including licensing fees) and expenditures. The Office of Information Services estimates costs of \$72,000 to create a new license type in the BreEZe system. OIS notes these costs will also be paid for by philanthropic funds.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Clinica de Salud del Valle de Salinas (source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received for the current version of this bill.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-4, 6/2/25

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, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel,

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

NOES: DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Sanchez

NO VOTE RECORDED: Gallagher, McKinnor, Patterson

Prepared by: Yeaphana La Marr / B., P. & E.D. /916-651-4104
8/30/26 16:26:51

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1331
Author: Elhawary (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 6/25/25
AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Cortese, Durazo, Laird
NOES: Strickland

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 9-2, 7/15/25
AYES: Umberg, Arreguín, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Wahab, Weber
Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Niello, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Allen, Stern

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 55-15, 6/5/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Workplace surveillance

SOURCE: California Federation of Labor Unions

DIGEST: This bill prohibits an employer, both public and private, from using a workplace surveillance tool to monitor or surveil employees in a bathroom located in the workplace.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 1) add and define the term “artificial intelligence”; 2) clarify the authorized use of a workplace surveillance tool when it is required to access a locked or secured bathroom; 3) clarify that workplace surveillance tools shall not have physically embedded or attached artificial intelligence; and 4) strikes the peace officer exemption in the bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) States that the “right to privacy is a personal and fundamental right protected by Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution of California and by the United States Constitution and that all individuals have a right of privacy in information pertaining to them.” Further states these findings of the Legislature:
 - a) The right to privacy is being threatened by the indiscriminate collection, maintenance, and dissemination of personal information and the lack of effective laws and legal remedies.
 - b) The increasing use of computers and other sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the potential risk to individual privacy that can occur from the maintenance of personal information.
 - c) In order to protect the privacy of individuals, it is necessary that the maintenance and dissemination of personal information be subject to strict limits. (Civil Code §1798.1)
- 2) States that advances in science and technology have led to the development of new devices and techniques for the purpose of eavesdropping upon private communications and that the invasion of privacy resulting from the continual and increasing use of such devices and techniques has created a serious threat to the free exercise of personal liberties that cannot be tolerated in a free and civilized society. (Penal Code §630)
- 3) Prohibits a person from intentionally, and without the consent of all parties to a confidential communication, using an electronic amplifying or recording device to eavesdrop upon or record the confidential communication. For purposes of these provisions, defines a “person” to mean an individual, business association, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other legal entity. (Penal Code §632)
- 4) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. (Civil Code §1798.100 et seq.)

- 5) Establishes the Consumer Privacy Rights Act (CPRA), which amends the CCPA and creates the California Privacy Protection Agency (PPA), which is charged with implementing these privacy laws, promulgating regulations, and carrying out enforcement actions. (Civil Code §1798.100 et seq.; Proposition 24 (2020))
- 6) Establishes within the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), various entities including the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE) under the direction of the Labor Commissioner (LC), and empowers the LC with ensuring a just day's pay in every workplace and promotes economic justice through robust enforcement of labor laws. (Labor Code §79-107)
- 7) Prohibits an employer from causing an audio or video recording to be made of an employee in a restroom, locker room, or room designated by an employer for changing clothes, unless authorized by court order. No recording made in violation of this prohibition may be used by an employer for any purpose. A violation of this section constitutes an infraction. (Labor Code §435)
- 8) Authorizes, until January 1, 2029, a public prosecutor to prosecute an action, either civil or criminal, for a violation of certain provisions of the labor code or to enforce those provisions independently. (Labor Code §181)

This bill:

- 1) Defines, among other terms, the following:
 - a) "Employer" means a person who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, employs or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person.
 - i) "Employer" includes all branches of state government, or the several cities, counties, cities and counties, and municipalities thereof, or any other political subdivision of the state, or a school district, or any special district, or any authority, commission, or board or any other agency or instrumentality thereof.
 - ii) "Employer" includes a labor contractor of a person defined as an employer under (i) above and any entity or individual that contracts with the labor contractor for labor or services, including, but not limited to, a "client employer" under Labor Code Section 2810.3 or an individual or business entity that contracts for property services under Labor Code Section 238.5.

- iii) “Employer” includes a farm labor contractor, as defined in Labor Code Section 1682, or foreign labor contractor, as defined in Section 9998.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
 - b) “Workplace surveillance tool” means a system, application, instrument, or device that collects or facilitates the collection of employee data, activities, communications, actions, biometrics, or behaviors by means other than direct observation by a person, including, but not limited to, video or audio surveillance, continuous incremental time-tracking tools, geolocation, electromagnetic tracking, photoelectronic tracking, a photo-optical system, or other means. “Workplace surveillance tool” does not include smoke or carbon monoxide detectors or weapon detection systems that automatically screen a person’s body.
- 2) Prohibits an employer, unless directed by a court order, from using a workplace surveillance tool to monitor or surveil employees in a bathroom located in the workplace.
 - 3) Grants employees the right to leave behind workplace surveillance tools that are on their person or in their possession when entering a bathroom.
 - 4) Specifies that (3) above does not apply, and therefore a worker does not have the right to leave behind workplace surveillance tools that are on their person or possession, if the employee is required to remain available during meal or rest periods pursuant to federal or existing state law.
 - 5) Authorizes, notwithstanding the specified prohibitions, an employer to check workplace surveillance tools for the one-time entry and exit of bathrooms in the workplace.
 - 6) Specifies that an employer is not in violation of the bill’s prohibitions in either of the following circumstances:
 - a) An employee voluntarily chooses to bring a workplace surveillance tool into a bathroom in the workplace.
 - b) An employee brings a workplace surveillance tool, including a badge or personal alarm system, into a bathroom in the workplace because the employer has a policy that requires workplace surveillance tools to be in the employee’s possession while on work premises for identification or safety

purposes or if the tool is required to access a locked or secured bathroom, if the workplace surveillance tool meets both of the following conditions:

- i) Does not detect or record audio or video.
 - ii) Does not have physically embedded or attached artificial intelligence.
- 7) Authorizes the Labor Commissioner to enforce these provisions, including investigating an alleged violation, and ordering appropriate temporary relief to mitigate a violation or maintain the status quo pending the completion of a full investigation or hearing through the procedures set forth under existing law, as specified, including issuing a citation against an employer who violates these provisions and filing a civil action.
 - a) If a citation is issued, specifies that the procedures for issuing, contesting, and enforcing judgments for citations and civil penalties issued by the LC shall be the same as those set forth in existing law, as specified.
- 8) Authorizes these provisions to also be enforced by a public prosecutor, as specified.
- 9) Authorizes, in any civil action brought, the petitioner to seek appropriate temporary or preliminary injunctive relief, including punitive damages, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
- 10) Specifies that in addition to any other remedy, an employer who violates these provisions shall be subject to a penalty of \$500 for each violation.
- 11) Provides that an action may be brought in the superior court in any county in which the violation in question is alleged to have occurred or in which the employer transacts business.
- 12) Provides that the above provisions are not intended to limit any other state or local law, as specified, that provides equal or greater protection to employees.
- 13) Specifies that the above provisions are severable and if any provision is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect.
- 14) Specifies that these provisions do not prohibit any employer from using workplace surveillance tools as required by federal or state laws or regulations, nor do they authorize an employer to use these as prohibited by existing federal or state law.

- 15) Specifies that these provisions do not prohibit the use of a workplace surveillance tool by an employer relating to either of the following:
 - a) The development of an aircraft for use in the national airspace.
 - b) The development of products or services for national security, military, space, or defense purposes.
- 16) Specifies, for purposes of (15) above, that these provisions apply only to the operations covered by a federal statute, federal regulation, or binding federal contract where the use of a workplace surveillance tool is reasonably necessary to comply with the federal statute, regulation, or the binding federal contract.
- 17) Finds and declares that the provisions of the bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair, therefore, section 1 applies to all cities, including charter cities.

Background

Need for this bill? According to the author: “As technology’s capabilities have increased, employer surveillance of workers has increased. Recent reports from ExpressVPN found that close to 80% of employers use monitoring software to track employee performance. With employer surveillance on the rise, workers have limited access to spaces in their workplace, that are not under constant surveillance. Employers use workplace surveillance to track, monitor, manage, and prevent workers from advocating for their rights. The new surveillance state at the workplace has proven to increase psychological distress, stress, and lower job satisfaction among workers.”

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1883 (Bryan, 2026) would regulate the use of workplace surveillance tools by both public and private employers. Specifically, the bill would, with certain exceptions, prohibit an employer from using a workplace surveillance tool that uses artificial intelligence to, among other things, collect neural data or recognize an individual’s emotional state. AB 1883 is pending on the Senate Floor.

SB 947 (McNerney, 2026) would, among other things, prohibit an employer from using an ADS to perform certain actions and regulates allowable ADS uses. SB 947 is pending on the Assembly Floor.

SB 951 (Reyes, 2026) would, among other things, establish the California Worker Technological Displacement Act requiring a covered employer to provide advance notice when artificial intelligence or other automated technology causes significant workforce disruption. SB 947 is pending on the Assembly Floor.

[NOTE: Please see the Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee analysis on this bill for more background information and information on more prior and related legislation.]

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- This bill would result in costs to the State as a direct employer to revise policies and ensure the use of any existing tools comply with its requirements (General Fund or special fund). The magnitude of such costs is unknown, and would be driven by the use of workplace surveillance tools across the State's roughly 200 departments and agencies.
- The Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) indicates that it would incur first-year costs of \$1.23 million, and \$1.67 million annually thereafter, to enforce the provisions of the bill. (Labor Enforcement and Compliance Fund).
- By authorizing public prosecution to enforce worker privacy rights, this bill could result in potentially significant cost pressures to the courts; the magnitude is unknown (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)). The specific number of new actions that could be filed under the bill also is unknown; however, it generally costs about \$10,500 to operate a courtroom for an eight-hour day. Courts are not funded on the basis of workload, and increased pressure on TCTF may create a need for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The enacted 2025-26 budget includes \$38 million in ongoing support from the General Fund to continue to backfill TCTF for revenue declines.
- This bill could result in increased penalty revenue to the State; the magnitude is unknown, but probably minor.

*Staff notes that the fiscal impacts noted above were provided for a previous version of this bill and do not reflect the amendments recently taken.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

California Federation of Labor Unions (Source)
Air Line Pilots Association, International
AFSCME California
Association of Flight Attendants - CWA
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Coalition for Worker Power
California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union
California Conference of Machinists
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Nurses Association
California Professional Firefighters
California School Employees Association
California State Legislative Board of the SMART - Transportation Division
California State University Employees Union
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Center for Democracy and Technology
Center for Inclusive Change
Center on Policy Initiatives
Church State Council
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, San Diego County Chapter
Communications Workers of America, District 9
Community Agency for Resources, Advocacy and Services
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Federation of California
Engineers and Scientists of California, IFPTE Local 20, AFL-CIO
Inland Empire Labor Council
International Cinematographers Guild, Local 600, IATSE
International Lawyers Assisting Workers Network
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
Los Angeles County Democratic Party
National Employment Law Project
National Union of Healthcare Workers
Northern CA District Council of the Int. Longshore and Warehouse Union
Oakland Privacy
Omidyar Network
Pillars of the Community

PowerSwitch Action
Rise Economy
San Diego Black Workers Center
Secure Justice
SEIU California State Council
Surveillance Resistance Lab
Teamsters California
TechEquity Action
The Center for AI and Digital Policy
The Workers Lab
Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO
UNITE HERE! International Union, AFL-CIO
UNITE HERE! Local 11
United Food and Commercial Workers, Western States Council
Utility Workers Union of America
Warehouse Worker Resource Center
Workers' Algorithm Observatory
Working Partnerships USA
Worksafe

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

Acclamation Insurance Management Services
ADT Security Services
Aerospace and Defense Alliance of California
Agricultural Council of California
Allied Managed Care
American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Anaheim Chamber of Commerce
Associated General Contractors of California
Associated General Contractors – San Diego Chapter
Association of California Healthcare Districts
Association of California School Administrators
Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriff's
Brea Chamber of Commerce
CalBroadband
Calforests
California Alarm Association
California Alliance of Family Owned Businesses
California Apartment Association

California Association of Health Facilities
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities
California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates
California Association of Recreation and Park Districts
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Attractions and Parks Association
California Automatic Vendors Council
California Bankers Association
California Beer and Beverage Distributors
California Cardroom Alliance
California Chamber of Commerce
California Cities for Self-reliance Joint Powers Authority
California Construction and Industrial Materials Association
California Credit Union League
California Farm Bureau
California Fitness Alliance
California Fraternal Order of Police
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Gaming Association
California Grocers Association
California Hospital Association
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Landscape Contractors Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Moving and Storage Association
California Municipal Utilities Association
California Pawnbrokers Association
California Pest Management Association
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
California School Boards Association
California Special Districts Association
California State Association of Counties
California State Council of SHRM
California Statewide Law Enforcement Association
California Travel Association

Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce
City of Concord
City of Orinda
Coalition of Small and Disabled Veteran Businesses
Colusa County Chamber of Commerce
Communities 4 California Cardrooms
Construction Employers' Association
Corona Chamber of Commerce
County of Fresno
County of Humboldt
County of Kern
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
County of Mendocino
Dairy Institute of California
Dana Point Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce
Flasher Barricade Association
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Housing Contractors of California
Insights Association
LA Cañada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce
Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce
League of California Cities
Lincoln Area Chamber of Commerce
Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Police Officers Association
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Morgan Hill Chamber of Commerce
Murrieta Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
National Association of Theatre Owners of California

National Electrical Contractors Association
National Health and Fitness Association
Northern California Power Agency
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Pacific Association of Building Service Contractors
Paso Robles and Templeton Chamber of Commerce
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management
Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
Resource Recovery Coalition of California
Rocklin Area Chamber of Commerce
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
Rural County Representatives of California
Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Jose Chamber of Commerce
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce
Security Industry Association
Sheriff's Employee Benefits Association
Shingle Springs/Cameron Park Chamber of Commerce
SHRM
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Southwest California Legislative Council
TechNet
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Tri County Chamber Alliance
Tulare Chamber of Commerce
United Chamber Advocacy Network
United Contractors
Urban Counties of California
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Walnut Creek Chamber of Commerce & Visitors Bureau
Western Car Wash Association
Western Electrical Contractors Association
Western Growers Association
Wilmington Chamber of Commerce
Wine Institute

Yuba Sutter Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the sponsors, the California Federation of Labor Unions:

“Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies go beyond video and audio surveillance and leaves workers vulnerable to surveillance by the boss while in bathrooms. This is not science fiction; AI surveillance is being used now. Halo Smart Sensor boasts that it is designed for “24/7 monitoring without video or audio...ideal for spaces like restrooms.” Halo claims it uses machine learning, and flags “aggression events” using key words. It also uses “infrared and thermal counters” to monitor occupancy. Throne, a “smart” porta-potty used by transit agencies in California, boasts 21 sensors inside the bathroom.

Workers deserve to use the bathroom without the boss getting real time AI updates on their location, use time, temperature, tone of voice, or key words that could include “union,” “wage claim,” or other words bosses can use to deny workers the right to organize their co-workers.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition of private employer organizations, including the California Chamber of Commerce, are opposed to the measure as it read before the recent amendments. Their opposition arguments, which may no longer apply to the current version of the bill, included:

“AB 1331 jeopardizes safety and security in every workplace:

- AB 1331 applies to both public and private employers, including schools, hospitals, gambling establishments, cities, counties, correctional facilities, small businesses, and more.
- AB 1331 permanently bans any use of AI in security systems used in a break room or cafeteria. This means banning the following:
 - Technology that pinpoints where there is an ongoing emergency, including gunshot detection or detection of sounds over a specific decibel
 - Technology that can detect in video footage when and where violence or theft occurred
 - Technology used to help find lost children in theme parks
- AB 1331 permanently bans any recording of audio in break rooms or cafeterias, including during an ongoing emergency

- AB 1331 allows workers (including any contractor who ever sets foot on premises) to request copies of video footage they are in, regardless of who else or what else is in that footage.
- AB 1331 functionally prohibits even simple use of AI”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 55-15, 6/5/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, 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, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Ávila Farías, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Macedo, Patterson, Ramos, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, Flora, Lackey, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco

Prepared by: Alma Perez-Schwab / L., P.E. & R. / (916) 651-1556
8/28/26 11:28:44

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1349
Author: Bryan (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/22/26
AYES: Wahab, Archuleta, Arreguín, Caballero, Menjivar, Richardson, Strickland
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi, Niello, Smallwood-Cuevas, Umberg

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/29/26
AYES: Cabaldon, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Umberg

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/30/26
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern,
Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 1/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Consumer protection: ticket sellers

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits speculative ticket sales, modernizes existing anti-bot provisions, and imposes restrictions on deceptive websites and advertising practices.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 exempt marketing, advertisement, or sale of season ticket packages, multigame packages, and inventory withheld at the sole discretion of a rights holder or venue operator, as well as playoff ticket packages by a rights holder or their authorized ticketing agent before the beginning of the applicable season, from new limitations on marketing and advertising contained in

the bill. The amendments also authorize a California-based professional sports team, a sports venue operator, or an entity that is owned, directly or indirectly, by the professional sports league of which the California-based professional sports team is a member, to withhold, reserve, manage, transfer, or allocate ticket inventory for operational or business purposes without being subject to restrictions, prohibitions, or liability outlined in laws governing ticket sellers.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines a ticket seller as any person who for compensation, commission, or otherwise sells admission tickets to sporting, musical, theatre, or any other entertainment event. Clarifies that various entities are not a ticket seller subject to various requirements. Establishes various requirements for ticket sellers, a violation of which constitutes a misdemeanor. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 22500 – 22511)
- 2) Prohibits a ticket seller from contracting to sell or accepting payment for tickets unless the ticket seller has lawful possession of the ticket; has a contractual right to obtain the ticket; or informs the purchaser the seller does not have possession of the tickets, has no contract to obtain the offered ticket, and may not be able to supply the ticket at the contracted price, as specified. Authorizes a ticket seller to accept a deposit from a prospective purchaser as part of an agreement that the ticket seller will make best efforts to obtain a ticket at a specified price or price range and within a specified time, provided that the ticket seller informs the purchaser orally at the time of the contract or receipt of consideration, whichever is earlier, and in writing within two days, of the terms of the deposit agreement, and includes in the oral and written notice other required disclosures. (BPC § 22502.1)
- 3) Prohibits a ticket seller from representing that they can deliver or cause a ticket to be delivered at a specific price or within a specific price range and fail to deliver within a reasonable time at or below or within the price and range of prices stated. Specifies that a ticket seller who violated this prohibition and violates 3) above is civilly liable to the ticket purchaser for two times the contracted price of the ticket, in addition to any sum expended in trying to attend the event, and reasonable attorney's fees and court costs. (BPC §§ 22052.2 and 22052.3)
- 4) Prohibits a person from using, selling, offering for sale, or advertising software designed to circumvent a ticket seller's security measures, access controls, or

other controls used to ensure an equitable ticket-buying process. Makes it unlawful to use software or other technological means to purchase tickets in excess of posted limits for online ticket sales. (BPC § 22505.5)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes a California-based professional sports team, a sports venue operator, or an entity that is owned, directly or indirectly, by the professional sports league of which the California-based professional sports team is a member, to withhold, reserve, manage, transfer, or allocate ticket inventory for operational or business purposes without being subject to restrictions, prohibitions, or liability outlined in laws governing ticket sellers.
- 2) Repeals existing BPC Section 22503.5 which exempts certain primary ticket sales activities from the law.
- 3) Establishes various definitions and makes various conforming changes.
- 4) Prohibits a ticket seller from engaging in a speculative ticket sale, defined as the advertisement, listing, marketing, offering for sale, contracting for sale, acceptance of payment for, or sale of a ticket by a person who, at the time of the advertisement, listing, marketing, offer for sale, contract for sale, acceptance of payment for, or sale, does not have either actual or constructive possession of the ticket or authorization by the event presenter or venue operator to sell the ticket. Prohibits a ticket seller from advertising, listing, marketing, offering for sale, contracting for sale, accepting payment for, or selling a ticket before the ticket has been made available for sale by the event presenter, venue operator, rights holder, or original seller, unless expressly authorized by the event presenter, venue operator, rights holder, or original seller unless the ticket seller has constructive possession of the ticket.
- 5) Exempts marketing, advertisement, or sale of season ticket packages, multigame packages, and inventory withheld at the sole discretion of a rights holder or venue operator, as well as playoff ticket packages by a rights holder or their authorized ticketing agent before the beginning of the applicable season from new limitations on marketing and advertising.
- 6) Prohibits a ticket resale marketplace from knowingly or recklessly processing payment, collecting a fee, advertising, listing, marketing, offering for sale, contracting for sale, accepting payment for, or facilitating the completion of a speculative ticket sale, and requires a ticket resale marketplace to implement reasonable measures designed to prevent speculative ticket sales on its platform.

- 5) Strengthens prohibitions against the use of ticket-buying software and other technological methods to circumvent ticket purchasing restrictions, including posted ticket limits, electronic queues, presale restrictions, account limitations, and security or access controls. Prohibits providing, selling, marketing, or facilitating software or services used to engage in or enable this conduct.
- 6) Prohibits deceptive or misleading practices in the advertising, marketing, sale, or resale of event tickets, including practices that misrepresent or create consumer confusion regarding the source, authorization, affiliation, availability, price, nature, or seating location of tickets. Provides that violations constitute false or misleading advertising under existing law.

Background

California's ticket sellers regulations were largely enacted before the widespread adoption of online ticket marketplaces, digital ticketing systems, mobile ticket transfers, and sophisticated resale platforms. Today, consumers purchase, transfer, and resell tickets through a variety of online channels that did not exist when many of the ticketing statutes were first enacted. While technological advances have increased convenience and expanded access to tickets, they have also introduced new challenges relating to speculative ticket sales, automated purchasing software, deceptive online practices, fee transparency, and restrictions on ticket transferability. Policymakers, regulators, artists, venues, ticketing companies, and consumer advocates have increasingly focused on whether existing laws adequately protect consumers in the modern ticketing marketplace.

Federal regulators have devoted significant attention to ticketing-related consumer protection concerns in recent years. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has identified hidden fees, deceptive pricing practices, and the use of automated software to circumvent ticket purchasing restrictions as practices that can harm consumers and impair fair competition. In 2024, the FTC adopted its Rule on Unfair or Deceptive Fees, commonly referred to as the "Junk Fees Rule," which requires greater transparency in ticket pricing and seeks to ensure that consumers receive meaningful information regarding the total cost of a ticket before making purchasing decisions. The FTC has also pursued enforcement actions under the Better Online Ticket Sales (BOTS) Act against entities alleged to have used automated technologies, multiple accounts, and other means to evade ticket purchasing limits designed to provide equitable access to tickets.

At the same time, federal antitrust scrutiny of the live entertainment industry has continued to increase. In 2010, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) approved the merger of Live Nation and Ticketmaster subject to conditions

intended to address competition concerns. In 2019, the DOJ announced that Live Nation had violated portions of the consent decree governing the merger and extended the decree through 2025. Following highly publicized ticketing issues associated with major concert tours and broader concerns regarding competition in the live entertainment marketplace, the DOJ and a coalition of state attorneys general, including California, filed an antitrust lawsuit against Live Nation Entertainment and Ticketmaster in 2024. The litigation alleges conduct affecting competition in concert promotion, venue services, and ticketing and reflects ongoing national debate regarding competition, consumer choice, and access to live entertainment events.

The Legislature has considered numerous measures over the past decade intended to address evolving issues in the ticketing marketplace. AB 329 (Pan, Chapter 325, Statutes of 2013) prohibited the use and sale of software designed to circumvent ticket purchasing controls intended to ensure an equitable ticket-buying process. AB 1556 (Friedman, Chapter 180, Statutes of 2021) strengthened consumer protections relating to cancelled, postponed, and rescheduled events by establishing refund requirements. Subsequent legislative efforts have explored a range of consumer protection issues including fee transparency, all-in pricing, resale marketplace disclosures, speculative ticket sales, deceptive practices, ticket transferability, and consumer understanding of ticket transactions. In addition, broader consumer protection measures such as SB 478 (Dodd, Chapter 740, Statutes of 2023), California's Honest Pricing Law, reflect increasing legislative interest in ensuring transparency and fairness in transactions involving mandatory fees.

Although California law already prohibits certain unfair ticketing practices, many of the existing statutes were enacted before the widespread use of digital ticketing, mobile ticket transfers, online resale marketplaces, and automated purchasing technologies. As a result, questions have emerged regarding whether existing laws adequately address modern practices such as speculative ticket sales, the use of sophisticated software to circumvent ticket purchasing controls, deceptive online ticketing websites, and consumer confusion regarding whether a ticket is being sold by an authorized seller or through a resale marketplace. Consumer advocates and policymakers have also raised concerns regarding consumer confusion about the source of tickets, whether tickets are being sold by authorized sellers or resale marketplaces, and whether sellers possess or have a legal right to transfer the tickets being offered for sale. Policymakers have increasingly examined whether additional statutory clarity is warranted to address these practices while preserving legitimate ticketing, resale, and consumer transfer rights.

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

According to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the bill will result in unknown court cost pressures ranging from minor to significant to the extent the Attorney General (AG) brings civil actions against any person who violates the new requirements and restrictions regarding ticket resale marketplaces. Actual costs will depend on the number of actions filed and the time required to adjudicate each case. The Department of Justice (DOJ) reports that it does not anticipate a significant fiscal impact; this assessment suggests the department may not actively pursue enforcement using the authority prescribed in the bill. The bill will also result in unknown, potentially significant court cost pressures as the False Advertising Law, Unfair Competition Law, and general statutes governing ticket sellers provide a private right of action for consumers. Although trial courts are not funded based on workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for additional court resources. For context, the proposed 2026-27 Governor's Budget would provide \$70 million General Fund support to the Trial Court Trust Fund. The bill will also result in unknown local county costs to the extent that a six month misdemeanor jail sentence is imposed, though incarceration for this offense appears unlikely. The average annual cost to incarcerate one person in county jail is approximately \$80,000. Actual county incarceration costs will depend on the number of convictions and the length of each sentence. Generally, county incarceration costs are not reimbursable state mandates pursuant to Proposition 30 (2012).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

None received for the current version of the bill.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

National Independent Venue Association of California
StubHub

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: StubHub notes that "The current language inadvertently allows sports venues, including those which contract with Ticketmaster as a retailer or operator, to continue the practice of "Holdbacks" or deceptive ticket supply manipulation under the broad umbrella of "operational or business purposes," effectively permitting the deceptive holdback practices AB 1349 otherwise seeks to prohibit. This is particularly concerning at a time when California itself has been actively challenging Live Nation/Ticketmaster's conduct in the ticketing marketplace. We hope that in the future, new statutory safe harbors that counter-balance broader consumer protection objectives will not occur without

a public airing. That said, while the Friday, 8/28/26, 11:45 pm amendment contains a drafting overreach, we support the important broader concepts in the bill”

According to the National Independent Venue Association of California, “Unfortunately, amendments adopted as AB 1349 moved through the Legislature have fundamentally changed the bill and left its own independent-venue cosponsor and members facing potential liability. Even more concerning, California’s professional sports teams have now been protected from this liability while independent music venues, promoters, and festivals remain exposed. Independent venues should not face new legal exposure while the resale marketplaces where speculative tickets are actually listed and sold remain inadequately accountable.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-0, 1/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, 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, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, DeMaio, Flora, Garcia, Gipson, Hadwick, Johnson, Papan, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Ta, Tangipa, Wicks, Wilson

Prepared by: Sarah Mason / B., P. & E.D. /916-651-4104
8/30/26 17:14:50

**** END ****

THIRD READING

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

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

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

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

SUBJECT: Income taxes: credits: motion picture credit

SOURCE: Author

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

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This bill:

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

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

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

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

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/25)

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

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/25)

None received

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

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

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

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

NOES: DeMaio, Ellis, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa

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

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

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1546
Author: Schultz (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/23/26

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Vehicles: driving under the influence

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill increases the punishment for a driving under the influence (DUI) conviction with two priors from a misdemeanor to a wobbler and increases the punishment for a DUI with four or more priors from a wobbler to a jail felony.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 include double jointing language.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug, or who has 0.08% or more, by weight, of alcohol (BAC) in their blood, to drive a vehicle (hereafter, "DUI"). (Vehicle (Veh.) Code, § 23152, subds. (a), (b), (f), & (g).)

- 2) Establishes graduated penalties for a first DUI, DUI with one prior, DUI with two priors, and DUI with three or more priors, including jail time, fines, ignition interlock device (IID) installation, license suspension or revocation, and completion of a DUI program. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, 13352.1, 23538, 23540, 23542, 23546, 23550, 23552, 23548, 23575.3.)
- 3) Requires a 10-year license revocation if a person has been convicted of three or more DUIs or DUIs causing bodily injury, the last of which was punishable as a DUI or DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, a DUI with three or more priors, or as an alternate-felony misdemeanor because of a prior specified felony. (Veh. Code, § 23597, subd. (a).)
- 4) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or the combined influence of the two, or who has a BAC of .08 or more, to drive a vehicle, and concurrently do any act forbidden by law or neglect any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, which proximately causes bodily injury to any person other than the driver (hereafter, “DUI causing bodily injury.”) (Veh. Code, § 23153 subds. (a), (f), & (g).)
- 5) Establishes graduated penalties for a first DUI causing bodily injury, DUI causing bodily injury with one prior, and DUI causing bodily injury with two or more priors, including jail or prison time, fines, IID installation, license suspension or revocation, and completion of a DUI program. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, 23554, 23556, 23560, 23562, 23566, 23568, 23575.3.)
- 6) Provides that a person who proximately causes bodily injury or death to more than one victim in any one instance that results in a felony conviction of a DUI causing bodily injury, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, or vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, shall receive a one-year sentence enhancement in state prison for each additional victim injured (maximum of three). (Veh. Code, § 23558.)
- 7) Punishes a person convicted of a DUI causing bodily injury, where the violation proximately causes great bodily injury to any person other than the driver, and the offense occurred within 10 years of two or more priors, as a felony by imprisonment for two, three, or four years in state prison, a \$1,015 to \$5,000 fine, and a five-year license revocation (Veh. Code, §§ 23566, subd. (b), 13352 subd. (a)(6).)

- 8) Provides that if a person is convicted of the above offense, and the underlying offense occurred within 10 years of four or more priors, there shall be an additional punishment of three years in state prison, which shall be served in addition and consecutive to the sentence imposed above. (Veh. Code, § 23566, subd. (c).)
- 9) Makes any DUI or DUI causing bodily injury (hereafter, “any DUI”) an alternate felony-misdemeanor if that person has previously been convicted of certain impaired driving crimes:
- 10) Punishes a person convicted of any DUI within 10 years of specified felonies – a DUI with three or more priors, a DUI causing bodily injury, or gross vehicular manslaughter – as an alternate-felony misdemeanor, a \$390 to \$1,000 fine, a four- or five-year license revocation (including a three-year designation as a habitual traffic offender), and a three- or four-year IID mandate. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, subd. (a)(6)-(7); 23550.5, subds. (a), (c) & (d); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)-(2).)
- 11) Punishes a person convicted of any DUI, who has a prior conviction for felony vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, as an alternate felony-misdemeanor, a fine of \$390 to \$1,000, a four- or five-year license revocation, and a three- or four-year IID mandate. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352 subd. (a)(6)-(7); 23550.5, subds. (b), (c) & (d); 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)-(2).)
- 12) Requires the court, if a person is convicted of a DUI or a DUI causing bodily injury, to consider a BAC of .15% or more, or a person’s refusal to take a breath or urine test, as a special factor that may justify enhancing the penalties in sentencing, in determining whether to grant probation, and, if probation is granted, in determining additional or enhanced terms and conditions of probation. (Veh. Code, § 23578.)
- 13) Requires the prosecutor, if the prosecution agrees to a plea of guilty or no contest to reckless driving in satisfaction of, or as a substitute for, an original charge of a DUI—also known as a wet reckless—to state for the record a factual basis for the satisfaction or substitution, including whether or not there had been consumption of an alcoholic beverage or ingestion or administration of a drug, or both, by the defendant in connection with the offense. Provides that a wet reckless is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 5 to 90 days, or by a fine of \$145-1,000, or both. (Veh. Code, §§ 23103, subd. (c); 23103.5, subd. (a).)

- 14) Requires a court to advise a person convicted of a DUI or a DUI causing bodily injury, or who pleads to a reckless driving conviction in satisfaction of, or as a substitute for an original DUI charge, of the following: “You are hereby advised that being under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, impairs your ability to safely operate a motor vehicle. Therefore, it is extremely dangerous to human life to drive while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both. If you continue to drive while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, and, as a result of that driving, someone is killed, you can be charged with murder.” (Veh. Code, § 23593, subd. (a).)
- 15) Provides that any person who personally inflicts great bodily injury on any person other than an accomplice in the commission of a felony or attempted felony shall be punished by an additional and consecutive term of imprisonment in the state prison for three years. (Pen. Code, § 12022.7, subd. (a).)
- 16) Defines “great bodily injury,” for purposes of the enhancement statute, as a significant or substantial physical injury. (Pen. Code, § 12022.7, subd. (f)(1).)
- 17) Prohibits the application of the great bodily injury enhancement to murder or manslaughter. Provides that the great bodily injury enhancement shall not apply if infliction of great bodily injury is an element of the offense. (Pen. Code, § 12022.7, subd. (g).)

This bill:

- 1) Increases the punishment for a person convicted of a DUI with two priors within 10 years of the current offense, from a misdemeanor to a wobbler, punishable either as a misdemeanor by imprisonment for 120 days to one year in county jail or as a jail-eligible felony by 16 months, two years, or three years, and by a fine of \$390 to \$1,000.
- 2) Increases the punishment and associated criminal sanctions for a person convicted of a DUI with four or more priors within 10 years of the current offense, as follows:
 - a) Increases the punishment from a wobbler to a jail felony, punishable by 16 months, two years, or three years, and by a fine of \$390 to \$1,000.
 - b) Extends the license revocation period from four years to five years, as specified.

- c) Extends the IID installation mandate from three years to four years.
- 3) Clarifies that the punishment and associated criminal sanctions that apply to a DUI with three or more priors apply only to a DUI with three priors.

Background

According to the most recent annual report on DUIs published by the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), there were 110,017 DUI arrests in 2021. (DMV, *32nd Annual Report of the California DUI Management Information System* (Oct. 2025), summary statistics available at <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/file/32nd-annual-report-dui-management-information-system-pdf> .) For DUI arrests made in 2020, 74.7% of DUI convictions were for first-time DUIs, 19.2% for second-time DUIs, 4.6% for third-time DUIs, and 1.4% for fourth or subsequent DUIs. (*Id.* at p. 30.)

Alcohol-Involved Traffic Fatalities. Alcohol- and drug-impaired driving contribute significantly to traffic deaths and injuries in California. According to the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), 1,355 people were killed in alcohol-involved traffic crashes in 2023 in the state. (OTS, *California's Annual Report Fiscal Year 2025* (Mar. 2026), p. 8 <https://www.ots.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/67/2026/03/FY_2025_Annual_Report_Final.pdf ; OTS, *California Traffic Safety Quick Stats* available at <<https://www.ots.ca.gov/ots-and-traffic-safety/score-card/> .) After a decade of increasing alcohol-involved crash fatalities, the latest data suggest this trend may be reversing. Like other fatal crashes, alcohol-involved crash fatalities decreased in California 4.5 percent between 2022 and 2023. (OTS, *Annual Report, supra*, at p. 8.)

Alcohol- and drug-involved crash fatalities (hereafter, “DUI crash fatalities”), which have historically comprised a significant portion of total crash fatalities, peaked at 2,065 in 2005, before declining to a multi-decade low of 1,416 in 2010. (DMV, *DUI Summary Statistics* <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv-research-reports/research-development-data-dashboards/dui-management-information-system-dashboards/dui-summary-statistics/> .) While DUI crash fatalities have steadily increased since then, DUI crash fatalities comprise an increasingly smaller proportion of total crash fatalities. In 2013, DUI crash fatalities were responsible for 54.7% of all crash fatalities. (*Ibid.*) That percentage dropped to 41.7% in 2021—the lowest proportion of total crash fatalities since 2001. (*Ibid.*)

This bill changes the state's DUI laws in two ways. First, it increases the punishment for a person convicted of a DUI with two priors from a misdemeanor to wobbler, punishable either as a misdemeanor by imprisonment for 120 days to one year in county jail or as a jail felony by 16 months, two years, or three years, and by a fine of \$390 to \$1,000. Effectively, this gives prosecutors discretion to charge a person's third DUI within 10 years as a felony.

Second, it increases the punishment and associated sanctions for a DUI with four or more priors. A DUI with three or more priors may currently be punished as a wobbler. (Veh. Code, §§ 23550, subds. (a), (b).) This means that a person convicted of their fourth, fifth, or sixth DUI in ten years can still be charged with a misdemeanor. This bill makes a DUI with four or more priors a jail felony, punishable by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years, and by a fine of \$390 to \$1,000. In other words, this change eliminates the misdemeanor option for the most serious category of repeat DUI offenders.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Potentially major costs to the counties to incarcerate if punishment increases from a one year misdemeanor sentence to a wobbler or to a jail felony punishable by 16 months, two years, or three years and by a fine of \$390 to \$1,000. The average annual cost to incarcerate one person in county jail is approximately \$80,000. In 2021 Los Angeles County budgeted \$1.3 billion for jail costs with \$90,000 per incarcerated person. Actual incarceration costs to counties will depend on the number of convictions and the length of each sentence. Generally, county incarceration costs are not reimbursable state mandates pursuant to Proposition 30 (2012).

Potentially significant costs to the courts to adjudicate new penalties. An eight-hour court day costs approximately \$10,500 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. While the courts are not funded on a workload basis, an increase in workload could result in delayed court services and would increase pressure to fund additional staff and resources. The FY 2026-27 Budget appropriated \$70 million General Fund for this purpose (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

Implementation will require the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to make modifications to its core legacy information technology systems to create new

court suspensions and update driving records accordingly. DMV is undertaking an enterprise modernization project, and resources are fully committed to the project. Coordinating implementation of this bill within the project could delay implementation and/or increase costs by requiring the services needed to be built outside the core legacy system.

The Motor Vehicle Account (MVA), the primary funding account for the DMV and the California Highway Patrol, is facing insolvency. The LAO has noted that, “Until a plan is put in place to address MVA’s structural deficit, we recommend the Legislature set a high bar for considering approval of any proposals that create additional MVA cost pressures and accelerate the risk of insolvency.” The proposed Governor’s FY 2026-2027 Budget currently projects that the MVA will be insolvent as soon as FY 2028-29.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Burbank Armenian Association
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
California Contract Cities Association
California District Attorneys Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California State Sheriffs’ Association
City of Norwalk
City of Thousand Oaks
League of California Cities
Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department
Peace Officers Research Association of California
Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment
Streets for All

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

ACLU California Action
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Debt Free Justice California
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa

Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union, Local 148

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/21/26

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

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /916-651-4118
8/30/26 15:24:12

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1560
Author: Tangipa (R), et al.
Amended: 8/12/26 in Senate
Vote: 27

SENATE ELECTIONS & C.A. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/30/26
AYES: Wiener, Choi, Allen, Cervantes, Umberg

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-0, 5/28/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Lobbyist certification

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill prohibits a person from serving as a lobbyist for 12 years after a conviction for a crime of public corruption.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/12/26 resolve chaptering conflicts with AB 2592 (Pacheco).

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Regulates lobbyists through the Political Reform Act (PRA), including by requiring lobbying firms and lobbyist employers to register with the Secretary of State (SOS) and file periodic reports disclosing their activities.
- 2) Requires, as part of the registration process, that each lobbyist submit a lobbyist certification with the SOS. This certification shall include:
 - a) A recent photograph;
 - b) The full name, business address, and telephone number of the lobbyist;

- c) A statement that the lobbyist understands the statutory gift limit; and
 - d) A statement that the lobbyist has or will complete an ethics course.
- 3) Specifies administrative, civil, and criminal penalties for violating provisions of the PRA, including making any person who knowingly or willingly violates the PRA guilty of a misdemeanor. Conviction of a misdemeanor under the PRA precludes a person from being a candidate for office or acting as a lobbyist for four years, unless the court at sentencing determines this provision is not applicable.
- 4) Prohibits a person from being a candidate for office or serving in elected office in California if the person has been convicted of a felony involving accepting, giving or offering to give any bribe, the embezzlement of public money, extortion or theft of public money, perjury, or conspiracy to commit any of these crimes.

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a person from serving as a lobbyist for 12 years after a felony conviction for a crime of public corruption, defined in 4) of existing law. If a person is already a registered lobbyist and is convicted of such a crime, then the person's certification as a lobbyist shall be void upon the conviction, and the lobbyist is required to terminate their registration immediately upon conviction.
- 2) Requires a lobbyist certification submitted to the SOS to include a statement that the lobbyist has not been convicted of a crime of public corruption within the previous 12 years.
- 3) Prohibits the SOS from accepting a lobbying certification from a person who has indicated on the lobbying certification that they have been convicted of a crime of public corruption within the previous 12 years.

Background

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

The PRA requires any person who qualifies as a lobbyist, and thus works for a lobbying firm or a lobbyist employer, to submit a lobbyist certification and include a recent photograph of the lobbyist. The SOS makes a list, with photographs, of all lobbyists publicly available on its website, which also provides lists of registered lobbying firms and lobbyist employers. The SOS publishes a directory of registered individual lobbyists, lobbying firms, and lobbyist employers.

Comments

Author's Statement. Public trust in government depends on accountability and integrity in the policymaking process. California law already recognizes that certain crimes of public corruption, including offenses involving the misuse or theft of public funds, are serious enough to prevent someone from running for public office for life. Yet under current law, those same individuals can still register as lobbyists and be paid to influence the decisions of the Legislature. That double standard undermines public confidence in government. This bill closes this loophole by prohibiting individuals convicted of public corruption from serving as lobbyists in California.

If someone has been convicted of corrupting the public process, they should not be allowed to profit from influencing it. This bill is a commonsense step to restore integrity, strengthen transparency, and ensure that Sacramento holds lobbyists to the same ethical standard expected of those who seek elected office.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/11/26)

Jerry P. Dyer, Mayor, City of Fresno
Nick Richardson, Fresno City Councilmember, District 6
California Common Cause
City of Bishop
County of Fresno Board of Supervisors
County of Inyo Board of Supervisors
Fresno Chamber of Commerce
Fresno County District Attorney's Office

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/11/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Fresno County, the Fresno County District Attorney, the Fresno Chamber of Commerce, and the County of Inyo write in support of the bill:

Over the years, our state has seen several high-profile cases in which individuals found guilty of public corruption-related charges continue working in an industry where public trust is essential. Allowing those facing such serious charges to lobby only encourages the problem. California cannot afford to let individuals with a record of unethical behavior influence policy and shape decisions that affect all Californians.

[This bill] is a straightforward, common-sense reform that protects the integrity of our government. By keeping those with corruption charges out of the lobbying process, this bill will help to restore public trust, promote fairness, and ensure that decisions are guided by the public interest, not what benefits individuals with questionable morals.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-0, 5/28/26

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

Prepared by: Carrie Cornwell / E. & C.A. / (916) 651-4106
8/18/26 13:09:31

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1642
Author: Harabedian (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Allen, Gonzalez, Menjivar
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Hurtado

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-3, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Wildfires: contamination standards

SOURCE: Eaton Fire Residents United

DIGEST: This bill requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulations and guidance for testing, remediation, and restoration of wildfire smoke contamination, as specified, and DTSC to develop advisory guidance for schools to support local educational agencies after a wildfire.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 establish interim standards for lead and asbestos for residential properties within a wildfire impact zone; require DTSC to adopt regulations for lead and asbestos testing and remediation; require DTSC to develop guidance for testing and remediating specified contaminants at the department's discretion; require CARB to develop guidance on indoor air contaminants following a wildfire; require DTSC, in collaboration with the Department of Education, to develop advisory guidance for schools to support local educational agencies after a wildfire; and make the enactment of these provisions contingent on the enactment of AB 1795 (Gipson).

ANALYSIS:

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the federal Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), which, among other things, empowers the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) with the authority to require reporting, record-keeping, and testing requirements, and restrictions relating to chemical substances and mixtures. (15 United States Code (USC) §§ 2601 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes, under TSCA, dust-lead hazard standards, post-abatement clearance levels, and abatement requirements for lead-based paint in certain residential structures. (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §§ 745.61 et seq.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL) to authorize the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to regulate the management of hazardous wastes in California. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) §§ 25100 et seq.)
- 2) Defines “hazardous waste” as waste, that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics:
 - a) Causes, or significantly contributes to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or
 - b) Poses a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment, as specified. (HSC § 25141(b))
- 3) Requires the DTSC, under the HWCL, to adopt, and revise when appropriate, standards and regulations for the management of hazardous wastes to protect against hazards to public health, domestic livestock, wildlife, or the environment. (HSC § 25150)
- 4) Establishes DTSC’s Toxicity Criteria for Human Health Risk Assessments, Screening Levels, and Remediation Goals (Toxicity Criteria Rule) for hazardous waste and hazardous substance cleanup sites; requires, among other things, that human health risk assessment calculations—including, but not limited to, all cancer risk and non-cancer hazard screening levels and corrective action objectives—use the toxicity criteria specified under the Toxicity Criteria Rule and attain human health protection, as specified. (22 California Code of Regulations (CCR) § 68400.5).

- 5) Specifies, under the Toxicity Criteria Rule, criteria for all human health risk assessments, human health risk-based screening levels, and human health risk-based remediation goals statewide, for the cleanup of releases of hazardous waste or hazardous substances to the environment. (22 CCR §§ 69020-69022)
- 6) Defines, under DTSC's health standards for the management of hazardous waste, "remediation goal" to mean a contaminant concentration that is media-specific (e.g., for air, groundwater, surface water, or soil affected by a release), site-specific, protective of human health and the environment, and used as a final cleanup goal for a response or corrective action. (22 CCR § 69020(c)(5))
- 7) Defines, under DTSC's health standards for the management of hazardous waste, "screening level" to mean a risk-based, contaminant concentration, calculated as specified and considered to be protective for humans (including sensitive groups) over a lifetime. (22 CCR § 69020(c)(6))
- 8) Establishes CARB as the air pollution control agency in California and requires CARB, among other things, to control emissions from a wide array of mobile sources and coordinate with local air districts to control emissions from stationary sources in order to implement the CAA. (HSC § 39000 et seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires, for the purposes of determining clearance for human occupancy for residential properties located within a wildfire impact zone, as defined, a lead and asbestos standard, as specified, to apply relative to wildfire-caused lead and asbestos remediation only.
- 2) Requires DTSC, in consultation with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to do both of the following:
 - a) Develop and adopt regulations pertaining to lead and asbestos testing, remediation, and restoration after a wildfire, as described, on or before December 31, 2028; and
 - b) Develop and publish on its website guidance pertaining to specified contaminants for testing, remediation, and restoration after hosting a public workshop on or before December 31, 2029.
- 3) Authorizes DTSC to make technical determinations to add or remove contaminants from the guidance documents and update the guidance documents every five years based on scientific changes and in DTSC's discretion.

- 4) Requires DTSC to post recordings of the public workshops and public comments on its website.
- 5) Requires CARB to develop and publish on its website guidance on levels for indoor air contaminants following residential smoke damage from a wildfire, implications for health or health outcomes, and possible protective measures to reduce health impacts based on the best available science and after hosting a public workshop on or before December 31, 2028.
- 6) Authorizes CARB to release interim guidance prior to December 31, 2028, and revise and update the guidance as new research and data become available.
- 7) Requires DTSC, in collaboration with the State Department of Education and other relevant state agencies, to develop advisory, nonregulatory guidance, for schools to support local educational agencies, as defined, after a wildfire no later than July 1, 2028.
- 8) Exempts all regulations and guidance required in these provisions from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and the California Environmental Quality Act.
- 9) Requires the act to become operative only if AB 1795 (Gipson) is enacted and takes effect on or before January 1, 2027.

Background

Fires in the wildland urban interface. Due to climate change, the frequency and severity of wildfires have been increasing in the state and globally.¹ Four out of the five most destructive wildfires in California history have occurred in the last 10 years.² In 2025, the Eaton and Palisades fires in Los Angeles County destroyed over 16,000 structures and burned nearly 38,000 acres combined; in 2018, the Camp Fire in Butte County destroyed nearly 19,000 structures and burned 153,000 acres; and in 2017, the Tubbs Fire in Napa and Sonoma counties destroyed more than 5,500 structures and burned nearly 37,000 acres.

These fires are all examples of wildland urban interface (WUI) fires, which means a zone of transition between unoccupied land and human development. It is known as the line, area, or zone where structures and other human development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels.³ California is first

¹ California Air Resources Board. (2026). Wildfires & Climate Change.

² CAL FIRE. (2025). Top 20 Most Destructive California Wildfires.

³ U.S. Fire Administration. (2026). What is the WUI?.

among the top 5 states with the most homes in WUI areas, with 30-45% of all homes in the state in WUI areas.

Where there's smoke, there's toxins. When fires in the WUI burn into densely populated areas, wildfires can transition into urban conflagrations, in which fires spread rapidly from structure-to-structure. In the wake of these fires, both the interiors and exteriors of structures can become polluted by smoke residue, ash, and debris, which can contain toxic chemicals. The smoke from these fires doesn't just consist of the chemicals from plant-fueled fires, but also of various toxic compounds from lead-based paint, lithium batteries, vinyl siding, fiberglass insulation, electrical wiring, rubber tires, and more.⁴

Fires have been blamed for a long list of health illnesses. Wildland fire smoke has been linked to increased hospital admissions for asthma, strokes, and heart attacks. House fires have been associated with higher levels of cancer in firefighters. But new hazards arise when these types of fires are combined and amplified by burning entire neighborhoods. Health risks associated with WUI fire toxicants can persist beyond the active burning of the fire, due to contamination of the ecosystem and built environment. Exposure to these toxicants and health impacts can also extend well beyond the WUI communities, as smoke can be transported for hundreds to thousands of kilometers.⁵

Studies have reported that several types of chemicals can be found at elevated concentrations inside of structures following WUI fires, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and heavy metals.^{6,7,8} Reports and independent studies have also demonstrated that unsafe levels of toxins can remain in homes after professional cleaning and can be redistributed throughout the home by the HVAC systems.⁹ Some types of contamination from WUI fire smoke damage may cause permanent physical damage to property and pose potential acute and chronic health impacts if it goes without sufficient remediation.¹⁰

⁴ Cornwall, W. (2025). [In the Ashes.](#)

⁵ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). [The Chemistry of Fires at the Wildland-Urban Interface.](#)

⁶ LA Fire Health Study. (2026). [LA Fire HEALTH Study.](#)

⁷ Jech, S., et. al. (2024). [Determination of Soil Contamination at the Wildland-Urban Interface after the 2021 Marchall Fire in Colorado, USA.](#)

⁸ Allen, J. et. al. (2025). [Post-fire soil hazards: recommendations for updated soil testing protocols and clearance thresholds.](#)

⁹ Callimachi, R. and Migliozi, B. (2025). [How Did This Family End Up Back in a Toxic House?.](#)

¹⁰ California Department of Insurance. (2026). [Report of the Smoke Claims and Remediation Task Force.](#)

For homes that remain standing but have been impacted by WUI fire smoke and debris, there are no uniform state or federal standards pertaining to investigation, testing, and remediation for indoor chemical hazards. Residents returning to their homes have reported feeling concerned about whether it is safe to do so. In the absence of such standards, various entities have developed professional standards and certifications to guide the work of remediation and testing by contractors and hygienists, as well as recommendations for residents. Some guidance has been released from the state for soil contamination following WUI fires.¹¹ The state has not released similar guidance for indoor contaminants. This bill would establish regulations and guidance on the testing and remediation of contamination from smoke damage, as specified, following a wildfire.

Smoke Claims and Remediation Task Force. Out of recognition of the need for statewide standards for investigating and addressing smoke damage, CDI established the Smoke Claims and Remediation Task Force (Task Force) in May 2025. Key takeaways of the report from the Task Force highlighted areas of agreement and disagreement on how to address smoke damage. There was general consensus regarding the relatively greater potential for harm from toxins resulting from WUI fires; the need for standards for contaminants of concern in addition to existing standards; the utility of a tiered classification system for smoke damage claims with varying protocols; and the importance of training and certification programs for personnel involved in the insurance claim and remediation process, including, but not limited to insurance adjusters, industrial hygienists, remediation experts, and testing laboratories.

This bill, and a related bill AB 1795 (Gipson), are proposed to address many of the issues raised during the Task Force. While AB 1642 establishes requirements and guidance around testing and remediation for smoke contamination, AB 1795 links those regulations and guidance to insurance claims and processes and establishes training and certification requirements, amongst other provisions. Both bills contain contingency provisions such that each bill will become operative only if the other bill is enacted.

Comments

Purpose of Bill. According to the author, “The 2025 Los Angeles Wildfires exposed the enormous gaps in our wildfire recovery protocol, specifically around testing and remediation for smoke damaged properties. There are currently no statewide standards for how to handle smoke damaged homes, what contaminants

¹¹ Department of Toxic Substances Control. (2025). Residential Soil Evaluation.

to test for, and what levels are unsafe for re-occupancy. This bill makes one thing clear: when it comes to our families' health we trust science. AB 1642 will create a statewide scientific standard for when it's safe to return to a home after an urban wildfire. Public health will be the standard, not the exception.”

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- DTSC estimates one-time costs of at least \$1.8 million in fiscal year 2027-28 (Toxic Substances Control Account [TSCA]), which includes funding for research as well as regulation development and adoption.
- The California Department of Insurance (CDI) estimates ongoing costs of \$727,5000 in fiscal year 2026-27, \$1.4 million in 2027-28, and \$1.2 million annually thereafter (Insurance Fund—Proposition 103 sub-account) to implement the provisions of this bill. CDI notes that Proposition 103 funds may not be able to absorb these additional costs, and that these costs would put additional pressure on Proposition 103, which could accelerate the need for a fee increase in the future.
- The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) estimates ongoing costs of \$1.2 million (General Fund) to maintain and update standards once they are developed, as needed and supported by the science, or the identification and development of additional needed standards as new WUI-related fire hazards are identified.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/2026)

301 Organics

350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley

350 South Bay Los Angeles

350 Southland Legislative Alliance

805 Undocufund

After the Fire

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc, Mu Lambda Omega Chapter

Altadena ACT

Altadena Arts

Altadena Colab

Altadena Community Land Trust

Altadena Earthseed Community Land Trust

Altadena Recovery Team

Altadena Tenants Union

Altogether
Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization
Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Beautiful Altadena
Biomax Environmental
Bw Builder
California Black Power Network
California Environmental Voters
California Green New Deal Coalition
California Integrative Therapy
California Interfaith Power & Light
California Teachers Association
Camp Fire
Catalyst California
Center for Biological Diversity
Centre for Applied Ecological Remediation
Champion Cleaners INC.
Christopherson Builders
City of Thousand Oaks
Civic Sundays
Clergy Community Coalition
Climate and Wildfire Institute
Coalition for a Safe Fire Recovery
Collaborate Pasadena
Community 3.0x
Conservation Strategies
Courage California
Day One
Eaton Fire Collaborative
Eaton Fire Renters Coalition
Eaton Fire Residents United
End Child Poverty CA Powered by Grace
Enviroscience, INC
Fire Safe Palisades
First Unitarian Church of San Jose, Environmental Justice Ministry Team
Glendale Environmental Coalition
Greenfaith
Holly Wyman Design
Hpp Cares
Huntington Asthma and Allergy Center

Idle DOT
Indivisible Alta-pasadena
Joan Collaborative
Kids and Teens Medical Group
L.a. Voice
L.z. Design Group
LA Region Community Recovery Organization
League of California Cities
Leap of Faith Family to Family Support
Lift LA
Little Tokyo Service Center
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
Los Angeles County Office of Violence Prevention
Mcclain Consulting Services
Meteorite Real Estate
Miramar Hoa
NAACP Altadena
National Day Laborer Organizing Network (NDLON)
Nefesh LA
Neighborhood First Responders
Nrdc Action Fund
P.e.a.r.l.s. of Compassion-patient, Equity, Advocates, Relationships, Love & Support
Pacific Film Foundation
Pacific Palisades Community Council
Palipower
Palisades Recovery Coalition
Pasadena Community Job Center
Pasadena Tenant Union
Pasadena/altadena Ivy Foundation
Pasadenans Organizing for Progress (POP!)
Pediatric Firestorm Team
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles
Plant Community LA
Public Counsel
Reclaim Our Power: Utility Justice Campaign
Resilient Palisades
Rise Economy
Rogue Food Unites
San Diego350

Sander Architects
Sonoma County Climate Activist Network (SOCOCAN!)
Sunita Jain Anti-trafficking Initiative
The Change Reaction
The Utility Wildfire Survivor Coalition
Town of Superior
United Policyholders
Uriu Architecture
Vida Mobile Clinic
Xtreme Athletics

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/2026)

American Property Casualty Insurance Association
California Association of Realtors
California Building Industry Association
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Pacific Association of Domestic Insurance Companies
Personal Insurance Federation of California
San Diego Gas and Electric Company

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 59-3, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, 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, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Chen, DeMaio, Johnson

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Castillo, Davies, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Nguyen, Patterson, Celeste Rodriguez, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis

Prepared by: Taylor McKie / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
8/30/26 15:17:32

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1680
Author: Calderon (D), et al.
Amended: 8/19/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE INSURANCE COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/24/26
AYES: Padilla, Niello, Becker, Menjivar, Richardson, Rubio
NO VOTE RECORDED: Jones

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-8, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California FAIR Plan Association

SOURCE: Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara / California Department of Insurance

DIGEST: This bill aims to create greater ability for the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to ensure accountability and coverage options in the operations of the California Fair Access to Insurance Requirements Plan Association (FAIR Plan).

Senate Floor amendments of 8/19/26 address chaptering issues with AB 69 (Calderon).

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) Allows the Insurance Commissioner (Commissioner) to conduct an examination of any company as often as the Insurance Commissioner in his or her discretion deems appropriate but shall, at a minimum, conduct an examination of every insurer admitted in this state not less frequently than once every five years.
- 3) Requires the Commissioner to approve the FAIR Plan's plan of operation and authorizes the Commissioner to examine the FAIR Plan's books, records, files, papers, and documents that relate to its operation.
- 4) Specifies that rates for the FAIR Plan shall not be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory, shall be actuarially sound so that premiums are adequate to cover expected losses, expenses and taxes, and shall reflect investment income of the plan.
- 5) Requires all members of the FAIR Plan to participate in the writings, expenses, profits, and losses of the FAIR Plan in the proportion that its premiums written during the second preceding calendar year bear to the aggregate premiums written by all insurers.

This bill:

- 1) Requires the FAIR Plan to take corrective actions, as specified by the Commissioner or their designee, to correct violations of applicable statutes, regulations, accounting principles, the plan of operation, or other legally binding applicable rules and identified in a report of examination or other operational report. Failure to take these actions will subject the FAIR Plan to up to \$20,000 for each unaddressed violation.
- 2) Allows the FAIR Plan to request additional extensions of 30 calendar days, or other greater extensions approved by the Commissioner, for good cause, to comply. The Commissioner or their designee may deny a request for an extension of time if it is determined the request is not made in good faith or there has not been a good faith effort to comply, as specified.
- 3) Specifies that the Commissioner may require the FAIR Plan to adjust the policy limits available under the programs it underwrites, and make additional coverage offerings available under the FAIR Plan to include fair rental value coverage under the FAIR Plan's renters' property insurance program.

- 4) Provides for civil penalties not to exceed \$10,000 for each act in violation or not to exceed \$20,000 if the act was willful and would require the Commissioner to impose those penalties.
- 5) Includes the provisions of AB 69 (Calderon) to address chaptering issues with that bill.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 69 (Calderon). Enacts various provisions to assist California Fair Access to Insurance Requirements Plan Association (FAIR Plan) policyholders in securing coverage outside of the FAIR Plan. These provisions include providing policyholder information to interested insurers and agents or brokers of record simultaneously, while also making policyholders aware of additional coverage options. Pending on the Senate Floor.

AB 2061 (Chen). Requires the FAIR Plan to post quarterly on its website, the number of policies it issued in each ZIP Code and its risk exposure. Additionally, deletes the requirement that the FAIR Plan publish its telephone number in all general distribution telephone directories in the state. Pending on the Senate Floor.

AB 234 (Calderon, Chapter 474, Statutes of 2025). Required the Speaker of the Assembly and the Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Rules to serve as nonvoting, ex officio members of the governing committee, and authorized each to name a designee to serve in their place.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The California Department of Insurance does not anticipate a fiscal impact from the bill (Insurance Fund).

Staff notes there may be an unknown potential increase in enforcement workload for CDI to address noncompliance with the Commissioner's specified corrective actions, which may be offset to some extent by penalty revenue (Insurance Fund). It is possible that higher aggregate penalties may incentivize the FAIR Plan to contest enforcement actions through the administrative hearing process rather than opting for immediate compliance, which may increase administrative and adjudicatory workload. The magnitude of this workload would depend on the number and scope of violations, as well as any attached penalties.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara / California Department of Insurance
(source)

Laguna Beach; City of
Lake Forest; City of
Los Alamitos; City of
Los Angeles; City of
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Tulare; City of
United Policyholders

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/13/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara, sponsor of this bill:

“In recent years, wildfire risks, insurer withdrawals, and widespread nonrenewals have driven unprecedented growth in FAIR Plan enrollment. As the FAIR Plan increasingly functions as a major insurer rather than a limited backstop, gaps have emerged in its coverage offerings, operational flexibility, and accountability mechanisms. The statutory framework has not kept pace with the scale of the FAIR Plan’s responsibilities or the needs of policyholders who rely on it.

In addition, the California Department of Insurance’s Report of Examination - the most comprehensive review of the FAIR Plan in decades – revealed systemic problems that have left wildfire survivors struggling with delays, denials, and inconsistent claims decisions, particularly after the 2025 Los Angeles wildfires, the largest urban wildfire disaster in state history. The examination evaluated the FAIR Plan’s financial conditions, corporate governance, and controls to protect policyholders across 32 areas – finding that in more than half of them, the FAIR Plan had not started or fully implemented the Department’s recommendations. The legislation would require the FAIR Plan to make significant operational and governance changes to meet Californians’ needs.

The FAIR Plan’s policy count and exposure levels have grown dramatically, creating financial and operational risks that extend beyond the program’s original purpose. Many policyholders require coverage options that exceed the FAIR Plan’s basic offerings, particularly renters and homeowners who require more complete protection. Commercial policyholders lack a mechanism to transition back into the admitted market, leaving many businesses dependent on the FAIR Plan for

extended periods. The Commissioner's oversight tools must be strengthened to ensure timely compliance with examination findings and statutory requirements. Without a penalty structure, there is limited deterrence for violations.

AB 1680 modernizes the FAIR Plan to reflect current market conditions and strengthen consumer protections. It clarifies and reinforces the Commissioner's authority to approve, revoke, or require revisions to the FAIR Plan's plan of operation and ensures that the Plan must adopt statutory and other legally binding examination recommendations within agreed-upon timelines."

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 62-8, 5/21/26

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

NOES: Alanis, DeMaio, Ellis, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Johnson, Patterson, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Flora, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Macedo, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Ta

Prepared by: Brandon Seto / INS. / (916) 651-4110
8/20/26 10:40:53

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1709
Author: Lowenthal (D), Alvarez (D), Bauer-Kahan (D), Bonta (D), Hoover (R), Muratsuchi (D), Patterson (R) and Wicks (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/22/26
AYES: Jones, Gonzalez, McNerney, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Reyes, Wiener
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon, Umberg

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/30/26
AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/28/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Covered platforms: age restriction: e-Safety Advisory Commission

SOURCE: Organization for Social Media Safety

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits “covered platforms” from providing an addictive feature to a user under the age of 16. The Attorney General (AG) may adopt regulations, as provided; and 2) establishes the e-Safety Advisory Commission to advise the AG on, among other things, matters related to online safety.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 refine definitions, make changes to the composition and duties of the commission, including requiring one member to have experience related to LGBTQ+ civil rights or public policy related to youth, and make technical changes.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Protecting Our Kids from Social Media Addiction Act, prohibits an operator of an addictive internet-based service or application, including a social media platform, from providing an addictive feed, as defined, to a minor user. (Health & Saf. Code § 27000 et seq.)
- 2) Defines “addictive feed” as an internet website, online service, online application, or mobile application, or a portion thereof, in which multiple pieces of media generated or shared by users are, either concurrently or sequentially, recommended, selected, or prioritized for display to a user based, in whole or in part, on information provided by the user, or otherwise associated with the user or the user’s device, unless any of the following conditions are met, alone or in combination with one another:
 - a) The information is not persistently associated with the user or user’s device and does not concern the user’s previous interactions with media generated or shared by others.
 - b) The information consists of search terms that are not persistently associated with the user or user’s device.
 - c) The information consists of user-selected privacy or accessibility settings, technical information concerning the user’s device, or device communications or signals concerning whether the user is a minor.
 - d) The user expressly and unambiguously requested the specific media or media by the author, creator, or poster of the media, or the blocking, prioritization, or deprioritization of such media, provided that the media is not recommended, selected, or prioritized for display based, in whole or in part, on other information associated with the user or the user’s device, except as otherwise permitted by this chapter and, in the case of audio or video content, is not automatically played.
 - e) The media consists of direct, private communications between users.
 - f) The media recommended, selected, or prioritized for display is exclusively the next media in a preexisting sequence from the same author, creator, poster, or source and, in the case of audio or video content, is not automatically played.
 - g) The recommendation, selection, or prioritization of the media is necessary to comply with the act. (Health & Saf. Code § 27000.5(a).)

- 3) Requires, for purposes of the Protecting Our Kids from Social Media Addiction Act, the Attorney General to adopt regulations regarding age assurance by January 1, 2027. (Health & Saf. Code § 27006(b).)
- 4) Establishes the Digital Age Assurance Act, which establishes a device-based age verification system in which parents who allow their children to be the primary user of a device can enter a non-identifying age-bracket signal that operating systems and application stores must send to application developers. (Civ. Code § 1798.500 et seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a covered platform from providing an addictive feature to a user under the age of 16. It requires a covered platform to implement reasonable measures to ensure users under the age of 16 are not provided any addictive feature on their platform.
- 2) Defines a “covered platform” as a website, online service, online application, or mobile application, including a social media platform, as defined in existing law, that offers users or providers users an addictive feature as a significant part of the service provided.
- 3) Requires a covered platform, before providing an addictive feature to a user, to verify the age of a user pursuant to the Digital Age Assurance Act, subject to regulation by the AG. Provides that, if a covered platform is unable to verify the age of a user pursuant to the Act, then the platform shall instead rely on age determination made pursuant to regulations made by the AG under the Protecting Our Kids from Social Media Addiction Act.
- 4) Provides that the AG may adopt regulations to implement and enforce these provisions.
- 5) Provides that the AG may alter the scope of “covered platform” if they determine that doing so is necessary to ensure that a “covered platform” applies to websites, online services, online applications, or mobile applications that make addictive features available to users under the age of 16.
- 6) Provides that a covered platform that violates the above provisions shall be subject to a civil penalty, brought only by the AG or a local public prosecutor, of up to \$50,000 per affected minor for a knowing violation and \$25,000 per affected minor for a negligent violation. Requires a court to consider the size of a covered platform, the severity and duration of the violation, and the platform’s good faith efforts to comply when assessing a civil penalty.

- 7) Establishes the e-Safety Advisory Commission as an independent advisory commission only for administrative purposes within the Department of Justice. Provides that the commission is purely advisory and shall not be considered a part of the Department of Justice for any other purpose.
- 8) Requires at least one member of the commission to have experience working on LGBTQ+ civil rights or statewide public policy related to LGBTQ+ youth. Requires the e-Safety Advisory Commission to consist of members who possess relevant experience and include individuals with expertise or experience in one or more of the following areas:
 - a) Pediatrics.
 - b) Child psychology, adolescent psychology, or social psychology.
 - c) Technology.
 - d) Civil society organizations with expertise in children's online safety or public health.
 - e) Advocacy on behalf of marginalized youth, including, but not limited to, youth of color, foster youth, or youth with disabilities.
 - f) Academia or research related to child development, public health, or online safety.
 - g) Education, specifically K-12 education.
- 9) Provides that the commission may advise the AG on the following:
 - a) The state of age assurance technologies.
 - b) Feedback from social media users, parents of minors, and online safety and children's safety organizations regarding implementation of California's online safety laws.
 - c) The differential impact of online age restrictions on various groups.
 - d) Harmful design features in covered entities and their impacts on youth health and well-being.
 - e) Safety practices of covered entities to protect children.
 - f) State agency rulemaking under Section 22685 of the Business and Professions Code.
 - g) Safe access to online community for isolated LGBTQ+ youth.
- 10) Requires the commission to report to the Legislature and Governor all of the following:
 - a) The commission's activities.
 - b) Proposed actions taken and statutory changes.
 - c) Recommendations for legislative changes to enhance the protections of minors online.

Background

Since its inception, social media has exploded in popularity. People around the world use social media to connect with like-minded others, find various resources, and entertain themselves. However, these benefits did not come without a heavy price: a price that is felt the most by children. Youth mental health problems are skyrocketing, while digital consumption only increases. Social media use has been linked to increasing depression, anxiety, suicidality, eating disorders, and countless other harmful effects.

In response, this bill prohibits “covered platforms” from providing an addictive feature to children under 16 years of age and requires the platforms to verify users’ ages pursuant to the Digital Age Assurance Act before providing users with an addictive feature. The AG is authorized to promulgate necessary regulations and to alter the scope of what is considered a “covered platform,” as necessary. The bill also stands up the e-Safety Advisory Commission as an independent advisory body to provide advice and recommendations to the AG on various topics.

The bill is sponsored by the Organization for Social Media Safety. It is supported by a variety of groups, including the California Initiative for Technology & Democracy and the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department. The bill is opposed by a wide variety of groups, including Chamber of Progress and ACLU California Action. For a more thorough analysis, please see the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee analysis of this bill.

Comments

According to the author:

AB 1709 would establish a state-wide minimum age requirement for users to create or maintain accounts on social media platforms that use addictive feeds as a significant part of the service provided by their platform. This bill is grounded in a substantial and growing body of research showing that early and unrestricted access to social media can harm children’s mental health, cognitive development, and overall well-being. Children under 16 face heightened risks online, including compulsive use patterns, exposure to harmful content, and negative mental health outcomes. These risks are not incidental but are closely tied to how modern social media platforms are designed. Many platforms rely on algorithmically driven feeds that prioritize engagement, often by delivering highly stimulating or emotionally charged content. This design encourages prolonged use and can foster

addictive behaviors, particularly in younger users whose self-regulation skills and executive functioning are still developing.

By requiring platforms to implement meaningful age verification and prevention measures, the bill shifts responsibility from individual users to the companies that control access and design. This approach aims to reduce early exposure to addictive platform features during a key developmental window and to encourage safer, age-appropriate digital environments.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Major costs to the Department of Justice, including enforcing the social media ban provisions and rulemaking. (General Fund)
- Significant to major costs annually to establish an e-Safety Advisory Commission. Costs may vary widely by year depending on workload. (General Fund)
- Potentially significant costs to the courts to adjudicate new penalties depending on violations that may be unique to every platform. An eight-hour court day costs approximately \$10,500 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. 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. The FY 2026-27 Budget appropriated \$70 million General Fund for this purpose (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Organization for Social Media Safety (Source)

American Academy of Pediatrics, California

Bright Light Strategies

California Catholic Conference

California Initiative for Technology & Democracy, a Project of California

Common CAUSE

Children's Advocacy Institute

Common Sense Media

Distraction-free Schools California
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Mama - West LA
Tech Oversight California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

ACLU California Action
Advocates for Youth
American Innovators Network
California Commission on the Status of Women and Girls
Chamber of Progress
Children's Online Safety and Privacy Research (COSPR)
Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
Colage
Computer & Communications Industry Association
Educateus
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Fight for the Future
Gen-z for Change
If/when/how: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice
Internet.works
Lawyers for Good Government
Lgbt Tech
Netchoice
Secular Education Association
Siecus: Sex Ed for Social Change
Technet
The Nexus of Privacy
Woodhull Freedom Foundation

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Organization for Social Media Safety writes:

AB 1709 is aimed at the mechanics of addictive platform design, not protected speech or online content. AB 1709 draws the correct public-safety line: children under 16 should not have to choose between social participation and exposure to addictive, compulsive-use design.

AB 1709 is a reasonable, evidence-based response to a well-documented problem. Younger adolescents should not be expected to navigate products engineered to capture and hold their attention during a critical stage of development, where the available evidence

clearly and convincingly shows both the serious harms of these products and long-standing internal awareness by the companies themselves.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition of industry groups, including Technet, write:

To be clear, our companies recognize the impacts their platforms can have and are committed to being part of the solution. However, social media is one factor, and any “solution” that ignores the scientific research, the individualized nature of mental health and the many other stressors impacting young people today, like academic pressure, school safety, socio-economic challenges, and substance abuse, is not actually responsive to this complex problem.

Against this backdrop, AB 1709 applies a blunt, one-size-fits-all restriction to a highly individualized issue. If passed and signed, this bill completely cuts off access, while the research instead identifies use patterns, individual vulnerability, and context as the relevant risk factors. The bill would eliminate the benefits that many teens find in social media and sever youth in marginalized communities from their online communities.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/28/26

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, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Wilson

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548, Benjamin Diaz / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548

8/30/26 14:44:16

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1795
Author: Gipson (D)
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE INSURANCE COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/24/26
AYES: Padilla, Becker, Menjivar, Richardson, Rubio
NOES: Niello
NO VOTE RECORDED: Jones

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Allen, Gonzalez, Menjivar
NO VOTE RECORDED: Dahle, Hurtado

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab
NO VOTE RECORDED: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-7, 6/8/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Smoke Damage Recovery Act

SOURCE: Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara / California Department of Insurance

DIGEST: This bill 1) requires that the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) develop, by June 30, 2027, health-based standards and requirements for minimum sampling, testing, and chemical screening levels for residential properties that have sustained smoke damage from a wildland-urban interface (WUI) fire or urban conflagration; 2) establishes a framework for the application and implementation of these standards, including the development of training and certification requirements for insurance adjusters and those who sample, test, or restore residential properties; and 3) sets down affiliated

requirements for insurers, and responsibilities for the California Department of Insurance (CDI).

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26

- 1) Task the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) in consultation with the California Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate with state and local agencies to evaluate the response and recovery operations related to the Lineage Logistics (Lineage) Fire, as specified, and assess if further laws and regulations may be needed to improve response and protect residents and businesses.
- 2) Require CalOES, by July 31, 2028, to submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature, and to post this report on its website.
- 3) Task the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to coordinate with state agencies, and other stakeholders to evaluate the related sufficiency of insurance coverage and assess if further or amended laws and regulations may be needed to address any shortfalls, as specified.
- 4) Require CDI, by December 1, 2027, to submit a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature, and to post this report on its website.
- 5) Create a rebuttable presumption that if wildfire smoke, ash, soot, char, or combustion byproducts are present in a surviving residential property in the wildfire impact zone after a wildfire, then smoke damage in the property is the result of that wildfire.
- 6) Specify restrictions on the termination of Additional Living Expenses coverage for smoke damage claims on residential properties within a wildfire impact zone, dependent on restoration of pre-loss condition or clearance for human occupancy.
- 7) Contain cross references to related guidelines and regulations for clearance for human occupancy, as well as contaminant testing, remediation, and restoration stated and developed pursuant to AB 1642 (Harabedian).
- 8) State that insurers will be responsible for covering the cost of sampling and testing necessary to restore a damaged property to its pre-loss condition and clear it for human occupancy.

- 9) Specify that for the portion of a smoke damage claim pertaining to the replacement of covered personal property that is deemed a total loss, the insurer must pay the undisputed amount of the actual cash value of the personal property within 30 days from the date the personal property is determined to be a total loss.
- 10) Specify that for the portion of a smoke damage claim pertaining to the replacement of covered personal property, the insurer must pay the undisputed amount of the replacement cost of the personal property within 30 days from the date the insurer was given a receipt for the replacement of that property.
- 11) Stipulate that if a residential property has been restored to pre-loss condition and cleared for human occupancy, a claim shall not be reopened due to recontamination. Instead, a new claim must be filed.
- 12) State that CDI shall implement and enforce a licensee's responsibility to restore a residential property to pre-loss condition and clear it for human occupancy.
- 13) Require CDI to develop training and certification programs for insurance adjusters and public insurance adjusters in inspecting, evaluating, sampling, or testing smoke damage caused by a wildfire involving residential properties. Subsequently, insurers, adjuster firms, or qualified managers must train and accredit their adjusters accordingly. Public insurance adjusters hired by insureds to adjust smoke damage claims must have the requisite license, training, and certification.
- 14) Require the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, by July 1, 2029, to propose to the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board regulations to protect the health and safety of employees performing work on residential properties that have sustained smoke or fire damage because of a wildfire. These regulations must include requirements for the certification of such individuals and allow fees for certification to be deposited into a newly created Wildfire Remediation and Restoration Certification and Training Fund for use, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to cover the costs of administering and enforcing the related requirements and regulations.
- 15) Create affiliated definitions.
- 16) Make conforming changes.
- 17) Make and revise related findings and declarations.

18) Remove the urgency clause.

19) Make this bill's provisions operative only if AB 1642 (Harabedian) is enacted by January 1, 2027.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that a fire perimeter is determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) in consultation with the Office of Emergency Services (CalOES). Subsequently, CAL FIRE must provide the Insurance Commissioner (Commissioner) with data describing the fire perimeter so that the Commissioner may determine which ZIP Codes are within or adjacent to the fire perimeter. The Commissioner must then issue a bulletin to inform insurers which ZIP Codes are subject to a one-year moratorium.
- 2) Defines a "state of emergency" as the duly proclaimed existence of conditions of disaster or extreme peril to the safety of persons and property within the state, caused by conditions such as air pollution, fire, flood, storm, epidemic, riot, drought, cyberterrorism, sudden and severe energy shortage, electromagnetic pulse attack, plant or animal infestation or disease, among other conditions.
- 3) Regulates the licensing including exam, education, and background check requirements for insurance adjusters, who engage in investigation for the purpose of obtaining information while adjusting or participating in the disposal of any claim in connection with a policy of insurance.
- 4) Regulates the licensing including exam, education, and background check requirements of public insurance adjusters who act on behalf of an insured in negotiating for or effecting the settlement of a claim or claims for loss or damage under a policy of insurance.
- 5) Establishes the Hazardous Waste Control Law (HWCL) to authorize the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to regulate the management of hazardous wastes in California.
- 6) Defines "hazardous waste" as waste, that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics:
 - a) Causes, or significantly contributes to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness.

- b) Poses a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment, due to factors including, but not limited to, carcinogenicity, acute toxicity, chronic toxicity, bio accumulative properties, or persistence in the environment, when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed.
- 7) Requires DTSC, under the HWCL, to adopt, and revise when appropriate, standards and regulations for the management of hazardous waste to protect against hazards to public health, domestic livestock, wildlife, or the environment.

This bill:

- 1) Requires CalEPA, on or before June 30, 2027, to develop health-based standards and requirements for minimum sampling, testing, and chemical screening levels for residential properties that have sustained smoke damage as a result of a WUI fire or urban conflagration.
- 2) Stipulates that the standards and requirements mentioned above must include protocols, parameters, and thresholds for pre-remediation testing, post-remediation testing, and clearance of a residential property for habitation after remediation is completed.
- 3) Requires, in creating these standards, CalEPA to consult with agencies including DTSC, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), California Air Resources Board (CARB), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), air pollution control districts, and local public health departments, as necessary. Requires CalEPA to adopt regulations to implement or make the above provisions more specific.
- 4) States that CalEPA may create additional standards and requirements pertaining to a particular wildfire, including requirements for the identification of contaminants, supplementary minimum sampling and testing recommendations or requirements, or chemical screening levels for residential properties that have sustained smoke damage. Further states that these requirements, relating to a particular wildfire, shall be exempt from specified state laws that govern rulemaking.
- 5) Creates related definitions, including that "impact zone" means a ZIP Code that is either within the fire perimeter or adjacent to the fire perimeter, as specified, and downwind of the fire perimeter based on maps generated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

- 6) Requires CalEPA, by January 1, 2028, to consult with CDI, CDPH, the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), Contractors State License Board (CSLB), State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), and any other state or local government agency, as may be necessary, to establish training and certification requirements for a person who inspects, evaluates, samples, tests, analyzes, remediates, or restores residential properties that have sustained smoke damage as a result of a WUI fire or urban conflagration, including industrial hygienists, restoration professionals, and laboratories.
- 7) Prohibits an insurer from terminating coverage for additional living expenses for a covered smoke damage claim submitted under a policy of residential property insurance, as a result of a WUI fire or urban conflagration until the property has been cleared for habitation pursuant to CalEPA's standards and requirements, subject to the applicable policy limit.
- 8) States that CalEPA's standards and requirements apply to all covered smoke damage claims within the impact zone submitted under policies of residential property insurance due to a WUI fire or urban conflagration.
- 9) Requires that, if a smoke damage insurance claim is settled on the basis of a written scope or estimate prepared by or for the insurer, the insurer must supply the claimant with a copy of each document upon which the settlement is based.
- 10) Stipulates that the estimate be for an amount that will restore the damaged property to at least its pre-loss condition and allow for restoration to meet or exceed CalEPA's standards and requirements, other relevant laws and regulations, and accepted trade and industry standards that do not conflict with CalEPA's standards and requirements.
- 11) Requires CDI, by January 1, 2028, to develop, implement, and enforce training and certification programs, as specified, for insurance adjusters and public insurance adjusters in inspecting, evaluating, sampling, or testing smoke damage caused by a WUI fire or urban conflagration involving residential properties.
- 12) Makes related findings and declarations.
- 13) Contains an urgency clause.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

CDI estimates a one-time cost of \$91,000 (Insurance Fund) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 to develop the training and certification program for adjusters and to address the expected increase in rate filing.

CalEPA estimates ongoing annual costs of \$6 million (General Fund) to promulgate regulations and to implement, administer, and enforce the requirements of this bill. CalEPA also anticipates substantial, yet undetermined, annual contracting costs.

The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) estimates total ongoing annual costs of \$1.024 million (Wildfire Remediation Certification and Training Fund and General Fund). This estimate includes \$624,000 to support 1.0 personnel year (PY) and \$400,000 in contract funding to maintain and update standards, as well as to identify and develop additional standards as new wildland-urban interface related fire hazards are identified.

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) estimates ongoing annual costs of \$545,000 (General Fund) beginning in FY 2026-27 to consult with CalEPA and to resolve current laboratory and measurement issues, including the specific chemicals to be tested, regarding residential property wildfire remediation and restoration.

The Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) anticipates any costs associated with its required consultation activities will be minor and absorbable.

Unknown costs to other state agencies required to consult with CalEPA during the development of the testing standards. Based on feedback from OEHHA, CDPH, and DIR, these costs may range from absorbable to the high hundreds of thousands of dollars (General Fund and special fund).

Staff notes that actual ongoing costs to each affected state agency are unknown because the bill does not specify a timeline or requirements for updating the standards. While the upfront workload to evaluate WUI-related fire hazards may be significant, ongoing costs could decrease in subsequent years. This reduction would occur if agencies review and update standards on an as-needed basis, rather than conducting a full annual review.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/14/26)

Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara / California Department of Insurance
(source)

City of Los Alamitos
Eaton Fire Residents United
United Policyholders

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/14/26)

301 Organics
350 Conejo
350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
350 South Bay LA
350 South Bay Los Angeles
350 Southland Legislative Alliance
After the Fire
Altadena Arts
Altadena Colab
Altogether
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Ban Sup
Biomax Environmental
California Community Foundation
Civic Sundays
Clergy Community Coalition
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Watchdog
Dena Rise Up
Eaton Fire Collaborative
Eaton Fire Renters Coalition
End Child Poverty CA
Glendale Environmental Coalition
Greenfaith
Hello Claire
Holly Wyman Design
Indivisible Alta Pasadena
Joan Collaborative
LA Voice
LA Standing Homes
Leap of Faith Family to Family Support
Little Tokyo Service Center
Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy
Maeve Mt. Washington Glassell Park
McClain Consulting Services

My Tribe Rise
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Pacific Association of Domestic Insurance Companies
Pacific Film Foundation
Pasadenans Organizing for Progress
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Resilient Palisades
San Diego 350
San Diego350
Sonoma County Climate Activist Network

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara, sponsor of the bill:

“California has experienced record-breaking wildfires, including the January 2025 Eaton and Palisades Fires, which destroyed thousands of homes and left many more contaminated by smoke, soot, ash, char, and other hazardous substances. Thousands of smoke-damage insurance claims have since been filed. Because no authoritative, enforceable standards exist for testing or remediating smoke damage, survivors report inconsistent claims handling, partial or total denials, and refusals by insurers to pay for pre- or post-remediation testing. CDI has taken executive actions—including consumer bulletins, enforcement actions, and investigations—but the absence of standards has resulted in a patchwork of insurer practices. In response to the January 2025 fires, I convened a Smoke Claims and Remediation Task Force to develop recommendations for statewide standards and insurance coverage expectations.

Residential property insurance policies that cover the peril of fire also cover smoke damage caused by fire, and insurers are required to cover restoration of properties to pre-loss condition. However, California has no statewide standards governing the inspection or testing of smoke-damaged homes, no minimum sampling or clearance protocols, no mandated remediation methods, and no training or certification requirements for professionals who assess or remediate smoke damage. No state agency is currently designated to enforce uniform smoke-damage remediation standards, and existing claims-handling requirements lack the specificity needed for consistent enforcement.

The absence of enforceable standards has resulted in inconsistent insurer practices, including denials of testing, partial claim denials, and refusals to reimburse for pre- or post-remediation testing. Homeowners and tenants face uncertainty about whether their homes are safe to reenter, and many have been forced to pay for

testing or remediation out of pocket. Without statewide standards, neither insurers nor regulators have a clear framework to ensure that smoke-damaged homes are restored to safe, habitable, pre-loss condition, and the resulting instability contributes to rising costs in the residential property insurance market

AB 1795 would create a comprehensive statewide framework for residential property insurance policies to ensure consistent, science-based handling of smoke-damage claims. This bill will mandate insurer compliance with remediation protocols and clarify their obligation to cover the cost of restoring properties to a pre-loss condition. Finally, AB 1795 also identifies the appropriate state agencies responsible for implementing and enforcing the standards and creates penalties for noncompliance.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to the insurance associations known as the “Trades”:

“The insurance industry supports standards on the testing and remediation of smoke claims and actively participated in the Smoke Claims and Remediation Task Force established by the California Department of Insurance (CDI). Clear and credible standards benefit homeowners, regulators, and insurers. However, standards must be grounded in defensible science and structured in a way that is operationally feasible and legally durable.

AB 1795 introduces a comprehensive new framework governing wildfire smoke testing, remediation, and insurance claims handling. While intended to improve consistency and consumer outcomes, several provisions raise significant concerns for insurers related to contract certainty, retroactive application, operational feasibility, and cost escalation.

The bill was improved in Assembly Insurance Committee; however we do remain concerned with certain provisions of the bill. Most importantly the cost. In recent years we have seen the costs for smoke claims grow exponentially. These are claims where a home does not have a single ember touch the home, and in some cases are exhausting million-dollar policies. These are unpredictable costs that fall well outside underwriting expectations and the pricing of smoke coverage. If AB 1795 moves forward as drafted companies will have to anticipate that the entirety of a homeowner’s policy could be exhausted through smoke claims, thus undermining the affordability and availability benefits of mitigation.

To address this concern and continue towards greater market availability and affordability we have suggested to the author and sponsor that a sublimit on smoke should be included. This would cap smoke coverage at a percentage of the total

policy coverage, such that cleaning, remediation, and testing are available without increasing the amount needed in claims paying capacity. This sublimit would be available with optional higher limits for those desiring higher coverage protection for smoke. This will contain the costs for those not in WUI or high smoke risk areas, while providing sufficient protection for homeowners and predictability to insurers. We appreciate the commitments made by the author to address this concern and are in active discussion with his office and the CDI to determine the best way to proceed.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-7, 6/8/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Chen, Connolly, Elhawary, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gipson, Mark González, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Castillo, DeMaio, Hadwick, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Bains, Davies, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Garcia, Jeff Gonzalez, Haney, Kalra, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Petrie-Norris, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Ta, Wallis

Prepared by: Brandon Seto / INS. / (916) 651-4110
8/30/26 16:21:58

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1830
Author: Petrie-Norris (D), Calderon (D), Lackey (R) and Ransom (D), et al.
Amended: 8/18/26 in Senate
Vote: 27 - Urgency

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 8/11/26

AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Pérez, Wiener

NO VOTE RECORDED: Cortese

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 12-1, 8/11/26

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

NOES: Cortese

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Ignition interlock devices

SOURCE: SAFE California Roads Coalition

DIGEST: This bill makes the installation of an ignition interlock device (IID) mandatory upon conviction of a first driving under the influence (DUI) offense involving alcohol; adopts a mandatory IID/restricted license model for alcohol-involved DUI convictions; allows a first-time DUI offender to opt for suspension of their driving privilege in lieu of maintaining a restricted license and IID; requires a 30-day (pre-conviction) administrative license suspension prior to a person applying for a restricted license for a DUI involving alcohol; creates a suspension/restricted license framework for drug-only DUI convictions; broadly reorganizes and consolidates existing DUI-related statutes; and repeals the existing statewide IID pilot program and other provisions of law made obsolete by the provisions of this bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Makes it unlawful for any person who is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage; who has 0.08 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood; who has 0.04 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood and is driving a commercial vehicle or a motor vehicle when a passenger for hire is a passenger in the vehicle; or is under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug to drive a vehicle. (Vehicle (Veh.) Code, § 23152, subds. (a), (b), (d), (e), (g).)
- 2) Makes it unlawful for a person who is addicted to the use of any drug or who is under the influence of any drug to drive a vehicle. (Veh. Code, § 23152, subds. (c) & (f).)
- 3) Makes it unlawful for a person to drive a vehicle and concurrently do any act forbidden by law, or neglect any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, which act or neglect proximately causes bodily injury to any person other than the driver, while the person is under the influence of any alcoholic beverage; has 0.08 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood; has 0.04 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood while driving a commercial motor vehicle or motor vehicle when a passenger for hire is a passenger in the vehicle; or is under the combined influence of any alcoholic beverage and drug. (Veh. Code, § 23153, subds. (a), (b), (d), (e), (g).)
- 4) Makes it unlawful for a person, while under the influence of any drug, to drive a vehicle and concurrently do any act forbidden by law, or neglect any duty imposed by law in driving the vehicle, which act or neglect proximately causes bodily injury to any person other than the driver. (Veh. Code, § 23153, subd. (f).)
- 5) Provides that convictions for DUI, DUI causing bodily injury, and a “wet reckless” are considered prior convictions for purposes of DUI sentencing. (Veh. Code, § 23550.)
- 6) Requires the DMV to immediately suspend the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle for any one of the following reasons:

- a) The person was driving a motor vehicle when the person had 0.08 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood.
 - b) The person was under 21 years of age and had a blood-alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.01 percent or greater, as measured by a preliminary alcohol screening test, or other chemical test.
 - c) The person was driving a vehicle that requires a commercial driver's license when the person had 0.04 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood.
 - d) The person was driving a motor vehicle when on probation for a DUI and the person had 0.01 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood, as measured by a preliminary alcohol screening test or other chemical test. (Veh. Code, § 13353.2, subd. (a).)
- 7) Outlines the following administrative (i.e., pre-conviction) license suspension timelines: 4 months for a first DUI; and 1 year for a second or subsequent DUI. (Veh. Code, §§ 13353.2, 13353.3.)
- 8) Prohibits the driving privilege from being restored, and a restricted or hardship permit to operate a motor vehicle from being issued, to a person during the specified suspension or revocation period, except as provided. Prohibits the driving privilege from being restored after a suspension or revocation until all applicable fees have been paid and the person submits proof of financial responsibility to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). (Veh. Code, § 13353.4.)
- 9) Allows a person subject to an administrative license suspension to apply for a restricted license if the person: satisfactorily provides proof of enrollment in licensed DUI program; installs a functioning, certified IID on any vehicle that the person operates and submits the "Verification of Installation" form; agrees to maintain the functioning, certified IID; was 21 or older at the time the offense occurred and provides proof of financial responsibility; and pays all applicable reinstatement or reissue fees. (Veh. Code, § 13353.6, subd. (a).)
- 10) Requires that a person whose driving privilege has been administratively suspended, who is eligible for a restricted driver's license, and who installs a functioning, certified IID, receive credit toward the mandatory term the person is required to install an IID for a conviction of a violation arising out of the same occurrence that led to the person's driving privilege being suspended equal to the period of time the person installs an IID under the administrative process. (Veh. Code, § 13353.6, subd. (d).)

- 11) Allows a person subject to an administrative license suspension to apply for a restricted license limited to travel to and from the activities required by a licensed DUI program that the person is enrolled in as well as to and from and in the course of the person's employment. Requires the DMV to suspend the person's privilege to operate a motor vehicle for 30 days and then issue the person a restricted driver's license, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 13353.7.)
- 12) Outlines a process by which a person subject to an administrative license suspension who has a prior DUI-related conviction may obtain a restricted license, including a requirement to install an IID. (Veh. Code, § 13353.75.)
- 13) Requires the DMV to immediately suspend or revoke the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle upon the receipt of an abstract of the record of a court showing that the person has been convicted of DUI or DUI causing bodily injury. (Veh. Code, § 13352, subd. (a).)
- 14) Outlines the following suspension and revocation periods for a person upon conviction of a DUI, and prohibits the driving privilege from being reinstated until the person submits proof of financial responsibility and successful completion of a DUI program, as specified:
 - a) For a first DUI, 6-month license suspension.
 - b) For a first DUI causing bodily injury, 1-year license suspension.
 - c) For a DUI with one prior, 2-year license suspension.
 - d) For a DUI causing bodily injury with one prior, 3-year license revocation.
 - e) For a DUI with two priors, 3-year license revocation.
 - f) For a DUI causing bodily injury with two priors or punishable as a felony, 5-year license revocation.
 - g) For a DUI with three priors or punishable as a felony, 4-year license revocation. (Veh. Code, § 13352, subd. (a)(1)-(7).)
- 15) Permits a person to apply for a restricted license following a DUI conviction if certain requirements are met, including installing an IID. Provides that the restricted driving privilege remains in effect until all reinstatement requirements are satisfied. (Veh. Code, § 13352, subds. (a) & (e).)
- 16) Requires a person whose driving privilege is restricted to arrange for each vehicle with a functioning, certified IID to be serviced by the installer at least once every 60 days in order for the installer to recalibrate the device and

monitor the operation of the device. Requires the installer to notify the DMV if the device is removed or indicates that the person has attempted to remove, bypass, or tamper with the device, or if the person fails three or more times to comply with any requirement for the maintenance or calibration of the ignition interlock device. (Veh. Code, §§ 13352, subd. (i); 13353.6, subd. (f).)

- 17) Requires the driving privilege to be suspended for 10 months when a person is convicted of DUI and whose BAC was 0.20 percent or more, by weight. Prohibits the privilege from being reinstated until the person gives proof of financial responsibility and successful completion of a DUI program. Permits a person to apply for a restricted license if certain requirements are met, including installing an IID. Provides that the restricted driving privilege remains in effect until all reinstatement requirements are satisfied. (Veh. Code, § 13352.1, subds. (a)-(d).)
- 18) Provides the following IID terms for a person required to install a functioning, certified IID upon conviction of a DUI involving alcohol:
 - a) For a person convicted of a violation of DUI involving alcohol with no priors, the court may order an IID for up to six months.
 - b) For a person convicted of a violation of DUI involving alcohol with one prior, the person is subject to a mandatory 12-month IID term.
 - c) For a person convicted of a violation of DUI involving alcohol with two priors, the person is subject to a mandatory 24-month IID term.
 - d) For a person convicted of a violation of DUI involving alcohol with three or more priors, the person is subject to a mandatory 36-month IID term. (Veh. Code, § 13353.75, subd. (h)(1).)
- 19) Provides the following IID terms for a person required to install a functioning, certified IID upon conviction of a DUI involving alcohol and causing bodily injury:
 - a) For a person convicted of a violation with no priors, the person is subject to a mandatory 12-month IID term.
 - b) For a person convicted of a violation with one prior, the person is subject to a mandatory 24-month IID term.
 - c) For a person convicted of a violation with two priors, the person is subject to a mandatory 36-month IID term.

- d) For a person convicted of a violation with one prior in the previous 10 years punishable as a felony, the person is subject to a mandatory 48-month IID term. (Veh. Code, § 13353.75, subd. (h)(2).)
- 20) Requires an IID manufacturer to agree to provide functioning, certified IIDs to DUI offenders at reduced costs when the offender is eligible for reduced costs. Provides that the failure of the manufacturer, its agents, or authorized installers to comply with the fee schedule specifying reduced fees for eligible offenders will result in suspension or revocation of the DMV's approval for the manufacturer to market IIDs in this state. (Veh. Code, § 13386, subd. (h).)
- 21) Requires every IID manufacturer and manufacturer's agent certified by the DMV to provide IIDs to adopt the following fee schedule that provides for the payment of the costs of the certified IID by offenders in amounts commensurate with that person's income relative to the federal poverty level (FPL):
- a) A person with an income at 100 percent of the FPL or below and who provides income verification is responsible for 10 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - b) A person with an income at 101 to 200 percent of the FPL and who provides income verification is responsible for 25 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - c) A person with an income at 201 to 300 percent of the FPL and who provides income verification is responsible for 50 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - d) A person who is receiving CalFresh benefits and who provides proof of those benefits to the manufacturer or manufacturer's agent or authorized installer is responsible for 50 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - e) A person with an income at 301 to 400 percent of the FPL and who provides income verification is responsible for 90 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - f) All other offenders are responsible for 100 percent of the cost of the IID.
 - g) The manufacturer is responsible for the percentage of costs for which the offender is not responsible. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (k)(1).)

- 22) Requires the IID provider to verify the offender's income to determine the cost of the IID by verifying specified following documents. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (k)(2).)
- 23) Establishes a statewide IID pilot program, which sunsets on January 1, 2033, that does the following:
- a) Requires a court to order the installation of an IID for repeat DUI offenders and any DUI causing bodily injury to another person, as follows:
 - i) For a period of one year for a person convicted of a DUI involving alcohol (or both alcohol and drugs) with one prior, or a first-time DUI causing bodily injury to another person;
 - ii) For a period of two years for a person convicted of a DUI involving alcohol (or both alcohol and drugs) with two priors, or a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with one prior;
 - iii) For a period of three years for a person convicted of a DUI involving alcohol (or both alcohol and drugs) with three or more priors, a DUI causing bodily injury to another person with two priors, or a prior specified DUI conviction punishable as a felony. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(B)-(D).)
 - b) Authorizes the court to order the installation of an IID for a first-time DUI offender for a period not to exceed six months from the date of conviction, or allows the offender to apply for a restricted driver's license upon specified conditions. Specifies that only one of these sanctions may be imposed. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subd. (h)(1)(A).).
- 24) Requires a person subject to an IID to arrange for each vehicle they operate to be equipped by a functioning, certified IID by a certified provider, provide proof of installation to the DMV, and pay a fee, determined by the DMV, sufficient to cover the costs of administration. (Veh. Code, § 23575.3, subds. (d) & (f).)

This bill:

- 1) Requires the DMV to immediately suspend the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle when the person was driving a motor vehicle when a passenger for hire was a passenger in the vehicle when the person had a 0.04 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood.

- 2) Requires a person subject to an administrative license suspension for a DUI involving alcohol to apply for a restricted license after a 30-day license suspension.
- 3) Eliminates the course of employment exception to the IID requirement in order to obtain a restricted license for purposes of an administrative license suspension.
- 4) Establishes the following license suspension timelines for a drug-only DUI conviction:
 - a) For a first DUI, the privilege is suspended for 6 months.
 - b) For a DUI causing bodily injury, the privilege is suspended for 12 months.
 - c) For a second DUI, the privilege is suspended for 24 months.
 - d) For a second DUI causing bodily injury, the privilege is suspended for 36 months.
 - e) For a DUI with two priors, the privilege is suspended for 36 months.
 - f) For a DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, the privilege is suspended for 48 months.
 - g) For any DUI with three or more priors, the privilege is suspended for 60 months.
- 5) Requires that certain conditions are met for the driving privilege (suspended due to a drug-only DUI) to be reinstated. Requires that the person provide proof of financial responsibility to DMV, provide proof of successful completion of a licensed DUI program, as specified, and pay all reinstatement and reissue fees.
- 6) Allows a person subject to a license suspension for a drug-only DUI to apply for a restricted license if the person provides proof of financial responsibility to DMV, completes a minimum specified period of the suspension period, provides proof of enrollment or participation in a licensed DUI program, as specified, and pays all reinstatement and reissue fees.
- 7) Requires a DUI program that a person is required to be enrolled in to report any failure to participate in the program to the DMV. Outlines a process to request a review of the finding that the person has failed to comply with the program requirements to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), requires DHCS to review the request, and requires DHCS to notify the person and the DUI program of their finding. Permits the DMV to reinstate any restricted license terminated as a result of the notification.

- 8) Requires, upon a conviction for a DUI involving alcohol, the driving privilege to be suspended. Prohibits the privilege from being reinstated until the person meets specified requirements, including maintaining a restricted license (which requires the installation of an IID) for a specified period of time. Provides the following restricted license periods:
 - a) For a first DUI, restricted license for 6 months.
 - b) For a first DUI causing bodily injury, restricted license for 12 months.
 - c) For a DUI with one prior, restricted license for 24 months.
 - d) For a DUI causing bodily injury with one prior, restricted license for 36 months.
 - e) For a DUI with two priors, restricted license for 36 months.
 - f) For a DUI causing bodily injury with two priors, restricted license for 48 months.
 - g) For a DUI with three priors, restricted license for 60 months.
 - h) For a first DUI with a BAC of .20 or higher, restricted license for 10 months.
- 9) Allows a first-time DUI offender to opt for suspension of their driving privilege in lieu of maintaining a restricted license and IID.
- 10) Revises the fee schedule for reduced IID fees as follows:
 - a) A person with an income at 125 percent of the FPL or below and who provides income verification is responsible for 10 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - b) A person with an income at 126 to 225 percent of the FPL and who provides income verification is responsible for 25 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
 - c) A person with an income at 226 to 325 percent of the FPL and who provides income verification is responsible for 50 percent of the cost of the manufacturer's standard IID program costs, and any additional costs accrued by the person for noncompliance with program requirements.
- 11) Provides that a person is not responsible for any IID costs, including installation, service, and maintenance, due to malfunctions of the IID unrelated to the person's non-compliance.

- 12) States that its provisions do not go into effect until January 1, 2031.
- 13) Makes other technical and conforming changes, including repealing existing provisions of law made obsolete by the provisions of this bill.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Significant one-time and ongoing state costs (Motor Vehicle Account (MVA), General Fund) to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). DMV reports that it would be required to modify forms, promulgate regulations, and make IT modifications prior to the January 1, 2031, implementation date. DMV indicates that these costs are estimated at \$3-6 million. Ongoing costs within the range would depend on the technology solutions ultimately adopted. The bill includes cost-recovery mechanisms through the restriction and reinstatement process, similar to those used in the existing pilot program. These estimates do not account for any supplemental funding that may be available (such as through the Office of Traffic Safety) to support implementation and help offset costs.

The MVA, the primary funding account for the California Highway Patrol and the DMV is facing insolvency. In a report, the LAO noted that, “Until a plan is put in place to address MVA’s structural deficit, we recommend the Legislature set a high bar for considering approval of any proposals that create additional MVA cost pressures and accelerate the risk of insolvency.” In the Governor’s proposed 2026-2027 budget, the Governor stated that, “the Budget currently projects that the MVA will be insolvent as soon as 2028-29. Given the ongoing fiscal constraints in the MVA, the Administration will continue to limit new workload or initiatives, including those with delayed implementation dates that would create additional cost pressures over time.”

Unknown, potential state costs to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to review relevant documents or evidence and to make determinations of whether a person failed to participate in a DUI program, as specified, and to notify the person and the DUI program of their findings.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

SAFE California Roads Coalition (source)
AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety

Alcohol Justice
 American College of Surgeons, Southern California Chapter
 Auto Club of Southern California
 California Alcohol Policy Alliance
 California Association of Highway Patrolmen
 California Coalition for Women Prisoners
 California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals
 California Professional Firefighters
 City of Sunnyvale
 Foundation for Advancing Alcohol Responsibility
 Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
 Mothers Against Drunk Driving
 National Alliance to Stop Impaired Driving
 Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment
 Yolo County District Attorney

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/13/26)

ACLU California Action
 California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
 California Coalition for Women Prisoners
 California Public Defenders Association
 Courage California
 Debt Free Justice California
 Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
 Justice2Jobs Coalition
 La Defensa
 Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union
 San Francisco Public Defender
 Smart Justice California
 Universidad Popular

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías,
 Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo,
 Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel,
 Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney,
 Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lee,
 Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan,
 Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez,

Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache,
Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Bonta, Bryan, Elhawary, Kalra, Quirk-Silva, Celeste
Rodriguez

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /
8/19/26 21:37:55

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1841
Author: Ramos (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE GOVERNMENTAL ORG. COMMITTEE: 14-0, 6/23/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarado-Gil

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: State holidays: Native American Day

SOURCE: Author

This bill, upon appropriation by the Legislature, entitles state employees to a holiday on the fourth Friday in September, known as “Native American Day,” in lieu of a personal holiday, as specified, and authorizes any state bargaining unit to negotiate for a paid holiday on Native American Day, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 incorporate additional changes to the Government Code proposed by SB 1394.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 address conflicting statutory chaptering issues with similar legislation, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/18/26 require that the implementation of this bill be contingent upon appropriation by the Legislature, rather than upon the determination of the Department of Human Resources that sufficient funds exist to provide a holiday for all state employees, and add coauthors, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) States that it is the policy of the state that the workweek of the state employee is 40 hours, and the workday of state employees is eight hours, except as specified.
- 2) Provides that all state employees are entitled to the following holidays: January 1, the third Monday in January, the third Monday in February, March 31, the last Monday in May, July 4, the first Monday in September, November 11, Thanksgiving Day, the day after Thanksgiving, December 25, the day chosen by an employee as a personal holiday, and every day appointed by the Governor of this state for a public fast, thanksgiving, or holiday.
- 3) Authorizes any state employee to elect to receive eight hours of holiday credit for the date known as “Lunar New Year,” the date known as “Genocide Remembrance Day,” the date known as “Diwali,” the date known as “Juneteenth,” or the date known as “Native American Day,” in lieu of receiving eight hours of personal holiday credit, as specified.
- 4) Authorizes a state employee to elect to receive eight hours of holiday credit for observance of a holiday or ceremony of the state employee’s religion, culture, or heritage in lieu of receiving eight hours of personal holiday credit, as specified.
- 5) Entitles every employee, upon completion of six months of his or her initial probationary period in state service, to one personal holiday per fiscal year, as specified.
- 6) Establishes the fourth Friday in September, known as “Native American Day,” as a holiday in this state.

This bill:

- 1) Provides that, upon appropriation by the Legislature, all state employees shall be entitled to a holiday on the fourth Friday in September, known as “Native American Day,” in lieu of the personal holiday, as specified.
- 2) Authorizes any state bargaining unit to negotiate to receive this day as a paid holiday as a part of their memorandum of understanding (MOU).

Background

Author Statement. According to the author's office, "Native American Day is a celebration honoring California's First People, their cultures, their achievements, and their resilience after centuries of violence and discrimination. It serves as a reminder that while the state has taken meaningful steps toward addressing the historical injustices committed against Native communities, the work of healing the deep scars that remain has only begun. Establishing Native American Day as an official state holiday affirms the state's commitment to building a long and meaningful relationship with its sovereign tribes. It acknowledges that despite years of displacement and violence, California's First People remain and will continue to be an essential part of the state's history and culture."

Native American Day. Among other things, information provided by the author states that, "[under] Section 19853 of the Gov. Code, Native American Day, the 4th Friday of September, is listed as one of the available holidays state employees may observe using their yearly allowance of personal holidays." While this policy acknowledges Native American Day as a holiday and allows state employees the option to observe it with pay, the policy does not adequately emphasize the significance of this day to California's history and culture.

In 2021, the California Legislature passed AB 855 (Ramos, Chapter 283, Statutes of 2021) making Native American Day a paid judicial holiday and removing Columbus Day from its approved list of observed holidays. This change was part of the Judicial Branch's ongoing efforts to modernize itself and provide recognition of the importance of diversity within the court system. However, while the Judicial Branch now formally observes Native American Day, the remainder of state government does not. Under current law, most state employees may observe the day only by using a personal holiday, which results in an uneven recognition and inconsistent treatment of this important cultural holiday for California tribes. This bill is intended to correct that disparity and ensure that Native American Day is recognized uniformly across all branches of state government.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 2017 (Haney, 2026) would add the first day of the month of Shawwal in the Islamic lunar calendar, known as "Eid al-Fitr," and the 10th day of the month of Dhu al-Hijjah in the Islamic lunar calendar, known as "Eid al-Adha" to the existing list of state holidays, as specified. (Pending on the Senate Floor)

AB 2294 (Ta, 2026) designates “Sylvia Mendez Day” as a state holiday, as specified. (Pending on the Senate Floor)

AB 2455 (Haney, 2026, Chapter 49, Statutes of 20026) requires the Governor to annually proclaim May 17 as “Bruce Lee Day,” and designates and sets apart that date each year as having special significance, as specified.

AB 855 (Ramos, Chapter 283, Statutes of 2021) replaced Columbus Day with Native American Day as an approved judicial holiday.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, CalHR reports annual costs of approximately \$16.3 million (\$12.2 million General Fund) to provide state employees with an additional paid holiday. While the bill makes the holiday contingent upon a determination by CalHR, the department notes that assessing fund sufficiency falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Finance.

Additionally, if the holiday is phased in over-time across multiple bargaining units, CalHR notes that overall state costs will change, and likely increase, depending on unit membership, salary ranges, and future wage increases.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/21/26)

California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California Native Vote Project
California Rural Indian Health Board, INC.
Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Office of the Mayor - City of San Bernardino
Redding Rancheria
Service Employees International Union, Local 1000
Wilton Rancheria
Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation
Yurok Tribe

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/21/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: In support of this bill, the California Native American Vote Project writes that, “[a]s an organization dedicated to advancing

civic engagement and political power in Native American communities across California, the California Native Vote Project works to ensure Native voices are heard, respected, and represented at all levels of government. Recognizing Native American Day as an official state holiday aligns with our mission to uplift Native identities, cultures, and histories, and reflects an ongoing commitment to equity, visibility, and tribal sovereignty.”

Further, “AB 1841 would make Native American Day, the fourth Friday in September, an official paid holiday for state employees. We believe this bill elevates the importance of this historic day, not just for native people, but all Californians. Native American Day is a celebration of the resilience of California’s First People and their struggle for survival. More importantly, it serves as a reminder to all that there is still more work to be done to help heal the scars of violence and discrimination that many tribes bare to this day.

And finally, “[i]n addition to its symbolic importance, Native American Day would serve as an opportunity for the public to learn more about California’s history. Formal recognition would encourage communities to dedicate time to learning about the people who inhabited these lands long before it was ever a state.”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/26/26

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

Prepared by: Brian Duke / G.O. / (916) 651-1530
8/30/26 14:44:15

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1871
Author: Fong (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/17/26

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

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Pupil instruction: dual enrollment: College and Career Access
Pathways partnerships

SOURCE: Hispanas Organized for Political Equality

DIGEST: This bill changes the College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) dual enrollment program by removing the requirement that participating students obtain a principal recommendation, requiring CCAP agreements to permit students to complete a single community college application for the duration of their participation, eliminating the existing limit of four college courses per term while retaining the 15-unit cap, and revising state reporting requirements to emphasize student outcomes.

Senate floor amendments of 8/28/26 add the Education Commissioner to the list of entities to which the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges is required to submit the annual CCAP report.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes community college districts to enter into a CCAP partnership agreements with school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to expand dual enrollment opportunities for students who may not already be college-bound or who are underrepresented in higher education. (Education Code (EC) § 76004)
- 2) Requires CCAP partnership agreements to be approved by the governing boards of participating entities and to include specified provisions related to courses offered, information sharing, facilities use, and student participation. (EC § 76004)
- 3) Requires, as part of CCAP participation protocols, parental consent and a principal recommendation, and provides that participating students need only submit one parental consent form and principal recommendation during their participation in the partnership. (EC § 76004)
- 4) Requires the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to revise the special part-time student application process so that a student participating in a CCAP partnership may complete a single community college application for the duration of participation. (EC § 76004)
- 5) Authorizes a student participating in a CCAP partnership to enroll in up to 15 units per term if specified conditions are met, provided those units constitute no more than four community college courses per term. (EC § 76004)
- 6) Requires participating community college districts and local educational agencies to annually report specified participation and completion data to the Chancellor's Office, including enrollment, course-taking, course completion, and full-time equivalent students (FTES) information. (EC § 76004)

This bill:

- 1) Deletes the requirement that CCAP participation protocols require a student to obtain a recommendation from the principal to participate in a CCAP partnership.
- 2) Requires CCAP partnership agreements to establish protocols authorizing participating students to complete a single community college application for the duration of their attendance as a special part-time student under the CCAP partnership.

- 3) Removes the existing limitation that restricts CCAP students enrolled under the 15-unit exception to no more than four community college courses per term.
- 4) Retains the existing 15-unit maximum per term for participating students.
- 5) Revises annual reporting requirements by replacing the requirement to report the total number of community college courses taken by CCAP participants with outcome-oriented measures.
- 6) Requires annual reporting of the total number of participating students who:
 - a) Successfully complete 12 or more units of college coursework before graduation;
 - b) Complete a certificate; or
 - c) Complete the coursework required for an associate degree or an associate degree for transfer.
- 7) Requires reporting of successful course completions by instructional modality, including online and in-person coursework.
- 8) Adds the Education Commissioner to the list of entities to which the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges is required to submit the annual CCAP report.

Comments

- 1) *Need for the bill.* According to the author, “CCAP program was established to enable high school students to take college courses at their school sites, easing logistical barriers. CCAP is an invaluable resource for high school students, setting students up for success in both their academic and professional lives. Despite the benefits of dual enrollment programs, dual enrollment participation has not been equitable for all students. According to the CCCCCO, participation rates were measured at 13.9% among white students, 10.9% among Latino students, and 10.8% among the socioeconomically disadvantaged.

“AB 1871 will ensure more equitable access to dual enrollment opportunities for all students by streamlining the application process so that a student completes only one application for the duration of their attendance at a

community college as a unique part-time student participating in a CCAP agreement. This will avoid confusion of the application process and remove an unnecessary hurdle that limits access to dual enrollment opportunities. To address potential bias in application approvals, this bill will also remove the requirement that the school principal approves a student's CCAP application. Applicants from certain racial or ethnic backgrounds may be unfairly favored or discriminated against, which has led to biased outcomes in approving applications. Furthermore, this bill will eliminate the four community college courses per term limit to give students flexibility in meeting the current 15-unit cap on dual enrollment courses. By removing this restriction, students can accumulate more college credits while still in high school, easing the transition to college and reducing future tuition costs. Lastly, AB 1871 will streamline the CCAP reporting requirements so that more outcome-driven data is collected to evaluate the program effectively.”

- 2) *Continued legislative interest in expanding dual enrollment participation.* Over the last decade, the Legislature has made significant investments in dual enrollment as a strategy to improve college access, accelerate postsecondary attainment, and strengthen college and career pathways. Those efforts include the creation of the CCAP framework in 2015, subsequent statutory refinements, and more recent state investments through the Golden State Pathways Program and Dual Enrollment Funding Opportunity Program. Participation has grown substantially during that period, with nearly 150,000 California students participating in dual enrollment by the Class of 2024. Research consistently finds that students who participate in dual enrollment are more likely to enroll in college, accumulate postsecondary credits, and complete degrees.

This bill continues that policy trend by focusing on administrative barriers that stakeholders argue may discourage student participation without directly advancing academic goals.

- 3) *Administrative streamlining versus local discretion.* Several provisions of this bill seek to simplify participation in CCAP partnerships. Requiring students to repeatedly complete community college applications and obtain principal recommendations may create additional administrative steps that vary across local partnerships. This bill therefore standardizes certain participation procedures and reduces local gatekeeping requirements.

At the same time, the Legislature may wish to consider whether the principal recommendation requirement serves any meaningful purpose within the CCAP

framework. Existing law already requires parental consent and local partnership agreements approved by governing boards. If principal recommendations are rarely used to screen students or identify readiness concerns, their removal may have little practical effect. Conversely, if some districts rely on principal recommendations as part of local student support and advising processes, the bill would reduce local discretion in favor of a more uniform statewide approach.

- 4) *Aligning reporting requirements with student outcomes.* Current law primarily emphasizes participation metrics, such as enrollment levels, courses taken, and course completion rates. This bill shifts part of the reporting framework toward student outcomes, including completion of at least 12 college units, certificates, and coursework leading to associate degrees or associate degrees for transfer.

This change reflects a broader policy question regarding how the success of dual enrollment programs should be measured. While participation data remains useful for understanding access and scale, outcome measures may provide a clearer picture of whether students are progressing along meaningful postsecondary pathways. The additional data required by this bill could help policymakers evaluate not only how many students participate in CCAP partnerships, but also whether those experiences are translating into measurable academic progress before high school graduation.

- 5) *Course limits and accelerated pathways.* Current law allows CCAP students to enroll in up to 15 units per term but separately limits those units to no more than four college courses. Because many community college courses carry three units, the four-course restriction can effectively prevent some students from fully utilizing the 15-unit authorization.

By removing the course-count limitation while retaining the overall unit cap, the bill creates greater flexibility for students enrolled in structured pathways designed to lead to certificates, credentials, or degree completion. The change appears intended to better align statutory course limits with the Legislature's growing interest in accelerated college and career pathways that allow students to accumulate meaningful postsecondary credit while still in high school.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

This bill could result in annual Proposition 98 General Fund costs, potentially in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for additional state apportionments due to increased CCAP enrollment and program participation. However, the bill's exact costs would depend on the number of new students that participate and the number of courses being taken.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Hispanas Organized for Political Equality (source)
Advanced Consulting, LLC
Alameda County Office of Education
Alliance for a Better Community
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Associated General Contractors, California Chapters
Black Women Organized for Political Action
Blu Educational Foundation
California Alliance of Dual Enrollment Partnerships
California Catholic Conference
California Charter Schools Association
California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office
California Community Foundation
California EDGE Coalition
Campaign for College Opportunity
Career Ladders Project
Career Launch Path
Central American Resource Center of California
Children Now
College for All Coalition
Community College League of California
Consejo de Federaciones Mexicanas
EdTrust-West
Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
Future Leaders of America
Go Public Schools
Immigrants Rising
Innercity Struggle
Journey House
Just Equations
Kid City Hope Place
Latino and Latina Roundtable of the San Gabriel and Pomona Valley
Latino Education Advancement Foundation

Linked Learning Alliance
Long Beach Community College District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles Urban Foundation
Mission Graduates
NextGen California
Prismatic Research & Strategy
Puente Learning Center
San Diego Unified School District
Small School Districts Association
Southern California College Attainment Network
Student Senate for California Community Colleges
The RP Group
uAspire
UC Student Association
Unite-LA
University of California Student Association
Young Invincibles

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26

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

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/31/26 0:07:33

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1903
Author: Wicks (D) and Wilson (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/30/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Construction defects

SOURCE: California Building Industry Association

DIGEST: This bill makes various changes to construction defect law, including: providing the builder an opportunity to obtain a release or waiver, upon agreement with the claimant, in exchange for repairs effective one year after repairs; providing a builder the ability to bring a motion to dismiss for failing to substantially comply to pre-litigation requirements; and increasing the requirements for notices of claims, and more.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 remove sections 1, 2, and 3 of the bill, pertaining to definitions and the applicable construction defect standards, remove section 4 of the bill relating to violations of any standard from hairline cracking, efflorescence, temporary moisture condensation, and staining; remove section 8 of the bill that amends Civil Code Section 930; and amends the language relating to a permissible release or waiver to state that a builder may obtain such a release in exchange for repairs, with the agreement of the claimant.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 add to this bill's provisions that substantially amend various sections of the construction defects standards in Civil Code sections 895 and 896, including to require damage to another component part for various defects; add a new section of the standards that make any hairline cracking, efflorescence, temporary moisture condensation, or staining outside of the living

space not a violation unless they result in damage to another building component; specify that the release applies effective one year after the conclusion of the repair; remove the requirement that any nonspeculative, present physical damage to another component part; make its provisions prohibiting an insurer from asserting that repairs are a voluntary payment effective July 1, 2027; remove this bill's provisions regarding investigative costs; add a provision that specifies that its amendments apply to structures subject to these provisions regardless of the date of substantial completion or close of escrow, except for when a claim for which a notice of claim has been served before this bill's operative date, or an action or proceeding commenced before the operative date; and add a severability clause.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that, in any action seeking recovery of damages arising out of, or related to deficiencies in, the residential construction, design, specifications, surveying, planning, supervision, testing, or observation of construction, a builder, general contractor, subcontractor, material supplier, individual product manufacturer, or design professional is generally liable for, and the claimant's claims or causes of action are to be limited to, violations of the building performance standards articulated in law. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 896.)
- 2) Requires a homeowner to follow all reasonable maintenance obligations and schedules communicated in writing to the homeowner by the builder and product manufacturers, as well as commonly accepted maintenance practice. (Civ. Code § 907.)
- 3) Requires, prior to filing any action for construction defect, a claimant or their legal representative to provide written notice via certified mail, overnight mail, or personal delivery to the builder of the claimant's claims that the construction of their property violates any of the performance standards specified in (1), above. (Civ. Code § 910.)
- 4) Requires the notice in (3) to include the claimant's name, address, and preferred method of contact, to state that the claimant alleges a violation against the builder, and to describe the claim in reasonable detail sufficient to determine the nature and location, to the extent known, of the claimed violation unless the claimant is within a homeowner's association in which case the notice may identify the claimants solely by address or other description sufficient to apprise the builder of the locations of the subject residences. (Civ. Code § 910.)

- 5) Requires a builder to acknowledge the receipt of a notice of a construction defect within 14 days after receipt of the notice of the claim, and if the claim is served by the claimant's legal representative, or if the builder receives a written representation letter from a homeowner's attorney, the builder must include the attorney in all subsequent substantive communications, including, without limitation, all written communications and all substantive and procedural communications, including all written communications, following the commencement of any subsequent complaint or other legal action, except that if the builder has retained or involved legal counsel to assist the builder in this process, all communications by the builder's counsel shall only be with the claimant's legal representative, if any. (Civ. Code § 913.)
- 6) Permits a builder, within 30 days of the initial or, if requested, second inspection or testing, to offer in writing to repair the violation. (Civ. Code § 917.)
- 7) Provides that if the builder fails to complete the repair within the time specified in a repair plan, the claimant may proceed with the filing of an action. (Civ. Code § 925.)
- 8) Prohibits a builder from obtaining a release or waiver of any kind in exchange for the repair work mandated by law, and that at the conclusion of the repair, the claimant may proceed with filing an action for violation of the applicable standard or for a claim of inadequate repair, or both. (Civ. Code § 927.)
- 9) Provides that if the applicable statute of limitations has otherwise run during the repair process, the time period for filing a complaint or other legal remedies for a construction defect claim, or for a claim of inadequate repair, is extended from the time of the original claim by the claimant to 100 days after the repair is completed, whether or not the particular violation is the one being repaired. (Civ. Code § 927.)
- 10) Provides that a builder may make a cash offer and not repair a defect and that a reasonable release of claims may be obtained in exchange for the cash payment. (Civ. Code § 929.)
- 11) Requires, in order to make a claim for violation of the performance standards of 1), a homeowner need only demonstrate, in accordance with the applicable

evidentiary standard, that the home does not meet the applicable standard, subject to the affirmative defenses set forth in law. (Civ. Code § 942.)

- 12) Provides that, if a claim for damages is made relating to a construction defect, the homeowner is only entitled to damages for the reasonable value of repairing any violation of the standards, the reasonable cost of repairing any damages caused by the repair efforts, the reasonable cost of repairing and rectifying any damages resulting from the failure of the home to meet the standards, the reasonable cost of removing and replacing any improper repair by the builder, reasonable relocation and storage expenses, lost business income if the home was used as a principal place of a business licensed to be operated from the home, reasonable investigative costs for each established violation, and all other costs or fees recoverable by contract or statute. (Civ. Code § 944.)
- 13) Provides that the provisions of (1) through (13) apply only to new residential units where the purchase agreement with the buyer was signed by the seller on or after January 1, 2003. (Civ. Code § 938.)
- 14) Authorizes a homeowner's association to institute, defend, settle, or intervene in litigation, arbitration, mediation, or administrative proceedings in its own name as the real party in interest and without joining with it the members, in matters pertaining to the following:
 - a) Enforcement of the governing documents;
 - b) Damage to the common area;
 - c) Damage to a separate interest that the association is obligated to maintain or repair; and
 - d) Damage to a separate interest that arises out of, or is integrally related to, damage to the common area or a separate interest that the association is obligated to maintain or repair. (Civ. Code § 5980.)
- 15) Requires that a homeowner's association board, no later than 30 days before filing of any civil action by the association against the declarant or other developer of a common interest development for alleged damage to the common areas, alleged damage to the separate interests that the association is obligated to maintain or repair, or alleged damage to the separate interests that arises out of, or is integrally related to, damage to the common areas or separate interests that the association is obligated to maintain or repair, provide a written notice to each member of the association who appears on the records of the association when the notice is provided. (Civ. Code § 6150.)

16) Defines the following terms:

- a) “Structure” means any residential dwelling, other building, or improvement located upon a lot or within a common area;
- b) “Claimant” or “homeowner” includes the individual owners of single-family homes, individual unit owners of attached dwellings and, in the case of a common interest development, any association; and
- c) “designed moisture barrier” and “actual moisture barrier.” (Civ. Code § 895.)

This bill:

- 1) Specifies that, for the written notice of claim described in (3), above, the notice must:
 - a) state that the claimant alleges a violation pursuant to the construction defect laws against the builder;
 - b) be signed by the claimant; and
 - c) include:
 - i. the claimant’s name, address, and preferred method of contact;
 - ii. a description of the claimed violation in reasonable detail sufficient to determine the nature and location, to the extent known, of the claimed violation; and
 - iii. evidence of the claimed violation, including copies of any reasonably available photographs, estimates, or reports relating to any claimed violation to the extent they exist at the time the notice is provided, and the specific location of the evidence.
- 2) Specifies that this notice shall have the same force and effect as a notice of commencement of a legal proceeding.
- 3) Removes the prohibition on a builder obtaining a release or waiver in exchange for a repair, and instead permits the builder, with agreement with the claimant, to obtain a release or waiver of any kind in exchange for the repair work effective one year after the conclusion of the repair.
- 4) Provides that, if a claimant does not substantially comply to the pre-litigation procedures, the builder may bring a motion to dismiss without prejudice in any court action, or a motion to stay until the requirements are satisfied in the alternative. Specifies that the court, in its discretion, may award a prevailing

party their reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing or opposing the motion.

- 5) Requires, in order to make a claim for a violation of the performance standards, a claimant must affirmatively demonstrate:
 - a) There is a violation of the applicable standard; and
 - b) The violation is caused by the original construction.
- 6) Prohibits, effective July 1, 2027, an insurer from asserting repairs as a voluntary payment or as payment made without the insurer's consent, or from denying counting the costs associated with those repairs, whether pursuant to a warranty or not, against a deductible or self-insured retention.
- 7) Specifies that an action may not be filed for a particular violation unless the conditions for filing the action for that violation have been met, unless agreed to by the parties.
- 8) Specifies that its amendments to the law apply to structures subject to the construction defect provisions regardless of the date of substantial completion or close of escrow, except for a claim for which a notice was served before the operative date of these amendments and any action or proceeding commenced before the operative date of this bill.
- 9) Provides a severability clause.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/2026)

California Building Industry Association (source)

21st Century Alliance

Abundant Housing LA

Abundant Housing Los Angeles

American Council of Engineering Companies of California

American Institute of Architects California

American Subcontractors Association-California

Anthony Tordillos - Councilmember, City of San Jose

Associated General Contractors

Associated General Contractors, California

Bay Area Council

Brian Barnacle - Councilmember, Petaluma

Cal Chamber
CalAsian Chamber of Commerce
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Conference of Carpenters
California Council for Affordable Housing
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California Housing Consortium
California YIMBY
California's Largest Cities
Casita Coalition
Chamber of Progress
Chris Ricci - Modesto City Councilmember
Circulate Planning & Policy
City of Bakersfield
City of Berkeley Councilmember Rashi Kesarwani
City of Burbank
City of El Cerrito
City of Foster City
City of Los Angeles
City of Mountain View
City of Redwood City
City of Sacramento
City of San Mateo
City of Thousand Oaks
Claremont City Councilmember, Jed Leano
Council of Infill Builders
Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky, City of Los Angeles
East Bay YIMBY
Emily Ann Ramos - Mayor, Mountain View
End Poverty in California (EPIC)
Everybody's Long Beach
Fieldstead and Company, Inc.
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greenbelt Alliance
Gregorio Gomez - Councilmember, Farmersville
Grow the Richmond
Habitat for Humanity California
House Sacramento

Housing Action Coalition
Housing Trust Silicon Valley
Long Beach; City of
Lucas Ramirez - Councilmember, Mountain View
Matthew Solomon, Councilmember - Emeryville
Mayor Matt Mahan, City of San Jose
Mayor Todd Gloria, City of San Diego
Monterey Bay Economic Partnership
Monterey Park Councilmember Thomas Wong
Monterey Peninsula YIMBY
Mountain View YIMBY
Napa-solano for Everyone
Neighbors for a Better San Diego
Neighborhood Partnership Housing Services Inc.
New California Coalition
New Way Homes
Northern Neighbors
Orange County Business Council
Peninsula for Everyone
People for Housing - Orange County
Phoebe Shin Venkat - Councilmember, Foster City
Rebecca Saltzman, El Cerrito Councilmember
Sacramento Councilmember Caity Maple
San Diego Housing Commission
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
San Jose YIMBY
San Mateo Forward
Santa Cruz YIMBY
Santa Rosa YIMBY
SF YIMBY
South Bay YIMBY
Southern California Black Chamber of Commerce
Southern California Leadership Council
Student Homes Coalition
The Two Hundred for Homeownership
Ventura County YIMBY
Yes! in Redwood City
YIMBY Action
YIMBY Los Angeles

YIMBY SLO

Zach Hilton - Councilmember, Gilroy
Zillow Group

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/2026)

97 individuals

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the California Building Industries Association and a number of other industry and pro-housing groups, which support this bill:

Homeownership is one of the most reliable and widely supported ways to achieve long-term financial stability. However, for many Californians, especially first-time buyers, the path to ownership has become increasingly challenging due to limited housing supply, high prices, and barriers that hinder the production of affordable homes.

California's residential construction defect law, established through SB 800 (2002), was intended to create a fair and efficient process for resolving defect claims while giving builders the opportunity to repair problems before litigation. Over time, however, that system has too often shifted away from timely repairs and toward costly, prolonged litigation. As a result, homeowners are often left waiting years for issues to be resolved, while the costs and uncertainty associated with litigation have made it harder to build condominiums and other multifamily ownership housing.

AB 1903 restores the original intent of the law by strengthening the right to repair, improving clarity and transparency in the claims process, and helping ensure disputes are resolved more efficiently. By realigning incentives to address legitimate construction issues and reduce unnecessary litigation risk, the bill will better support homeowners while also making it more feasible to build attainable missing-middle homes in California.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/26/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patterson, Pellerin,

Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers,
Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria,
Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Bryan, Connolly, Garcia, Kalra, Lee,
Muratsuchi, Patel, Celeste Rodriguez, Valencia

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
8/30/26 21:40:21

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1969
Author: Bonta (D), Alvarez (D) and Jackson (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

Prior Senate votes not relevant pursuant to Senate Rule 29.10(c)

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/26/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Community Schools Partnership Program: Promise Neighborhoods

SOURCE: GRACE/End Child Poverty CA

DIGEST: This bill 1) requires a local educational agency (LEA) that elects to retain up to 10% of California Community Schools Partnership Program (CCSPP) funds for its eligible schoolsites to use those funds in a way that is consistent with the Community School framework; and 2) requires LEAs to, among other things, use those funds to serve as a network lead for multiple eligible schoolsites located in a Promise Neighborhood.

Senate floor amendments of 8/28/26 incorporate double-jointing language to avoid chaptering out issues with AB 133 and SB 133.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes, in federal law, the Promise Neighborhood program, which provides grants to nonprofit organizations, tribal organizations, or institutions of higher education, which, together with partners, develop and implement plans to

significantly improve outcomes of children living in a given neighborhood.
(Title 20 United States Code (USC) § 7274)

- 2) Defines “community school” to mean a public school serving preschool, transitional kindergarten, kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, with strong and intentional community partnerships ensuring pupil learning and whole child and family development, and specifically includes the following:
 - a) Integrated supports services, including the coordination of trauma-informed health, mental health, and social services that ensure coordination and support with county and LEA resources and nongovernmental organizations, and early screening and intervention for learning and other needs.
 - b) Family, pupil, schoolsite staff, and community engagement, which may include home visits, home-school collaboration, culturally responsive community partnerships to strengthen family well-being and stability, and school climate surveys.
 - c) Collaborative leadership and practices for educators and administrators, including professional development to transform school culture and climate, that centers on pupil learning and supports mental and behavioral health, trauma-informed care, social-emotional learning, restorative justice, and other key areas relating to pupil learning and whole child and family development.
 - d) Extended learning time and opportunities, including before and after school care and summer programs. (Education Code (EC) § 8901 (b))
- 3) Defines “Promise Neighborhood” to mean a targeted geographic area served by the Promise Neighborhoods program, as authorized by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114-95), or a collaborative network of service providers that serves geographically defined areas or neighborhoods and focuses on revitalizing economically-disadvantaged communities through the establishment of a cradle-to-career network of services aimed at improving the health, safety, and education of the occupants in the defined area. (EC § 8901(m))
- 4) Requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to adopt and maintain an implementation Framework for the California Community Schools Partnership Act that is responsive to evidence and research on the CCSPP model and outcomes, which shall include, but not be limited to all of the following:

- a) The statutory pillars of integrated supports services; family, pupil, schoolsite staff, and community engagement; collaborative leadership and practices for educators and administrators; and extended learning time and opportunities.
 - b) The key conditions of learning, cornerstone commitments, and proven practices consistent with successful community school research, including, but not limited to, embedded instructional and service coordination practices, shared governance, community engagement, and integration with other community-based approaches like Promise Neighborhoods.
 - c) Required data, reporting, and accountability elements necessary for schoolsites, LEAs, and a system of support for continuous improvement, including, but not limited to, measurable indicators for shared governance, community engagement, and integration of services at the county and regional levels.
 - d) Differentiated elements for elementary and secondary community school models.
 - e) Differentiated measures for LEA and schoolsite readiness to implement a new community school, and achieve certification, as specified.
 - f) Key practices for county coordinators and regional transformational assistance centers. (EC § 8901.5)
- 5) Requires the SBE to review and adopt, as necessary, an updated framework, as specified, on or before January 1, 2030, and every five years thereafter, in response to specified CCSPP evaluation results and certification recommendations, and other research on the program's pupil and system outcomes. (EC § 8901.5)
- 6) Appropriates, for the 2026–27 fiscal year, an initial sum of \$1 billion dollars from the General Fund to the California Department of Education (CDE) to administer the CCSPP. (EC § 8903(b))
- 7) Authorizes an LEA to retain up to 10% of funds awarded pursuant to the CCSPP for its eligible schoolsites each fiscal year. Requires that those funds be used to administer community schools established at eligible schoolsites, manage professional learning and networking, and coordinate services and funding streams for community schools under the LEA with eligible schoolsites. (EC § 8903(f))

This bill:

- 1) Makes a series of legislative findings and declarations on the importance of collaborative approaches such as neighborhood-based partnerships, regional place-based partnerships, and community schools in ensuring that a continuum of services reach children in communities where they are needed the most.
- 2) Establish the intent of the Legislature that the vital contributions provided by community-based and regional networks be brought to scale so that all children and families have the opportunities and continuum of services needed to break the cycle of poverty.
- 3) Requires LEAs that elect to retain up to 10% of CCSPP funds for its eligible schoolsites to use those funds in a way that is consistent with the Community Schools Framework.
- 4) Requires LEAs, among other things, to use those retained funds to serve as a network lead for multiple eligible schoolsites located in a Promise Neighborhood.
- 5) Incorporates additional changes to Section 8903 of the Education Code proposed by SB 133 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) and AB 133 (Gabriel, 2026) to be operative only if this bill and SB 133 or AB 133 are enacted, and this bill is enacted last.

Comments

Need for the bill. According to the author, “California has made historic investments in our children through community schools, universal prekindergarten, expanded learning, behavioral health, school meals, and other programs designed to help children thrive. Yet too often, these investments operate in separate systems, leaving schools and families to navigate a complicated web of programs on their own. AB 1969, the It Takes a Village Act of 2026, builds on California’s historic \$1 billion investment in community schools by providing technical clarification that strengthens the partnerships and infrastructure necessary to make that investment successful over the long term.

“AB 1969 recognizes that community partnerships and coordination are needed. The bill strengthens coordination between local educational agencies, community-based organizations, county offices of education, and Promise Neighborhoods, and allows LEAs to use existing administrative funding to serve as a network lead for multiple community school sites within a Promise Neighborhood. By better coordinating the resources we already invest in children and families, AB 1969

helps ensure students can access the academic, health, behavioral health, and other supports they need to succeed. It takes a village to raise a child, and AB 1969 helps ensure California's public systems work like one.”

Promise Neighborhoods. The Promise Neighborhood Initiative is a federal grant program that seeks to create cradle-to-career pipelines in communities historically impacted by poverty. Modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone in New York City, Promise Neighborhoods serve as a place-based educational approach that connects community members with access to high-quality early care and education, smooth and effective transitions to K-12 schools, and pathways to postsecondary and career success.

Since the first cohort in 2011, Promise Neighborhood program funds have helped grantees establish 46 Promise Neighborhoods across the country, with 356 participating schools. California currently has ten Promise Neighborhood sites located in San Francisco's Mission District, Oakland, Hayward, Los Angeles, Chula Vista, San Diego, Corning, and Klamath River.

According to the California Promise Neighborhood Network, Promise Neighborhood investments have produced successful outcomes for children and families living in economically disadvantaged communities across California. *For examples of outcomes, please refer to the Senate Education Committee analysis.*

California Community Schools Partnership Program. As noted in the SBE's 2022 adopted California Community Schools Framework, a community school is any school serving pre-kindergarten through high school students using a whole-child approach, with an integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement. As a school improvement strategy, community school initiatives enable LEAs and schools to work closely with educators, students, and families to understand and address the unique needs, assets, and aspirations of the school community.

Community schools often include four evidence-informed programmatic features, which are aligned and integrated into high-quality, rigorous teaching and learning practices and environments:

- Integrated support services;
- Family and community engagement;
- Collaborative leadership and practices for educators and administrators; and
- Extended learning time and opportunities.

Since the passage of the California Community Schools Partnership Act in 2021, the Legislature has allocated over \$4.1 billion for the CCSPP. This year's Budget Act approved an additional \$1 billion in ongoing Proposition 98 General Fund for the CCSPP to expand the community school model to more school sites that have large concentrations of students from low-income families, English learners, and youth in foster care.

The CCSPP has long recognized Promise Neighborhoods as a compatible community-based approach, encouraged LEAs to develop partnerships with existing Promise Neighborhood lead agencies, and authorized LEAs that serve as network leads for multiple eligible schoolsites within a Promise Neighborhood to use CCSPP to support planning needs.

This bill amends language from the 2026 Budget Act to require an LEA that elects to retain up to 10% of CCSPP funds for administrative purposes to, among other things, use those funds to serve as a network lead for multiple eligible schoolsites located in a Promise Neighborhood.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

GRACE/End Child Poverty CA (Source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 56-14, 5/21/26

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

NOES: Castillo, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick,
Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis
NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Flora, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey,
Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Schultz

Prepared by: Therresa Austin / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/30/26 16:05:11

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2005
Author: Ahrens (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/10/26
AYES: Durazo, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird
NOES: Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 6-2, 6/30/26
AYES: Arreguín, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cortese, Durazo, Padilla
NOES: Seyarto, Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Gonzalez, Grayson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

SENATE FLOOR: 18-11, 8/25/26
AYES: Allen, Arreguín, Ashby, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Padilla, Richardson, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NOES: Alvarado-Gil, Grayson, Grove, Jones, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares
NO VOTE RECORDED: Archuleta, Becker, Choi, Gonzalez, Hurtado, Pérez, Reyes, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 5/14/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Housing developments: urban lot split: owner-occupancy

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill revises owner-occupancy requirements for an urban lot split under SB 9 (Atkins, Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021) until January 1, 2032.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 delete requirements for a notice of owner-occupancy and a deed restriction requiring owner-occupancy on subsequent owners and instead require the buyer of a parcel or unit to provide to the applicant an affidavit or declaration that they will occupy the parcel for three years. The amendments also revise the entities that can be applicants for an urban lot split and delete the limitation on local agencies adding requirements solely or partially on the basis of the project being an urban lot split.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Allows, under the California Constitution, cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.”
- 2) Requires, under SB 9, a city or county to ministerially approve either or both of the following, as specified:
 - a) A housing development of no more than two units (duplex) in a single-family zone; or,
 - b) The subdivision of a parcel zoned for residential use, into two approximately equal parcels (urban-lot split), as specified.
- 3) Authorizes a city or county to impose objective zoning, subdivision, and design review standards that do not conflict with state standards, except:
 - a) A city or county shall not impose objective standards that would physically preclude the construction of up to two units or that would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area. A city or county may, however, require a setback of up to four feet from the side and rear lot lines; and,
 - b) A city or county shall not require a setback for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as the existing structure.
- 4) Requires a city or county to ministerially approve a parcel map for an urban-lot split only if the local agency determines that the parcel map for the urban-lot split meets specified requirements.

- 5) Provides that a local government shall not be required to permit more than two units on a parcel.
- 6) Requires an applicant for an urban-lot split to sign an affidavit stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the approval of the urban-lot split.

This bill:

- 1) Adds the option for an applicant of an SB 9 urban-lot split to select a different owner occupancy requirement, which shall be imposed as a condition of approval of a parcel map for the lot split, as follows:
 - a) The applicant signs an affidavit stating they intend to sell both parcels of an urban lot split after issuance of a certificate of occupancy within 3 years from the date of the approval of the urban lot split.
 - b) The applicant requires that one of the units on each parcel of the lot split remain owner-occupied for three years, beginning on the date the parcel or unit is conveyed.
 - c) If the applicant selects this option, a home buyer of a parcel or unit designated by the applicant to satisfy the owner-occupancy requirement must provide to the applicant an affidavit or declaration, under penalty of perjury, stating that the home buyer intends to occupy the parcel or unit as the home buyer's primary residence for three years beginning on the date of the conveyance. A failure to comply with this requirement does not invalidate any transfer of title or affect the validity of the parcel.
 - d) The local agency records a notice of the owner-occupancy requirement as a condition of ministerial approval of the parcel map for the lot split.
 - e) The parcel or unit being purchased is subject to a recorded deed restriction imposing the owner-occupancy requirement on any subsequent homebuyer who purchases the parcel or unit during the three-year period.
 - f) The homebuyer records a notice of owner-occupancy as a condition to acquiring title to a parcel or unit. The notice shall state that the homebuyer, and any subsequent homebuyer who purchases the parcel or unit during the three-year period, is required to occupy the parcel or unit or designate the parcel or unit as their primary residence.

- 2) Requires all applicants for SB 9 urban-lot splits to sign an affidavit, under penalty of perjury, stating that they intend to comply with the owner occupancy requirement.
- 3) Allows a natural person who is a trustee of a living trust of a natural person or a LLC of a natural person to be the applicant for an urban-lot split under SB 9.
- 4) Provides that an applicant that is an LLC that violates the SB 9 owner occupancy requirements shall be liable for civil penalties.
- 5) Excludes the boundaries of the 2025 Palisades or Eaton Fires in Los Angeles County from the bill.
- 6) Requires the seller of an urban-lot split under SB 9 to disclose, in writing, any owner occupancy requirement for three years after the conveyance of an urban-lot split if the seller is the managing or authorized member of a LLC or the trustee of a living trust.
- 7) Sunsets the provisions of SB 9 that are added by this bill on January 1, 2032.

Background

Planning and approving new housing is mainly a local responsibility. The California Constitution allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” It is from this fundamental power (commonly called the police power) that cities and counties derive their authority to regulate behavior to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the public—including land use authority.

Planning and Zoning Law. State law provides additional powers and duties for cities and counties regarding land use. The Planning and Zoning Law requires every county and city to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area the plan covers. Cities’ and counties’ major land use decisions—including most zoning ordinances and other aspects of development permitting—must be consistent with their general plans.

Subdivision Map Act. The Subdivision Map Act (or Map Act) governs how local officials regulate the division of real property into smaller parcels for sale, lease, or financing. Cities and counties adopt local subdivision ordinances to carry out the Map Act and local requirements. City councils and county boards of supervisors use the Map Act to control a subdivision's design and improvements. Local subdivision approvals must be consistent with city and county general plans.

Under the Subdivision Map Act, cities and counties can attach scores of conditions. The Map Act allows local officials to require, as a condition of approving a proposed subdivision, the dedication of property within a subdivision for streets, alleys, drainage, utility easements, and other public easements and improvements. Once subdividers comply with those conditions, local officials must issue final maps. For smaller subdivisions that create four or fewer parcels, local officials usually use parcel maps, but they can require tentative parcel maps followed by final parcel maps. The Map Act also constrains the dedications and improvements that local cities and counties can require as a condition of a subdivision of four or fewer lots to only the dedication of rights-of-way, easements, and the construction of reasonable offsite and onsite improvements for the parcels being created.

Senate Bill 9 (Atkins, 2021). SB 9 requires cities and counties to permit ministerially either or both of the following, as long as they meet specified conditions:

- A housing development of no more than two units (a duplex).
- The subdivision of a parcel into two approximately equal parcels (urban lot split).

To be eligible, a development or parcel to be subdivided must be located within an urbanized area or urban cluster, as defined by the United States Census and cannot be located on specified types of sites with certain environmental conditions.

SB 9 requires a city or county to permit a housing development containing no more than two units ministerially in single family zones if the development meets certain conditions, including the requirements on eligible parcels above. A development can include adding one unit to an existing unit, or constructing two new units. In combination, SB 9's provisions allow up to four units to be built in areas where local zoning currently only allows one home.

Owner-occupancy requirements. Among other conditions, SB 9 requires that an applicant for an urban lot split submit a sworn affidavit to the city or county stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the approval of the urban lot split. It also prohibits a local agency from imposing other owner occupancy standards.

Because housing developers focus on selling properties to other owners after they complete construction, SB 9's owner-occupancy requirement effectively prohibits

anyone other than an owner-occupant from building the maximum of four units allowed by the law.

Recent reports on SB 9's effectiveness. In July 2021, as SB 9 was proceeding through the legislative process, the Turner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley (Turner Center) completed an analysis that estimated it could make approximately 700,000 units financially feasible to construct. The report emphasized that this number represents a maximum potential number of units, and was not a forecast of the number of units that would be developed.

After one year of SB 9 implementation, the Turner Center evaluated SB 9's effectiveness through another report. The report found that SB 9's impact has been limited, and some larger cities have only seen a few, if any, applications for lot splits or new units. According to the report:

We found that SB 9 activity is limited or non-existent in these thirteen cities (Table 1). Los Angeles had the most overall activity, with 211 applications for new units under SB 9 in 2022. The state's other large cities all reported very few applications for lot splits or new units. For example, the city of San Diego reported receiving just seven applications for new SB 9 units in 2022. To put these numbers into context, the city of San Diego permitted over 5,000 new homes in all of 2021 and Los Angeles permitted just under 20,000 new homes in 2021.

The report listed a variety of changes that could increase use of the law, including:

- Establishing more flexible standards for new home design—such as larger maximum home sizes and heights—and limiting extra costs—such as impact fees, particularly for single-family home to duplex conversions; and
- Revisiting the owner-occupancy requirement to encourage higher usage, while maintaining proper guardrails to protect against speculation by institutional investors and displacement in vulnerable communities.

In 2024, the Legislature amended SB 9 to address some of the early barriers to low utilization of the law through SB 450 (Atkins, Chapter 286, Statutes of 2024). SB 450 added a 60-day review period for SB 9 applications, removed the ability of local agencies to deny certain SB 9 projects, prohibited a local agency from imposing standards on SB 9 projects that do not apply to the underlying zoning district, gave the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) explicit enforcement authority over SB 9, and strengthened the statewide concern

findings that applied SB 9 to charter cities. However, SB 450 did not modify the law's owner-occupancy requirements.

Uptake in recent years has increased: HCD's Annual Progress Report dashboard reports, as of June 2026, that 1,671 SB 9 projects have been submitted statewide, with 862 projects submitted in the City of Los Angeles alone. The author wants to further encourage the use of SB 9 to build additional units.

Comments

Purpose of the bill. According to the author, "California's housing shortage—and the growing homeownership crisis—requires solutions at many scales. SB 9 was designed to enable small, incremental housing production led by homeowners, creating opportunities for more attainable, entry-level ownership in existing neighborhoods. It also allows homeowners to unlock value within their own property that is otherwise inaccessible unless they sell and leave their home.

"However, implementation has revealed unintended technical barriers that prevent some responsible homeowners from participating, particularly those who use common estate planning tools. AB 2005 clarifies the law, so it works as intended, ensuring these homeowners are not excluded while maintaining strong protections against investor speculation.

"In my district, I still need to rent because the average price of a first-time home exceeds \$ 1 million. AB 2005 can help create greater equity in homeownership, removing barriers that unlock small-scale housing production, expand access to entry-level homeownership, and support long-term wealth building for California families who are increasingly being priced out of the market."

There's gold in them thar hills. The urban lot split provisions of SB 9 attempt to strike a balance between encouraging widespread, but less visible, densification of single-family zones and the desire to keep community ties intact. It allows homeowners to build generational wealth by splitting off a portion of their lot to be used to develop new housing, while keeping them in their home and the community they have connections to. SB 9's current owner-occupancy requirement allows urban lot splits in these circumstances, but prevents developers, who may have more expertise and capacity to build new units but do not occupy the units they build, from maximizing the number of units built through SB 9. AB 2005 revises the owner-occupancy requirement to allow sale of units developed using an urban lot split to future homeowners who occupy the property. This could enable more SB 9 units to be built, which are smaller and therefore may sell for cheaper than the currently available homes. Opponents of the measure are

concerned that this could lead to displacement of vulnerable residents if investors see a profitable opportunity and flip less-expensive housing into more expensive new homes that are unaffordable to existing community members.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

Abundant Housing Los Angeles
Bay Area Council
California Apartment Association
California Yimby
Casita Coalition
Circulate Planning & Policy
East Bay for Everyone
East Bay Yimby
Equitable Land Use Alliance (ELUA)
Families and Homes San Jose
Fieldstead and Company, INC.
Grow the Richmond
Housing Action Coalition
Mountain View Yimby
Napa-solano for Everyone
New California Coalition
Northern Neighbors Sf
Peninsula for Everyone
San Francisco Yimby
San Jose Yimby
San Mateo Forward
Santa Cruz Yimby
Santa Rosa Yimby
South Bay Yimby
Spur
Student Homes Coalition
Sv@home Action Fund
The Two Hundred for Homeownership
Ventura County Yimby
Yes! in Redwood City
Yimby Action
Yimby Los Angeles

Yimby Monterey Peninsula
Yimby Slo

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

California Association of Realtors
Sustainable Community Development Corporation
United Neighbors

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 66-1, 5/14/26

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

NOES: DeMaio

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bauer-Kahan, Boerner, Castillo, Flora, Gallagher, Johnson, Macedo, Muratsuchi, Patel, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Schiavo

Prepared by: Anton Favorini-Csorba / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
8/30/26 15:44:38

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2047
Author: Bauer-Kahan (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-2, 6/23/26

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

NOES: Niello, Valladares

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/30/26

AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 58-19, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Firearms: 3-dimensional printing blocking technology

SOURCE: Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund

DIGEST: This bill makes it unlawful to sell or transfer a three-dimensional printer in California that is not equipped with firearm blocking technology that meets minimum performance standards developed by the Department of Justice (DOJ); requires the DOJ, beginning July 1, 2027, to check on a quarterly basis whether ASTM International has published industry standards for equipping three-dimensional printers with firearm blocking technology, and if the DOJ determines that ASTM International has published or adopted such industry standards, requires the DOJ to publish written guidance or regulations within 24 months after making that determination; requires this guidance to describe minimum performance standards for three-dimensional printer firearm blocking technology

before a printer can lawfully be sold or offered for sale in the state; specifies that, if the DOJ determines as of July 1, 2029 that ASTM International has not published industry standards for firearm blocking technology for three-dimensional printers, the DOJ has no further responsibility to ascertain whether ASTM International has published or adopted industry standards; exempts from its provisions printers used exclusively for the manufacturing of properties (props) in the entertainment industry or a person who distributes or causes the distribution of digital firearm manufacturing codes solely for the bona fide purpose of, among other things, developing refining and testing the functionality of a firearm blocking technology; and permits the DOJ to adopt regulations that provide for additional exceptions, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 amend the definitions of “firearm” and “firearm blocking technology”, ass a definition for “machine gun conversion device” clarify that the requirements upon the Department of Justice (DOJ) apply when it determines that ASTM International has published or adopted industry standards for firearm blocking technology for three-dimensional printers that demonstrate that it is technologically feasible to equip three-dimensional printers in order for those printers to be lawfully sold or offered for sale in California; permit, rather than require, the DOJ to provide for a self-attestation or self-certification process by which manufactures must certify that the three-dimensional printers they sell in California incorporate firearm blocking technology that meets the DOJ’s minimum performance standards; makes it unlawful to sell, offer for sale, or transfer for consideration a three-dimensional printer in California that is not equipped with firearm blocking technology that meets the minimum performance standards; clarifies that these provisions do not apply to printer used exclusively for manufacturing props for the entertainment industry and to a person who distributes or causes to be distributed a digital firearm manufacturing code solely for the bona fide purpose of developing or testing the functionality of firearm blocking technology or maintaining an updated library of digital firearm manufacturing code files solely for that bona fide purpose.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Firearm Industry Responsibility Act (FIRA) to prohibit firearm industry members from dealing in abnormally dangerous firearm-related products. Requires a firearm industry member to comply with the firearm industry standard of conduct, and makes it a violation of the firearm industry standard of conduct for a firearm industry member to fail to comply with

specified provisions, including establishing, implementing, and enforcing reasonable controls. (Civil [Civ.] Code, §§ 3273.50 et seq.)

- 2) Specifies that a firearm-related product includes a “firearm manufacturing machine,” and defines, for the purposes of FIRA, “firearm manufacturing machine” to mean a three-dimensional printer, as defined, a computer numerical control (CNC) milling machine, or a similar machine, that is marketed or sold, or is reasonably designed or intended to be used, to manufacture or produce firearms, firearm components, or firearm accessories. (Civ. Code § 32783.50(d).)
- 3) Authorizes a person who has suffered harm because of a firearm industry member’s conduct, the Attorney General, a city attorney, and a county counsel to bring an action in court under FIRA for a violation of the firearm industry standard of conduct. (Civ. Code § 3273.52.)
- 4) Permits a civil action to be brought against a person who knowingly distributes or causes to be distributed, by any means, including the internet, any digital firearm manufacturing code to any other person in this state who is not a federally licensed firearms manufacturer, a member of the Armed Forces, or any law enforcement agency or forensic laboratory, as specified, or who commits specified criminal acts related to firearms. (Civ. Code § 3273.61.)
- 5) Prohibits a person from selling, offering to sell, transferring, advertising, or marketing a CNC milling machine or three-dimensional printer in a manner that knowingly or recklessly causes another person in the state to engage in conduct prohibited by Penal Code section 29185, or in a manner that otherwise knowingly or recklessly aids, abets, promotes, or facilitates conduct prohibited by that section.
 - a) Creates a rebuttable presumption that a person is engaged in this prohibited conduct if they offer to sell, advertise, or market a CNC milling machine or three-dimensional printer in a manner that, under the totality of the circumstances, is targeted at purchasers seeking to manufacture firearms or that otherwise affirmatively promotes the machine or printer’s ability to manufacture firearms, and the person sells or transfers the CNC milling machine or three-dimensional printer without verifying that the purchaser or transferee in this state is a federally licensed firearms manufacturer or not otherwise prohibited, as specified. (Civ. Code § 3273.62.)

- 6) Makes it unlawful to knowingly, willfully, or recklessly cause another person to engage in the unlawful manufacture of firearms, or to knowingly, willfully, or recklessly aid, abet, promote, or facilitate the unlawful manufacture of firearms. (Civ. Code § 3273.625.)
- 7) Defines “firearm” to mean a device, designed to be used as a weapon, from which is expelled through a barrel, a projectile by the force of an explosion or other form of combustion. (Pen. Code § 16520.)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes the “California Firearm Printing Prevention Act,” and defines for the Act the following:
 - a) “ASTM International” to mean ASTM International, formerly American Society for Testing Materials;
 - b) “Department” to mean the Department of Justice;
 - c) “firearm” to mean the definition of firearm in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Penal Code section 16520;
 - d) “firearm blocking technology” to mean hardware, firmware, or other integrated technological measures capable of ensuring a three-dimensional printer will not proceed to any print job unless the underlying three-dimensional printing file has been evaluated by a firearms blueprints detection algorithm and determined not to be a printing file that would produce a firearm or a machine gun conversion device;
 - e) “machine gun conversion device” to mean a part or combination of parts designed for use in converting a semiautomatic weapon into a machine gun, to include a “pistol converter” as defined in Penal Code section 17015; and
 - f) “Three-dimensional printer” to have the same meaning as defined in Civil Code section 3273.60.
- 2) Requires, no later than July 1, 2027, that the DOJ check on a quarterly basis whether ASTM International has published industry standards for equipping three-dimensional printers with firearm blocking technology.
- 3) Requires the DOJ, if the DOJ determines that ASTM International has published or adopted industry standards for firearm blocking technology for

three-dimensional printers and that those standards demonstrate that it is technologically feasible to equip three-dimensional printers with firearm blocking technology, to publish written guidance or regulations within 24 months, and requires this written guidance or regulations to describe minimum performance standards for firearm blocking technology that shall be equipped in three-dimensional printers in order for those printers to be lawfully sold or offered for sale in California. Requires, in accordance with the California Administrative Procedure Act, that this written guidance or regulations be developed in consultation with stakeholders.

- 4) Requires the DOJ's written guidance or regulations pursuant to 12), above, to be informed by the ASTM International industry standards, and permits the written guidance or regulations to incorporate some or all of the ASTM International industry standards. Permits the DOJ's written guidance or regulations to provide additional or alternative definitions, standards, processes, or requirements other than what is included in the industry standards published by ASTM International to promote the purposes of these provisions, and permits them to consider and incorporate industry standards for firearm blocking technology for three-dimensional printers published or adopted by a state governmental entity outside of California, as applicable.
- 5) Permits the DOJ's written guidance or regulations to provide for a self-attestation or self-certification process by which manufacturers of three-dimensional printers must certify to the DOJ that each three-dimensional printer make and model that the manufacturer sells, offers for sale, or intends to sell in California incorporates firearm blocking technology that meets the minimum performance standards published by the DOJ.
- 6) Requires, commencing one year after the DOJ has published its written guidance or regulations for firearm blocking technology, that a manufacturer of any three-dimensional printer ensure that the three-dimensional printer is equipped with firearm blocking technology that meets the minimum performance standards in the DOJ's guidance or regulations before the manufacturer sells, offers to sell, or transfers for consideration a three-dimensional printer to any person in California.
- 7) Makes unlawful, commencing one year after the DOJ has published its written guidance or regulations for firearm blocking technology, to sell, offer for sale, or transfer for consideration a three-dimensional printer in the state of

California that is not equipped with firearm blocking technology that meets the minimum performance standards set forth in the DOJ's guidance or regulations.

8) Exempts from these provisions:

a) Printers used exclusively for the manufacturing of properties (props) in the entertainment industry; or

b) A person who distributes, or causes the distribution of, digital firearm manufacturing code, as defined in Section 3273.60, solely for the bona fide purpose of developing, refining, and testing the functionality of firearm blocking technology or maintaining an updated library of digital firearm manufacturing code files solely for that bona fide purpose.

9) Specifies that, if the DOJ determines on July 1, 2029 that ASTM International has not published industry standards for firearm blocking technology for three-dimensional printers, the DOJ shall not be required to make any further determinations under these provisions.

10) Permits the DOJ to promulgate regulations and develop forms and publications to implement the requirements of this bill, and permits the DOJ to update the minimum performance standards, including to reflect any future updates ASTM International makes to the industry standards described in Section 3273.633. Permits the DOJ to adopt regulations that provide for exceptions to these provisions, if those exceptions are consistent with the purpose of these provisions to prevent the use of three-dimensional printers to illegally produce firearms and machine gun conversion devices.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Costs to DOJ to establish and operate this program overall are unquantifiable and will require the hiring of personnel and securing technological expertise outside DOJ's existing scope and capabilities (General Fund).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund (source)

American Academy of Pediatrics

Asian American Christian Collaborative

Beverly Hills High School Students Demand Action

Brady California

Brady United Against Gun Violence
California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians
California Medical Association (CMA)
California Police Chiefs Association
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Chapman University Students Demand Action
City of Alameda
City of Los Angeles
City of Santa Rosa
Former City Attorney Mike Feuer, City of Los Angeles
Giffords
GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBTQ Equality
Indivisible Mid-peninsula
Jewish California
Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
Newtown Action Alliance
Prosecutors Alliance Action
Riverside County Democratic Party
San Diegans for Gun Violence Prevention
San Diego City Attorney
San Diego County School Board Association
Students Demand Action At UC Davis
Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
UCLA Students Demand Action
Youth Alive!

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

3D Printing Nerd
ACLU California Action
California Rifle and Pistol Association, Inc.
Citizens Privacy Coalition of Santa Clara County
Community Manufacturing Initiative
Democratic Socialists of America - San Diego
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Esaero, Inc.
Fight for the Future
Free Software Foundation
Fulu Foundation
Gray Area
Gun Owners of California, Inc.

Ifixit
Inspired Flight Technologies
Invisible Pack Inc.
Make Good Inc.
Mantis Composites Inc.
Matterhackers
National Rifle Association - Institute for Legislative Action
Noisebridge Hackerspace
Oakland Privacy
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse
Prusa Usa, Inc.
Root Access Hackerspace
Secure Resilient Future Foundation
See3d, Inc.
Software Freedom Conservancy
Streamline Aerospace
Sudo Room Hackerspace
Thangs Inc.
Trust Automation
Zone 5 Technologies
West3d LLC

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

According to Everytown for Gun Safety, the sponsor of this bill:

The 3D printed gun crisis is not a faraway or abstract problem. It's happening here in California, right now. And at the rate it's increasing, this crisis will get much worse if we don't use every tool we have. In just the six month span between September 2025 - February 2026, numerous instances of 3-D printed firearm manufacturing were uncovered by law enforcement agencies all around California. These incidents often include teenagers too young to legally purchase the types of firearms they are printing at home.

- In September 2025, Yuba County Sheriffs uncovered a "fully operational 3D-printing workshop" run by three men aged 19-38 and seized 8 handguns, several 3-D printed handgun frames, four assault weapons, one rifle, and assorted firearms parts.
- In October 2025, the Santa Clara County DA's Gun Violence Task Force arrested a man who was on probation for domestic violence running a ghost gun manufacturing operation out of his apartment. The press release paints an alarming picture: "When task force members entered the

prohibited person's home, they found the 3D gun printer still working inside a closet, two loaded weapons, three nearly finished weapons, and 35 machine gun conversion devices. All of the weapons were considered "ghost guns" – made and sold with no serial number to avoid tracing and detection."

- In November 2025, Santa Rosa Police detectives found an 18-year-old running a ghost gun manufacturing operation in his apartment, less than two years after arresting a 14-year-old illegally manufacturing a ghost gun with a 3-D printer.
- In February 2026, 3D-printed firearms were recovered in at least four more newsworthy incidents, spread around the state:
 - Law enforcement in Santa Rosa seized over 165 guns and three 3D printers from a 22-year-old ghost guns manufacturer.¹⁸
 - Victor Valley sheriffs found a 3D-printed assault rifle, over 130 Polymer80 jigs, 3D printer materials and a 3D printing guide for different firearms in a Lucerne Valley ghost guns arrest involving a man who was previously indicted and pled guilty for manufacturing guns for a gun trafficker.¹⁹
 - A San Jose teenager was arrested with 27 finished or near-finished 3D-printed firearms, including DIY machine guns, and two 3D printers near his sneaker collection in his bedroom.
 - A Daly City narcotics and identity theft investigation led to uncovering a San Francisco residence with several 3D-printed firearms, rifle components, and a 3D printer. [...]

3D-printing firearms is the next wave of the ghost guns crisis, a problem California has been battling for years. The threat is evolving and our policy solutions need to evolve too. AB 2047 gives us a chance to get a step ahead of the criminals running underground ghost gun selling operations and the teenagers tempted to use a home 3-D printer in their bedroom or basement to print a deadly weapon. [...]

While California's recent laws have focused on prohibition and deterrence, AB 2047 provides an opportunity for prevention using new technology to stop 3D gun printing at its source. We can't fully address this emerging threat to our foundational gun laws and public safety without an intervention at the manufacturing stage. And there's good news on this front: the technology already exists to equip printers to identify and block these dangerous firearm print jobs. AB 2047 will simply ensure that printer

manufacturers actually deploy these technological solutions and stop the spread of DIY firearms before it accelerates any further.

Specifically, AB 2047 creates a new requirement that 3D printers sold in California must be equipped with firearm printing blocking technology by March 2029. The law will primarily be enforced through civil mechanisms similar to the existing Firearm Industry Responsibility Act (Civil Code section 3273.50 et seq.) and existing laws allowing for civil actions to enjoin Unlawful Firearm Manufacturing (Civil Code section 3273.60). The bill sets out a staged implementation process to evaluate and certify the underlying components of firearm printing blocking technology before imposing any kind of requirement on 3D printer manufacturers.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

According to the California Rifle & Pistol Association, which opposes AB 2047:

While framed as preventing unlawful manufacturing, this bill represents a costly, impractical, and constitutionally problematic burden on innovation, small businesses, and lawful hobbyists.

Key concerns:

- **Technological Impracticality and Ineffectiveness:** Detection algorithms and software controls can be evaded by technically skilled individuals through modifications, open-source alternatives, or altered files. Criminals will simply ignore the mandates or obtain printers out-of-state, while law-abiding makers and innovators face unnecessary barriers.
- **Burdensome Regulation and Costs:** Mandatory certification, attestations, testing, and quarterly DOJ lists will drive up prices for 3D printers, harm small businesses and California's emerging tech sector, and stifle hobbyist innovation in areas far beyond firearms (prototyping, education, manufacturing).
- **Constitutional Issues:** The bill imposes prior restraints and technological mandates on tools that have substantial lawful uses, raising serious Second Amendment concerns under Bruen and due process issues. It effectively creates a de facto ban on non-compliant printers for most consumers.
- **Bureaucratic Overreach:** Placing the DOJ in charge of certifying complex software algorithms and policing printer sales adds layers of red tape

without meaningfully addressing criminal activity, which is already illegal under existing manufacturing prohibitions.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 58-19, 5/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, 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, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Lackey, Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
8/30/26 14:16:30

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2059
Author: Wilson (D), et al.
Amended: 8/25/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMITTEE: 5-0, 7/1/26

AYES: Blakespear, Valladares, Dahle, Gonzalez, Hurtado

NO VOTE RECORDED: Allen, Menjivar

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/18/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Environmental Quality Act: transportation impacts:
vehicle miles traveled: mitigation

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill specifies that for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a transportation project is presumed to have a less than significant transportation impacts as determined by the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) metric if the project meets certain criteria: this provision will sunset once the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) publishes guidance on VMT mitigation for transportation projects meeting that same criteria.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires lead agencies with the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a proposed discretionary project to prepare a negative declaration (ND), mitigated negative declaration (MND), or environmental impact report (EIR) for this action, unless the project is exempt from the California

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (Public Resources Code § (PRC) 21000 et seq.)

- 2) Requires the Office of Planning and Research (OPR, now known as LCI) to prepare and develop proposed guidelines for the implementation of CEQA by public agencies. Requires the guidelines to include objectives and criteria for the orderly evaluation of projects and the preparation of EIRs and NDs. Also requires the guidelines to include criteria for public agencies to follow in determining whether a proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. (PRC § 21083)
- 3) Requires LCI to prepare proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts within transit priority areas (TPAs). Requires the criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. (PRC § 21099)
- 4) Authorizes LCI to adopt CEQA Guidelines alternative methods of analyzing transportation impacts under CEQA including Vehicle Mile Traveled (VMT). Pursuant to this authority, LCI revised the CEQA Guidelines to identify VMT as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project's transportation impacts and to apply VMT statewide. (PRC § 21099)
- 5) Establishes an in-lieu fee mechanism for VMT mitigation – permitting a project, which is under the jurisdiction of a regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) and has a VMT mitigation requirement pursuant to CEQA, to satisfy its VMT mitigation requirement by contributing an unspecified amount per VMT to the transit-oriented development (TOD) fund to provide financing for transit-oriented rental housing developments. (PRC §21080.43 and 21080.44)

This bill:

- 1) Requires Caltrans to develop guidance for non-metropolitan areas on VMT mitigation for transportation projects that do not add lanes to the state highway system, unless there is a demonstrated safety or evacuation need for the project. Specifically, this bill requires Caltrans in their guidance to:
 - a) Provide case studies of the costs associated with VMT mitigation for these projects and provide examples of mitigation measures for these types of projects.

- b) Identify barriers to implementing VMT mitigation for these projects
 - c) Develop recommendations for processes for lead agencies and developers to identify and implement appropriate VMT mitigation for these types of projects.
 - d) Develop recommendations for appropriate VMT significance thresholds for these transportation projects.
- 2) Specifies that, until December 31, 2031, a transportation project for which a lead agency has issued a notice of preparation, as defined, is presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact as determined by the VMT metric if the project meets the following:
- a) At least 70% of the project lies within one or more nonmetropolitan counties; and
 - b) The project does not add lanes to the state highway system unless there is a demonstrated safety or evacuation need for the project.
- 3) Adds the following definitions:
- a) "Demonstrated evacuation need" means a project that is specifically identified as necessary to provide evacuation capacity for the affected area in an adopted local hazard mitigation plan, general plan safety element, local emergency operations plan, or other local or regional emergency evacuation plan approved by a city, county, or regional planning agency through a public process;
 - b) "Demonstrated safety need" means a project for which the lead agency demonstrates, through documented collision, injury, or fatality data specific to the project location, or through a risk-based or systemic safety analysis consistent with state and federal guidance, that the proposed project includes safety countermeasures that are necessary to reduce the number and severity of injuries or the number of fatalities, including reducing specific risks to vulnerable road users;
 - c) "Nonmetropolitan county" means a nonmetropolitan county designated by the Methodology for Determining Rural Status of Project Site for 2025 Applications issued by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee on January 1, 2025 (including 22 rural counties); and
 - d) "Transportation project" means a project undertaken by a public agency that consists of the planning, design, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, improvement, expansion, or operation of a highway, road, bridge, transit facility, rail facility, bicycle or pedestrian facility, or other public transportation infrastructure.

Background

CEQA 101. Under CEQA, projects (unless they have a specific exemption) must undergo environmental analysis. This process starts with an initial study which determines what level of further environmental review is needed for a given project. If a project has no significant effects on the environment, or if those effects can be fully mitigated, the project can move forward with a negative declaration (ND) or mitigated negative declaration (MND). If the initial study finds that the project has potential significant effects on the environment, then a full EIR is conducted. An EIR provides thorough environmental review of a proposed project. The EIR also includes proposed mitigation measures for any significant effects that it identifies and considers alternatives to the proposed project.

What are significant transportation impacts in CEQA. Transportation impacts are one of the key environmental impacts that must be considered under CEQA. In July 2020, the CEQA guidelines directed agencies to use VMT to analyze the transportation impacts of a project under CEQA, replacing an older metric for transportation impacts, Level of Service (LOS). While LOS measures the presence of traffic and how quickly cars can move through a street, VMTs are a metric that simultaneously considers greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and diversity of land uses. VMT measures the amount of travel for all vehicles in a geographic region over a given period (typically one year), and can be calculated for a region or on a per-capita basis.

To help lead agencies use VMTs as a tool to assess whether a project has significant transportation impacts under CEQA, LCI, released a “Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA” (Technical Advisory) that includes a recommended threshold VMT level over which additional VMTs would be considered a significant transportation impact. The threshold for “significant transportation impacts” recommended by LCI for residential projects is a VMT level that is least 15% lower than existing VMTs per capita in the project area. In other words, if a project has an associated VMT rate that is only 14% lower than the VMT per capita in the project area, that project would be considered to have significant transportation impacts. For retail projects, any net increase in total VMT is considered a significant transportation impact. The pre-existing VMT per capita in an area used to measure the relative VMT impacts of the project may be measured as regional VMT per capita or as city VMT per capita. Having the option to compare a project’s VMTs to regional or city VMT per capita gives

projects some flexibility in achieving the 15% threshold and some variability across projects and regions.

These thresholds for VMT significance are recommendations, not requirements. Local entities can develop their own thresholds or VMT criteria. In fact, OPR writes in the Technical Advisory that “in rural areas... fewer options may be available for reducing VMT, and significance thresholds may be best determined on a case-by-case basis.”

How to mitigate VMTs? If a project has VMT levels above the significance threshold, as determined by the lead agency under CEQA, then those impacts could be mitigated through CEQA. In its ‘Technical Advisory’, LCI provides a long list of actions a local government could take to reduce a project’s VMT. These mitigation measures include, among others:

- a) Orient the project toward transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
- b) Improve pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service;
- c) Project design (street grid instead of cul-de-sacs);
- d) Incorporate affordable housing into the project;
- e) Incorporate a neighborhood electric vehicle network;
- f) Provide traffic calming;
- g) Provide bicycle parking;
- h) Limit or eliminate the supply of parking;
- i) Implement or provide access to a commute reduction program;
- j) Provide car-sharing, bike-sharing, and ride-sharing programs;
- k) Provide transit passes;
- l) Shift single occupancy vehicle trips to carpooling or vanpooling; or
- m) Provide telework options for office projects.

VMT mitigation bank. In 2025, the legislature passed AB 130 (Committee on budget, Chapter 22, Statutes of 2025) which established a VMT mitigation bank. The money that is put into the VMT bank through in-lieu fees will be invested in affordable housing and related infrastructure projects in the following order of priority locations: (1) location-efficient areas within the same region as the impacting project; (2) other areas within the same region as the impacting project; (3) location-efficient areas within an adjacent region.

AB 130 tasked LCI with developing guidelines to implement the VMT mitigation bank, including defining an appropriate rate for the VMT in lieu fee and identifying a “location-efficient areas” where low-VMT housing funded through

the VMT bank can be located, and proximity radius, which will determine how far apart projects funded through the VMT mitigation bank can be from projects that generated the funding through the VMT in lieu fee.

Money paid into the fund will be kept in separate accounts for each region, with prioritization given to projects in the same region as the project that generated the VMT in-lieu mitigation fee. “Regions” are defined as the territory of metropolitan planning organization (MPOs) within which a project is located, or the territory of the RTPA within which a project is located if the project is located outside of the boundaries of an MPO. LCI guidelines further separate Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region into sub-regions given that SCAG is significantly larger than the other MPOs.

LCI has published a draft AB 130 statewide VMT mitigation program guidance document which accepted public comment through May 8th, 2026.

Ongoing investigations at Caltrans re: VMT in rural areas. In May 2025, the SB 743 Implementation Working Group Rural VMT Action Subcommittee was formed to develop a response to CAPTI 2.0 Key Action S2.2. This identifies key actions to: Improve VMT analysis and mitigation guidance for rural projects to better account for the low VMT impact of many rural projects in consultation with rural stakeholders. The working group will improve guidance on VMT analysis and mitigation options for projects on the State Highway System (SHS) within rural areas in California. This stakeholder working group is a subcommittee to the ongoing Caltrans-LCI SB 743 Implementation Working Group.

On June 30, 2026, a study by UC Berkeley that had been commissioned by Caltrans was published titled: “Investigating the Ability to Assess VMT Impacts of Rural Capacity-Enhancing Projects” It was commissioned by Caltrans as required by CAPTI 2.0 action item, and concludes:

While California is making progress meeting the goals of VMT reduction from CAPTI investments, much of the significant reductions are tied to mitigation or avoidance of projects in urbanized areas. A one-size-fits all strategy may not be suitable for rural projects. The existing research on induced travel demand and VMT reduction is primarily from studies conducted in urban and metropolitan areas where highway capacity has been added with the goal to relieve congestion. Implementation of these strategies in rural areas require more nuanced guidance given the limited research.

Comments

Purpose of Bill. According to the author, “California’s transition to a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) framework under CEQA, implemented pursuant to SB 743 (Steinberg, 2013), was intended to better align transportation and land use decisions with the state’s climate goals. While that objective remains important, the current, project-level application of VMT mitigation has created unintended consequences that are undermining the delivery of critical transportation infrastructure, particularly in rural communities.

“AB 2059 strikes a balanced path forward by maintaining California’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions while ensuring that the state’s smallest counties can deliver safe, reliable, and resilient transportation infrastructure. For these reasons, AB 2059 is a necessary and timely reform.”

Is AB 2059 jumping the gun on AB 130? Last year, the Legislature passed AB 130, which established a VMT mitigation bank wherein developers could pay in lieu fees into the VMT bank instead of mitigating VMTs directly. That fund is then intended to subsidize location-efficient housing (e.g. housing in infill areas that have low VMTs). LCI has released draft regulations to implement the VMT bank, but the program has not yet been finalized.

One of the benefits of a VMT bank is to provide developers with another option to mitigate VMTs, particularly when direct VMT mitigation can be very expensive for some projects. By allowing transportation projects in rural areas to presume that their transportation impacts are not significant until 2032, AB 2059 would take projects out of the soon-to-be finalized VMT mitigation bank before it is possible to determine if the VMT mitigation bank is a viable option to reduce costs for such projects.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 130 (Committee on budget, Chapter 22, Statutes of 2025) establishes, among numerous other provisions, an in-lieu fee mechanism for VMT mitigation – permitting a project, which is under the jurisdiction of a regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) and has a VMT mitigation requirement pursuant to CEQA, to satisfy its VMT mitigation requirement by contributing an unspecified amount per VMT to the transit-oriented development (TOD) fund to provide financing for transit-oriented rental housing developments. (PRC 21080.43 and 21080.44)

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- One-time costs, possibly in the high tens of thousands or low hundreds of thousands of dollars (General Fund), for the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) to develop, publish, and integrate CEQA guidance, as well as to update guidelines and procedures.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/25/26)

California Nevada Cement Association
Transportation California
Tulare; City of

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/25/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/18/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Calderon, Dixon, Gallagher, Lee, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Stefani, Wicks

Prepared by: Brynn Cook / E.Q. / (916) 651-4108
8/26/26 9:20:14

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2065
Author: Petrie-Norris (D)
Amended: 8/26/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENERGY, U. & C. COMMITTEE: 14-2, 6/24/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Becker, Caballero, Dahle, Gonzalez, Hurtado, McNERNEY, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Stern, Wahab

NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Strickland

NO VOTE RECORDED: Grove

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0, 5/21/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Rates: prohibited cost recovery

SOURCE: The Utility Reform Network

DIGEST: This bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to assess specified penalties on electrical corporations, gas corporations, water corporations or sewer system corporations if they record costs in financial accounts that are prohibited from being recovered from ratepayers or the cost is already authorized for recovery through another ratemaking mechanism.

Senate Floor Amendments of 08/26/26 remove telephone corporations from this bill and remove one of the three conditions that results in prohibited cost-recovery, specifically that the utility exceeds the scope of the CPUC's authorization for the specific account or application.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Provides, under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, that no electric utility may recover from any person other than the shareholders (or other owners) of the utility any direct or indirect expenditure by such utility for political advertising. This is defined to include advertising intended to influence public opinion with respect to legislative, administrative, or electoral matters, or with respect to any controversial issue of public importance. (16 U.S. Code §2623(b)(5))
- 2) Establishes and vests the CPUC with regulatory authority over public utilities, including electrical corporations, gas corporations, water corporations, sewer system corporations, and telephone corporations. (Article 12 of the California Constitution)
- 3) Authorizes the CPUC to fix the rates and charges for every public utility and requires that those rates and charges be just and reasonable. (Public Utilities Code §451)
- 4) Prohibits a public utility from including any bill for services or commodities furnished by any customer or subscriber any advertising or literature designed or intended (1) to promote the passage or defeat of a measure appearing on the ballot at an election, (2) promote or defeat of a candidate to any public office, (3) to promote or defeat the appointment of any person to any administrative or executive positions in government, or (4) to promote or defeat any change in legislation or regulations. (Public Utilities Code §453 (d))
- 5) Provides the CPUC with general, broad authority to regulate every public utility in the state. (Public Utilities Code §701)
- 6) Prohibits an electrical or gas corporation from recovering expenses for compensation (defined to include annual salary, bonus, benefits, or other consideration paid to an officer of the corporation) from ratepayers and requires compensation is paid solely by shareholders of the electrical or gas corporation. (Public Utilities Code §706)
- 7) Prohibits a utility from recording to an above-the-line account or otherwise recovering from ratepayers specified costs related to promotional advertisements and political influence activities. Defines “above-the-line-account” to mean an account that contains expenses that a utility recovers from ratepayers, including an account that contains expenses that the utility used to

calculate a revenue requirement request in its general rate case. (Public Utilities Code §748.3)

- 8) Authorizes the CPUC to require a public utility to correct any rates, practices, equipment or behavior that is unjust, unreasonable, unsafe, improper, inadequate, or insufficient. (Public Utilities Code §761)
- 9) Prohibits the CPUC from prescribing a system of accounts and form of accounts, records, and memoranda for corporations subject to the regulatory authority of the United States that is inconsistent with that established and updated by or under the authority of the United States. (Public Utilities Code §793)
- 10) Provides the CPUC with authority to levy fines against regulated entities for violation of law. Requires penalties to be deposited in the State's General Fund. (Public Utilities Code §2100 *et seq.*)
- 11) Provides any public utility that violates or fails to comply with any provision of the Constitution, order, decision, decree, rule, direction, demand, or requirement of the CPUC, is subject to a penalty of not less than \$500, and no more than \$100,000, for each offense. (Public Utilities Code §2107)

This bill:

- 1) Defines "utility" to mean an electrical corporation, gas corporation, water corporation, sewer system corporation, also known as investor-owned utilities (IOUs). The definition no longer includes telephone corporations.
- 2) Requires the CPUC to find that a utility has engaged in prohibited cost recovery, if the utility records a costs to a regulator-approved financial account that meets specified criteria, specifically if the cost is categorically excluded from ratepayer recovery by statute, CPUC decision, or CPUC rule, or has already been authorized for recovery through another ratemaking mechanism.
- 3) Requires the CPUC, upon making a determination that such a corporation has recorded prohibited costs to a ratepayer-funded account in violation of CPUC rule, tariff, or statute:
 - a) Disallow recovery of the cost from ratepayers.

- b) Impose a financial penalty for inappropriate cost recovery equal to the amount of the prohibited cost recovery or three times that amount if the CPUC determines there have been two or more separate instances of prohibited cost recovery by the same utility with the preceding five years or there has been a sustained practice of prohibited cost recovery extending across multiple reporting periods.
- 4) Provides that the bill does not limit the CPUC's authority to assess fines and penalties from existing law and CPUC rules.
- 5) Requires each such utility to submit an annual report to the CPUC identifying all instances in the prior year in which prohibited cost recovery was identified, the actions that were taken in response to the identification, and any actions that were taken by the utility to prevent future occurrences.

Background

Cost recovery of expenses by IOUs. CPUC-regulated utilities routinely submit requests for cost recovery related to their operations to the CPUC, including expanding their infrastructure, paying for operation expenses, etc. As required by statute in Public Utilities Code §451, the CPUC may only approve a utility's request for cost recovery that is deemed just and reasonable. Review of utility expenses to ensure they are just and reasonable is the principal purpose of the CPUC's existence and the primary task of the agency as an economic regulator. Statutory authority also authorizes the CPUC to disallow expenses that are not deemed just and reasonable or prudent. The review of a utility's expenses is largely, although not exclusively, conducted through the utility's general rate case (GRC). Most utilities regulated by the CPUC are required to undergo a GRC whereby the utility requests funding for distribution, generation and operation costs associated with their service for the coming years (3-4 years depending on the utility). Usually performed every three (now four) years and conducted over roughly 18+ months, the GRCs are major regulatory proceedings which allow the CPUC and stakeholders to conduct a broad, exhaustive, and detailed review of a utility's revenues, expenses, and investments in plant and equipment to establish an approved revenue requirement – essentially the amount the utility is authorized to recover from customers in utility rates.

Statute disallows recovery of certain expenses. Statute prohibits IOUs from recovering from ratepayers certain expenses, including activities related to elections of candidates, legislation, bonuses paid to executives of the IOU under specified conditions, activities marketing against community choice aggregators,

as well as, any situation where the IOU has failed to sufficiently maintain records to enable the CPUC to completely evaluate any relevant issues related to the prudence of any expense relating to the planning, construction, or operation of the IOU's plant. Under the requirements of the Federal Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 and subsequent state statute, IOUs are also prohibited from recovering from any person other than shareholders direct and indirect expenditures for promotional or political advertising. Additionally, IOUs must abide by CPUC orders.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) accounting and financial reporting. FERC jurisdiction Account 426.4 of the Uniform System of Accounts (USofA) requires that utility shareholders pay for expenditures for the purpose of influencing public opinion or the decisions of public offices. FERC has established regulatory accounting and financial reporting requirements for its jurisdictional entities in the electric, natural gas, and oil pipeline industries. These requirements play a role in FERC's strategy of setting just and reasonable cost-of-service rates. The foundation of the FERC's accounting program is the USofA codified in the agency's regulations. In addition, FERC issues accounting rulings relating to specific transactions and applications through orders and Chief Accountant guidance letters. This body of accounting regulations, orders, and guidance letters comprises the FERC's accounting and financial reporting requirements which promote consistent, transparent, and decision-useful accounting information for the FERC and other stakeholders. These accounting and financial reporting requirements take into consideration the FERC's ratemaking policies, past FERC actions, industry trends, and external factors (e.g., economic, environmental, and technological changes, and mandates from other regulatory bodies) that impact the industries under the agency's jurisdiction. Electric Public Utilities & Licensees, Natural Gas, and Oil Pipeline companies within FERC jurisdiction are required to maintain their books and records in accordance with the USofA. The USofA provides basic account descriptions, instructions, and accounting definitions that are useful in understanding the information reported in the Annual Report.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the author:

Utility companies have a documented history of charging ratepayers for costs that should have been disallowed. Under current law, this usually means that the utility just gives the money back. That's not accountability. As a deterrent, AB 2065 establishes mandatory automatic penalties, with bigger consequences

for repeat offenders. Californians paying some of the most expensive utility bills in the country deserve to know that at least their bills are accurate and fair.

Desire for more consequences. The proponents for this bill contend the existing penalty framework under Public Utilities Code §2107 and 2108, and the CPUC's Penalty Assessment Methodology adopted in Resolution M-4846, generally treats inappropriate utility cost recovery as a matter for correction rather than deterrence. They allege that when the CPUC or other parties identify costs that should not have been recorded to ratepayer-funded accounts, the typical consequence is disallowance which means the utility simply returns the money or is denied recovery. They point to the California State Auditor's August 2023 report, *Electricity and Natural Gas Rates (Report 2022-115)*¹, which documented that this corrective-only enforcement framework is insufficient. The Auditor identified significant risk that utilities seek recovery of costs that are ineligible, including costs already authorized through another mechanism, and that the CPUC and Public Advocates Office (PAO) have limited capacity to scrutinize the large volume of utility cost recovery requests. The PAO shared recent examples that were IOUs included the recording of lobbying and advocacy expenses in energy efficiency balancing accounts, personal entertainment expenses in ratepayer-funded accounts, and other prohibited expenses. They argue that with the prospect of disallowance and not a meaningful financial penalty, the IOUs' calculus too often encourages careless or improper accounting. The PAO contends that if the inappropriate cost is detected, the utility simply gives the money back; if is not detected, ratepayers pay.

Opponents raise concern that this bill is too vague, broad, and unnecessary. They believe the existing law and CPUC rules already address the issues regarding prohibited cost recovery by utilities, including penalties. They also contend that accounting entry alone cannot constitute inappropriate cost recovery as the real impact on ratepayers is only once the costs are approved for recovery in rates by the CPUC. They further raise concerns that this bill limits the utility's ability to reprioritize within an authorized revenue requirement, including necessary safety, reliability, and customer-service work. They contend this bill's vague language will result in chilling necessary decision-making and would stymy good-faith efforts to address issues by utilities. However, recent floor amendments are an attempt to address these concerns. The small rural telephone corporations, which are the only telephone corporations implicated by this bill, argue that their

¹ California State Auditor, *Electricity and Natural Gas Rates: The California Public Utilities Commission and Cal Advocates Can Better Ensure That Rate Increases Are Necessary*, Report 2022-115 (August 2023), available at <https://information.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2022-115/index.html>.

accounting is unique, as it is governed by Federal Communications Commission requirements, particularly as much of their service costs are funded by federal subsidies. They also contend their lack of reliance on balancing and memorandum accounts means they should not be included in this bill. Recent floor amendments remove telephone corporations from the provisions of this bill in response to the concerns raised by the small rural telephone corporations.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 327 (McNerney, 2025) prohibits certain political influence activities and expenses by electrical or gas corporations, those related to opposing efforts to municipalize energy utility service, from being recorded in certain accounts and having the costs recovered from ratepayers. The bill is pending before the full Assembly.

AB 1167 (Berman, Chapter 634, Statutes of 2025) prohibited certain political influence activities and advertising expenses by electrical and gas corporations from being recovered from ratepayers and authorizes the CPUC to assess penalties for violations related to the bill's provisions.

SB 24 (McNerney, 2025) would have included many of the same provisions related to prohibiting recovery of political influence expenses from ratepayers as AB 1167. The bill was vetoed.

SB 938 (Min, 2023) would have expanded the types of activities an electrical or gas corporation is prohibited from recovering in rates by expanding the definitions of political activities and advertising and requires specified reporting of related activities. The bill failed passage in the Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications Committee.

AB 562 (Santiago, Chapter 429, Statutes of 2019) required that any expense incurred by an IOU in assisting or deterring union organizing, as defined, is not recoverable either directly or indirectly in the utility's rates and is required to be borne exclusively by the shareholders of the IOU.

SB 790 (Leno, Chapter 599, Statutes of 2012) revised and expanded the definition of CCA, requires the CPUC to initiate a Code of Conduct rulemaking, and allows CCAs to receive public purpose funds to administer energy efficiency programs.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

The Utility Reform Network (Source)
Earthjustice
Public Advocates Office

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Southern California Edison

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Public Advocate's Office states:

Existing law, regulations, and prior CPUC decisions establish clear rules governing which utility expenses ratepayers may be asked to fund. AB 2065 creates meaningful consequences for utilities attempting to recover costs in violation of those rules. One of our Office's core functions is to review utility cost recovery requests to ensure that rates are appropriate and reasonable. In this work, we have uncovered numerous instances of utilities actively attempting to recover inappropriate costs from ratepayers. Utilities have attempted to use ratepayer funds for disallowed political activities, luxury items for employees, and costs they have already been reimbursed for. Current accountability measures are not strong enough to discourage utilities from pursuing inappropriate cost recovery that can unfairly increase rates for customers. California's ratepayers are facing an affordability crisis. AB 2065 will provide the CPUC with the tools it needs to ensure that the state's regulated utilities are not compounding this crisis by shifting inappropriate costs onto ratepayers.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Pacific Gas & Electric and Southern California Edison state the bill is "overly broad and ambiguous in ways that could increase administrative disputes, create operational uncertainty, and ultimately raise costs for customers without providing additional bill relief." They argue this bill conflates accounting with cost recovery, the scope of authorization is unclear, the language is vague regarding authorized recovery through another ratemaking mechanism, and this bill risks sweeping good-faith disputes over interpretations of existing law and CPUC rules. In general, they argue this bill is not needed and could chill necessary operational decision-making by utilities.

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Chen, Gabriel, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Lowenthal, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Wicks, Wilson

Prepared by: Nidia Bautista / E., U. & C. / (916) 651-4107
8/27/26 22:09:24

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2204
Author: Gabriel (D) and Bryan (D), et al.
Amended: 8/24/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/23/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Prisons: organized sports programming

SOURCE: Anti-Recidivism Coalition

DIGEST: This bill requires the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to establish a policy on organized sports programming at facilities operated by the department.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/24/26 clarify that moneys deposited into the Second Chance Sports Fund shall be available upon appropriation by the Legislature in the annual Budget, rather than requiring approval by the Government Operations Agency; and add a sunset date applying to the bill's provisions of January 1, 2036.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26:

- Extend the deadline by which CDCR must formalize a policy on organized sports programming from July 1, 2027 to January 1, 2028;
- Require that in developing the policy, CDCR must consider additional factors, including geographic, climate, and infrastructure differences across department facilities that may affect equitable access to organized sports programming and

how to maximize access to sports programming using existing recreational spaces and infrastructure;

- Clarify that monies deposited into the Second Chance sports Fund are available upon appropriation;
- Clarify that the Controller, rather than the Treasurer, must annually report on the amount deposited in the fund;
- Extend the deadline for the first report from the Controller to January 1, 2029;
- Delete the sunset date that applies to the provisions of the bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the position of Secretary of CDCR and vests in that position responsibility for the care, custody, treatment, training, discipline, and employment of persons confined in state prisons. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 5054.)
- 2) Authorizes CDCR to adopt regulations as necessary to implement the department's administrative duties. (Pen. Code, § 5058.)
- 3) Provides that any amendments to existing regulations and any future regulations adopted by CDCR that may impact visitation of incarcerated persons shall do all of the following:
 - a) Recognize and consider the value of visiting as a means to improve the safety of prisons for both staff and incarcerated persons;
 - b) Recognize and consider the important role of incarcerated person visitation in establishing and maintaining a meaningful connection with family and community; and
 - c) Recognize and consider the important role of incarcerated person visitation in preparing an incarcerated person for successful release and rehabilitation. (Pen. Code, § 6400, subds. (a)-(c).)
- 4) Provides that the essential purpose of incarceration is rehabilitation and successful community reintegration, which should be achieved through education, treatment, and active participation in rehabilitative and restorative justice programs. (Pen. Code, § 1170.)
- 5) Requires CDCR to develop and implement policies for contraband interdiction at institutional entry points, including standardized screening procedures

applicable to all individuals entering facilities, such as visitors, staff, volunteers, and contract employees. (Pen. Code, § 6402.)

- 6) Establishes the Inmate Welfare Fund, which authorizes CDCR to fund programs for the benefit of incarcerated persons, including recreational and physical education activities, hobby programs, and other leisure-time services. (Pen. Code, § 5006.)
- 7) Requires CDCR to provide incarcerated persons with access to recreational and physical education programs under safe and secure conditions, consistent with custodial classification and institutional operations. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220.)
- 8) Permits CDCR to allow competitions between outside public teams and teams of incarcerated individuals if competitions take place within the facility and under the direct supervision of staff. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220, subd. (e).)
- 9) Provides that incarcerated persons may voluntarily participate in athletic activities, contests, and games only if those activities are specifically authorized by the institution head or their designee. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220, subd. (f).)
- 10) Authorizes CDCR to regulate recreational programming, including restricting activities that present safety risks and requiring supervision and medical clearance for certain activities. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220.1.)
- 11) Authorizes CDCR to regulate and control access to its institutions through a visitor approval process, including establishing conditions necessary to ensure institutional safety and security. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3170.)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes a policy in California to recognize participation in organized sports programming in state prisons as a form of rehabilitation.
- 2) Requires CDCR to adopt a department-wide policy on organized sports programming to be applied to all CDCR facilities by July 1, 2027.
- 3) Requires CDCR to consult with a wide range of stakeholders when creating the policy, including researchers and experts in sports and rehabilitation, criminal

justice reform organizations, professional and semi-professional sports teams and leagues, CDCR staff, and organizations representing incarcerated persons and their families.

- 4) Requires CDCR to consider the following topics when adopting the policy:
 - a) The safety of CDCR staff, incarcerated persons, and other participants;
 - b) The appropriate use of CDCR resources and facilities by incarcerated persons;
 - c) Eligibility requirements for participation; and
 - d) Broader impacts to public safety.
- 5) Permits CDCR to solicit proposals, accept unsolicited proposals, negotiate, and enter into agreements with public and private entities, including professional sports teams, the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, and private universities for the purpose of expanding access to organized sports programming at CDCR facilities.
- 6) Establishes the Second Chance Sports Fund within the State Treasury and requires:
 - a) Funds deposited into the fund to be available, upon appropriation and approval of the Government Operations Agency, to support the expansion of organized sports programming at facilities operated by CDCR;
 - b) The Government Operations Agency to seek advisement from the Legislature and CDCR on how to prioritize the use of the funds, and to approve the uses of the moneys;
 - c) The fund to receive money from any source, including private donations;
 - d) The funds to supplement, not replace, existing funding for recreational sports programming at CDCR; and
 - e) No more than 5 percent of the funds to be used for administrative purposes.
- 7) Requires the State Treasurer to provide a report to the Legislature on the amounts deposited into the fund before January 1, 2028, and annually thereafter.
- 8) States that the provisions of this bill will remain operative until January 1, 2030, or until the funds appropriated pursuant to this bill are exhausted, whichever occurs first.

9) Includes legislative findings and declarations.

Background

Although there is limited research on the positive impact of sports programming, there are some studies that suggest structured sports programming in correctional settings may support improvements in institutional behavior, mental health, and post-release outcomes for incarcerated individuals. For example, the Twinning Project, a partnership between correctional systems and professional soccer clubs in England and Wales, was recently evaluated in collaboration with researchers at the University of Oxford. The evaluation found that participation in their soccer-based programming was associated with a significant reduction in disciplinary infractions, as well as increased social bonding and optimism regarding post-release outcomes.

More broadly, a systematic review and meta-analysis of sports-based interventions found that participation in such programs was associated with moderate improvements across a range of outcomes, including recidivism, anger control, substance use, and attitudes toward offending. Additional research suggests that sports participation may contribute to improved mental health outcomes among incarcerated individuals, including reduced stress, improved emotional regulation, and increased social connection.

Existing regulations already provide for rehabilitative programming, including recreational and physical activities. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220.) CDCR currently states on its website that “Physical Education and Recreation programs are provided at each institution.” Additionally, existing regulations provide that incarcerated persons may participate in athletic activities, contests, and games, even with outside organizations, so long as the program is authorized by institutional leadership. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220, subd. (f).) CDCR also permits access to approved visitors and outside organizations, including for the provision of recreational programs and activities, subject to institutional security requirements. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 3220, subd. (e).)

This bill seeks to expand access to organized sports programming in state prisons by directing CDCR to develop a department-wide policy, facilitate partnerships with outside organizations, and establish a fund to support such programming. The bill is intended to increase opportunities for incarcerated persons to participate in structured athletic activities through collaboration with public and private entities, including colleges, universities, and professional sports teams. Specifically, the bill is intended to create more opportunities for incarcerated individuals to participate

in programs like the San Quentin Giants, where outside organizations visit the prisons for sports programming.

The primary effect of this bill is to require CDCR to formalize and standardize a policy on organized sports programming and to consult with specified stakeholders in doing so. While the bill encourages expanded collaboration with outside entities and establishes a funding mechanism to support such efforts, it does not mandate that CDCR enter into specific partnerships, implement particular programs, or ensure that organized sports involving outside participants are available at a specific number of facilities.

Therefore, while the bill may provide additional structure, guidance, and potential funding opportunities for organized sports programming, its practical impact will largely depend on how CDCR exercises its existing discretion to implement and expand existing recreational sports programs.

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

The Senate Appropriations Committee writes:

Moderate to significant costs to CDCR to establish the Second Chance Sports Act (General Fund). Unknown annual costs to CDCR and the Gov Ops Agency to establish and operate organized sports programming (private).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/21/26)

Anti-recidivism Coalition (source)
California Democratic Party
California Police Chiefs Association
California Public Defenders Association
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Sacramento Mayor Kevin McCarty
San Quentin Skunkworks
Smart Justice California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/21/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

Smart Justice California writes:

AB 2204 would direct the California Department of Corrections (“CDCR”) to establish a policy on organized sports, in collaboration with researchers, nonprofits, athletic organizations, and correctional line staff. The legislation would allow CDCR to collaborate with public and private entities, such as colleges and universities or professional sports teams, to implement this sports policy. Additionally, the legislation would establish a state fund to support the expansion of rehabilitative sports programs. The fund would be able to receive donations from a variety of sources, including private philanthropy, further facilitating public-private partnerships like those at San Quentin Rehabilitation Center.

By providing additional support, investment, and collaboration, AB 2204 will provide meaningful opportunities for incarcerated people to participate in sports. Not only will this improve physical and mental health at CDCR facilities, but it will also help improve outcomes for our state’s incarcerated population, helping to make California a safer place.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/27/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /916-651-4118
8/25/26 10:43:48

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2383
Author: Zbur (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENERGY, U. & C. COMMITTEE: 13-4, 6/30/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Caballero, Gonzalez, Hurtado, McNERNEY, Reyes, Richardson, Stern, Wahab

NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Dahle, Grove, Strickland

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-3, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Electricity: data centers

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to establish electrical corporation tariffs by January 1, 2028, for transmission and distribution and generation services for certain data centers. This bill specifies requirements these tariffs must meet, including, but not limited to, establishing requirements for data centers to pay for certain utility costs resulting from their interconnection in a manner that prevents an electrical corporation from assessing these costs on other ratepayers. This bill also requires Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs) to adopt generation tariffs for data centers that provide protections similar to those required in this bill for electrical corporation tariffs.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 remove provisions of this bill related to transmission interconnection, make various clarifications, and modify this bill's prepayment requirements to instead require a payment mechanism that meets specified cost-recovery requirements, including the provision of pre-payment or

collateral sufficient to cover an electrical corporation's long-term generation contracting costs incurred to serve a tariffed data center.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the CPUC to supervise and regulate every public utility in the state and permits the CPUC to do anything that is necessary and convenient to exercise its power and jurisdiction. (Public Utilities Code §701)
- 2) Authorizes the CPUC to set rates for public utilities and specifies that every cost charged by utilities to customers must be just and reasonable. (Public Utilities Code §451)
- 3) Defines an electrical corporation as every corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any electric plant for compensation within this state, except where electricity is generated on or distributed by the producer through private property solely for its own use or the use of its tenants and not for sale or transmission to others. (Public Utilities Code §218)
- 4) Defines a load-serving entity (LSE) as an electrical corporation, Energy Service Provider (ESP), or CCA. Existing law specifies that a LSE does not include a local publicly owned electric utility (POU) or the State Water Project. (Public Utilities Code §380)
- 5) Creates the Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) by establishing a state goal of procuring at least 60% of total retail sales of electricity from renewable energy resources by December 31, 2030, with specified benchmarks up to that date. Existing law requires the CPUC to oversee electrical corporations' compliance with renewable energy procurement mandates and requires the California Energy Commission (CEC) to oversee POU renewable energy procurement compliance. (Public Utilities Code §399.11 et. seq.)
- 6) Establishes a policy to source 100% of all in-state retail electricity sales from zero-carbon resources by December 31, 2045. Existing law requires the CPUC, CEC and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to incorporate this policy into all relevant plans. (Public Utilities Code §454.53)
- 7) Authorizes the CPUC to assess the extent to which electrical corporation costs for new loads from data centers result in cost shifts to other electrical

corporation customers. Existing law specifies that this assessment must be published by January 1, 2027, and it must include the following:

- a) An analysis of potential electrical corporation costs associated with utility procurement for data center electricity consumption.
 - b) An analysis of potential electrical corporation costs associated with new transmission and distribution assets to serve new data centers or expansions of existing data centers, as specified.
 - c) Identification of opportunities to address any substantial cost shifts. (Public Utilities Code §913.22)
- 8) Establishes an opt-in permitting process at the CEC for certain non-fossil fueled power generation facilities. Existing law specifies certain criteria a facility must meet in order to qualify for this opt-in certification. These criteria include, but are not limited to, meeting certain labor standards for the construction of the facility seeking certification. Existing law specifies requirements regarding the use of a prevailing wage and skilled and trained workforce for opt-in permitting eligibility. (Public Resource Code §25545 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Establishes various definitions for the purposes of this bill, including defining a data center as a facility, or a part of a facility, housing computing infrastructure, including graphics and central processing units, servers, storage devices, networking equipment, and associated power and cooling systems, primarily for the purpose of storing, or distributing electronic data. This bill also defines a “participating customer” as a data center subject to a tariff established by this bill.
- 2) Requires the CPUC, to the extent permissible under federal law, to direct each electrical corporation to file a transmission and distribution service tariff that does all the following:
 - a) Ensures that all data centers pay a reasonable share of costs relating to wildfire mitigation, wildfire liability, electrification and environmental programs, and other costs typically collected from distribution-level ratepayers.
 - b) Prevents stranded costs for, or cost shifts to electrical corporation customers that are not subject to the tariff.

- c) Ensures that charges generally included in the generation component of a customer's bill can be assessed as a separate line item for unbundled customers that do not receive transmission, distribution, and generation services from the same utility.
- 3) Requires the CPUC to direct each electrical corporation to file a generation service tariff that does all the following:
- a) Ensures the procurement of generation resources supporting utilities' ability to meet RPS and zero-carbon procurement goals.
 - b) Ensures that data centers provide equitable contributions to reliability and other programs funded through charges generally collected through the generation component of a customer's bill.
 - c) Requires the tariffed customer to report expected on-site generation located in front of the customer's meter.
 - d) Ensures that a tariffed data center does not receive compensation for onsite generation in a manner that would result in cost shifts to other retail electricity consumers.
 - e) Establishes a payment mechanism to ensure that a tariffed data center pays for utility costs resulting from utility procurements necessary to serve the data center's incremental new load. This mechanism must prevent non-tariffed customers from incurring stranded asset costs resulting from procurement for tariffed data centers. This bill specifies that the payment mechanism established to ensure that tariffed data centers pay for incremental generation costs must be 10 years in duration, include early termination fees, facilitate pre-payment or upfront collateral to pay for generation costs, and ensure that the data center pays a minimum percentage of its expected load, as specified. This bill requires procurements to comply with state climate goals and authorizes a tariffed data center to offset the obligation to pay for utility incremental generation costs by installing zero-emissions resources behind-the-meter. Any reduction in generation payment obligations must be relative to the amount of zero-emissions resources installed behind the customer's meter.
- 4) Specifies that the generation tariff established by this bill shall not apply to the following types of data centers:
- a) A publicly funded research facility.
 - b) A public safety facility.
 - c) A publicly funded national security facility, as identified by the commission.

- d) A publicly owned facility.
 - e) A utility facility, including, but not limited to, a facility operated for the purpose of providing telecommunications services to the public by a terrestrial facilities-based telecommunications provider.
- 5) Requires the CPUC to establish a minimum load threshold for the purpose of applying this bill's generation tariff to a data center with a load above that threshold. This bill specifies that the CPUC may not set this minimum threshold above 25 megawatts (MW).
- 6) Requires CCAs and ESPs to establish data center generation tariffs that are consistent with this bill's requirements for IOU data center generation tariffs.
- 7) Specifies that this bill's generation tariff requirements to not authorize the CPUC to regulate the rates, terms, or condition of electrical service provided by a CCA or ESP.
- 8) Clarifies that this bill does not expand the Direct Access program.

Background

Data center growth has triggered electric rate concerns and new utility procurement needs. Data centers in California vary in purpose and size, and many facilities meeting the definition of a data center do not primarily support generative artificial intelligence (AI). Even those data centers that do support generative AI can provide services for a wide variety of clients, including national defense installations, research universities and labs, government agencies, and telecommunications systems. While this bill broadly applies to all large energy consumers, data centers have been the primary focus of recent ratepayer concerns regarding cost shifts from the commercial and industrial sectors. According to a May 2024 report from the CEC, data centers comprise approximately two percent of the state's total annual electricity demand. The CEC anticipates that data centers' electricity consumption may double in the next 10 years without implementation of any additional energy efficiency measures. Load growth from data centers has been substantially higher in other states. Pennsylvania – New Jersey – Maryland Interconnection (PJM) operates the largest regional grid in the United States. In January 2026, data from PJM indicated that 40% of its expected increased electricity demand will come from data centers. With this increase in electricity demands, PJM has seen record high costs for electricity to meet future reliability needs in addition to new transmission costs. Consumers in four states

within PJM territory paid over \$4 billion in 2024 alone for transmission projects serving data centers. California has not experienced the level of data center growth seen in some other states; however, a number of California's utilities are projecting substantial data center load growth in the next four years.

Data centers are not the only source of projected significant load growth. In forecasts focusing on near term demand, the CEC has shown that the California Independent System Operator may experience a 1.8 gigawatt (GW) load growth from data centers by 2030. However, the CEC's energy demand forecast covering 2025 through 2045 indicates that vehicle electrification will be the largest driver of peak electricity demand in the state by 2045. While data centers are expected to increase peak electricity demand by 4.7 GW by 2045, electric vehicles and associated charging infrastructure may contribute approximately 8.2 GW to peak demand. Regardless of the sector contributing to the largest share of future energy costs, serving these future loads will necessarily require additional resources. To address these needs, the CPUC has ordered utilities under its jurisdiction to collectively procure six GW of new zero emissions energy resources by 2032. This six GW procurement is intended to cover near-term load growth and account for delays in delivering previously planned renewable resources, including offshore wind resources.

The CPUC is in the process of modifying rate structures to address potential cost shifts from new large loads, including data centers. In addition to ordering new procurements to serve future load growth, the CPUC is also considering new tariffs and rate structures to prevent large loads from unduly burdening other ratepayers. In November 2024, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) filed an application at the CPUC to establish a new electric rule for retail electricity customers seeking interconnection at the transmission level (Application 24-11-007). According to PG&E's filings, data centers were 67% of the 34 transmission interconnection applications that PG&E received between 2023 and November 2024. In July 2025, the CPUC issued an initial decision (D. 25-07-039) that approved an interim PG&E electric rule for data centers that pre-pay the cost of interconnection. On April 9, 2026, the CPUC started the process to open a rulemaking on the California Advanced Electric Rate Design (R. 26-04-009). As part of this proceeding the CPUC intends to explore opportunities to address affordability challenges associated with wildfire costs and rapid load growth, including load from data centers. The CPUC's order opening this rulemaking indicates that the CPUC intends to publish a staff proposal on rate reforms as part of this proceeding in the 3rd Quarter of 2026. Since this bill would establish requirements for rate classes and tariffs that impact issues the CPUC intends to explore in its ongoing rate

reform proceeding, this bill may require the CPUC to modify its ongoing rulemaking.

Bill may prevent other ratepayers from incurring costs associated with stranded generation costs. As data center loads increase, utilities must procure electricity to meet these new loads. In order to ensure sufficient generation resources and meet existing long-term procurement obligations, IOUs may enter into long-term contracts to develop new incremental generation resources to serve growing data center demands. Increasingly, consumer groups have expressed concern that a financial bubble in data center and AI investment may ultimately collapse, leading to the sale of a large number of data centers and potentially, the liquidation of other facilities. To the extent that IOUs have entered into long-term contracts to serve facilities that cease operations in their service territories before the IOUs can fully recoup the costs for those contracts, other ratepayers may be left paying any costs that remain when a data center ceases electricity service. This bill's generation tariff requires the CPUC to establish cost recovery mechanisms to ensure that IOUs can continue to enter into long-term contracts (10 years in duration) without facing the risk that unpaid generation costs would be shifted to other ratepayers when a data center ceases operations before those contracts are fully paid.

Bill's transmission service tariff requirements may depend on federal rules.

Existing law's boundaries between federal and state jurisdiction over transmission rates generally reflect an electricity landscape in which transmission-interconnected facilities are primarily electricity generators receiving wholesale transmission service. Recently, large load electrical customers have been requesting transmission level interconnection to receive retail electric service at transmission-level voltages. This bill requires the CPUC to establish a transmission and distribution service tariff that ensures that transmission and distribution service costs are not shifted to other ratepayers. Since transmission is generally considered an interstate service, transmission rates largely fall under federal jurisdiction. Under the Federal Power Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) sets formulas for utilities to calculate their transmission costs of service, which are used to calculate transmission rates. The CPUC represents California electricity customers in FERC transmission rate proceedings; however, the CPUC does not directly regulate the transmission rate formulas administered by FERC. Since FERC retains authority over transmission rates, the CPUC may be limited in its ability to regulate transmission service rates under this bill; however, the CPUC retains the authority to regulate utility costs associated with the electric distribution system. Consequently, this bill requirements for transmission and distribution

service tariffs may largely impact the CPUC's obligations when ratemaking on distribution services.

Bill is linked SB 886 (Padilla) of the current legislative session. Both this bill and SB 886 require the CPUC to establish tariffs to address utility costs associated with data centers. This bill requires the CPUC to establish a transmission and distribution service tariff as well as a generation tariff for data centers. This bill also sets requirements for CCA and ESP generation tariffs. SB 886 requires the CPUC to establish a transmission interconnection tariff and authorizes the establishment of a demand response program for data centers. SB 886 also sets CPUC duties when establishing all of these data center tariffs, including those tariffs contained in this bill. While these bills are not expressly contingent upon each other, the bills' requirements do not conflict with each other. Together, SB 886 and AB 2383 establish the *California Technology Innovation and Ratepayer Protection Act* as a single article in the Public Utilities Code.

Related/Prior Legislation

SB 886 (Padilla, 2026) requires the CPUC to ensure that electric corporation costs to serve data centers are not shifted to other ratepayers when adopting tariffs for data centers. The bill requires the CPUC to adopt a transmission interconnection tariff transmission-interconnected data centers that ensures that utility costs associated with interconnecting those data centers are paid for by the data centers and are not shifted to other ratepayers. The bill also authorizes tariffed data centers to participate in a demand response program established by the CPUC and specifies that this demand response program may not result in any net costs for other ratepayers. The bill is pending in the Assembly.

SB 887 (Padilla, 2026) establishes certain permitting permissions for data centers that meet specified criteria. These criteria include provisions similar to the requirements for the tariff specified in this bill. The bill is pending concurrence in the Senate.

SB 978 (Pérez, 2026) would have required the CPUC to create a special rate structure for large data centers to prevent cost shifts to other customers. The bill would have established labor requirements for the construction of facilities subject to the bill. The bill would have expanded existing CPUC reporting requirements to include a specified assessment about data center impacts to renewable procurement goals. The bill was held by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1577 (Bauer-Kahan, 2026) requires the owner of a data center to submit specified information regarding the data center's energy consumption to the CEC and local agencies permitting the construction of the data center. The bill also sets limitations on the ability of the CEC and local agencies to disclose information submitted by data centers and requires the CEC report on load impacts of data centers in the Integrated Energy Policy Report. The bill is headed to the Governor.

SB 57 (Padilla, Chapter 647, Statutes of 2025) authorized the CPUC to assess the extent to which electrical corporation costs for new loads from data centers result in cost shifts to other electrical corporation customers. The bill also required the CPUC to publish and submit a report regarding its assessment to the relevant legislative policy committees by January 1, 2027.

AB 222 (Bauer-Kahan, 2025) would have required the CPUC to assess the extent to which electrical corporation costs for serving data centers result in cost shifts to other customers. The bill also would have required the CEC to establish a process for data centers to submit specified energy efficiency data to the CEC, and it required the CEC to assess data centers' energy consumption. Certain provisions of the bill were substantially similar to provisions in this bill. The bill was held by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1298 (Cortese, 2024) would have increased the amount of thermal generation a data center could use as backup power from 100 MW to 150 MW without triggering the CEC's power plant siting process. The bill would have also created conditions for data centers to use this exemption. The bill died in the Assembly.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Ongoing costs, likely in the high hundreds of thousands of dollars annually (ratepayer funds), for the CPUC to open or expand a proceeding creating a new classification and rate schedule for data centers, evaluate cost allocation, stranded-cost, and cost-shift issues associated with those customers, develop minimum contract requirements between data centers and load-serving entities including contract duration, early termination fees, minimum payment requirements, and onsite-generation reporting, ensure consistency of those requirements across LSEs, and provide associated legal, policy, administrative, and Administrative Law Judge support — among other things.

- To the extent that this bill impacts electricity rates, it could result in costs or savings to the state as an electric utility ratepayer. The State of California is an electricity customer, purchasing roughly one percent of the state's electricity. As such, the state incurs costs when rates increase, and realizes cost savings if rates go down (various funds).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/30/26)

Bay Area Council

California State Association of Electrical Workers

California State Pipe Trades Council

E2

Engineers and Scientists of California, Local 20

Little Hoover Commission

NAACP California-Hawaii State Conference

National Diversity Coalition

Natural Resources Defense Council

SEIU California

Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/30/26)

Building Owners and Managers Association of California

CalAsian Chamber of Commerce

California African American Chamber of Commerce

California Business Properties Association

California Chamber of Commerce

California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

California Large Energy Consumers Association

California Manufacturers and Technology Association

Climate Action Campaign

Data Center Coalition

NAIOP California

Net-Zero California

TechCA

TechNet

The Utility Reform Network

Western States Petroleum Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the author:

California is recognized globally as a premier hub for the innovation economy, and specifically, with a leading footprint in advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence. With the rapid growth of these technologies, the state must grapple with the associated development of large load data centers. AB 2383 advances affordability for electricity ratepayers by ensuring that data centers pay their fair share and that costs of providing service to these facilities are not borne by other ratepayers. This bill will ensure timely and efficient planning as the state prepares for the emergence of unprecedented demand on the electrical grid, and will be critical in protecting ratepayers and advancing system-wide reliability.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: Opponents argue that this bill is unnecessary and could limit the growth of technology infrastructure. In opposition, the California Chamber of Commerce states:

Unfortunately, the bill's structure provides a rigid statutory framework that could complicate project development, discourage investment in digital infrastructure, and constrain the CPUC's ability to tailor ratepayer protections to actual costs and system conditions. AB 2383 seeks to ensure that the costs of serving new data center loads are not shifted onto other ratepayers. That objective is appropriate, but it is already being addressed through existing utility tariffs, interconnection agreements, and ongoing CPUC proceedings. Rather than letting the CPUC develop a record, the bill dictates terms for transmission and distribution service, generation service, and tariffs offered by community choice aggregators and electric service providers.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 69-3, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, 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, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: DeMaio, Ellis, Hadwick

NO VOTE RECORDED: Castillo, Chen, Dixon, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo,
Celeste Rodriguez, Ta

Prepared by: Sarah Smith / E., U. & C. / (916) 651-4107
8/30/26 17:20:19

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2414
Author: Nguyen (D)
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE: 5-0, 6/29/26

AYES: Becker, Ochoa Bogh, Laird, Pérez, Weber Pierson

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Developmental services: direct support professionals

SOURCE: California Disability Services Association

DIGEST: This bill defines “Direct Support Professional” for purposes of the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act).

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 add double-jointing language.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 strike the requirement for the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to develop billing guidance necessary to facilitate compensation associated with DSP University training.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Lanterman Act, which states that California is responsible for providing a range of services and supports sufficiently complete to meet the needs and choices of each person with developmental disabilities, regardless of age or degree of disability, and at each stage of life, and to support their

integration into the mainstream life of the community. (Welfare and Institutions Code [WIC] 4500 et seq.)

- 2) Establishes a system of nonprofit Regional Centers, overseen by DDS, to provide fixed points of contact in the community for all persons with developmental disabilities and their families, to coordinate services and supports best suited to them throughout their lifetime. (WIC § 4620)
- 3) States legislative intent to phase in funding and policies beginning in the 2021–22 fiscal year to implement developmental services rate reform, which shall include a quality incentive program, create an enhanced person-centered, outcomes-based system, and complete this transformation by July 1, 2025. (WIC §4519.10)
- 4) Finds and declares that Direct Support Professionals are critical to the provision of services and support to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities, and, in recognition of the value of the services provided by Direct Support Professionals, additional training and development will enhance the services they provide and foster a more sustainable workforce. (WIC §4511.5(a))
- 5) Requires DDS to develop or utilize existing curriculum to implement enhanced Direct Support Professional training that promotes services that are person centered and culturally and linguistically sensitive, and that improve outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Provides it is the intent of the Legislature to enhance the quality of services that consumers receive from Direct Support Professionals, including, but not limited to, improving knowledge about general health and safety issues, employing principles of self-determination, and working to improve quality of services and quality of life, including advancing health equity for consumers of regional center services. Requires the enhanced Direct Support Professional training to include, but not be limited to, all of the following elements:
 - a) Competency based.
 - b) Tiered training and certification.
 - c) Continuing education.
 - d) Outcome measures, as defined by DDS, with input with stakeholders, as specified. (WIC §4511.5(b))

- 6) Requires DDS to consult with stakeholders throughout the implementation of enhanced Direct Support Professional training, as specified. (WIC §4511.5(c))
- 7) Requires DDS, commencing on July 1, 2025, and every other year thereafter, to review and update the rate models per the cost inputs available at the time of the review and post the updated rate models on its internet website no later than January 1 of the following year. Provides that an adjustment to a provider rate shall be contingent upon the appropriation of funds by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act and approval of federal funding. (WIC §4519.11)
- 8) Defines “substantial disability” as the existence of significant functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity, as determined by a regional center, and as appropriate to the age of the person:
 - a) Self-care.
 - b) Receptive and expressive language.
 - c) Learning.
 - d) Mobility.
 - e) Self-direction.
 - f) Capacity for independent living.
 - g) Economic self-sufficiency. (WIC §4512(1)(1))
- 9) Defines, for community care facility licensing, “activities of daily living” as the following six activities: bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring, continence, and eating. (22 California Code of Regulations [CCR] §80001(a)(1))

This bill:

- 1) Requires DDS, on or before April 1, 2027, to develop the billing guidance necessary to facilitate compensation associated with the enhanced Direct Support Professional training described in (5) above.
- 2) Defines “Direct Support Professional” as an individual who receives compensation to provide direct support to children or adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities, is employed by a service provider receiving regional center funding, and spends at least 50% of their working time completing direct support tasks, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

- a) Services that enhance independence and community inclusion.
 - b) Assisting with skill development, including personal and vocational coaching.
 - c) Providing assistance with activities of daily living.
- 3) Renames “direct service professional” to “Direct Support Professional” throughout the Lanterman Act.
- 4) Adds double jointing language with AB or SB 175.

Background

Purpose of the Bill. According to the author, “Direct Support Professionals (DSPs) are on the front lines, providing direct and essential support to California's community of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDDs). This workforce ensures that folks with IDD maintain their dignity, independence, and access to social opportunities by providing a wide range of supports, including job coaching and employment support, mobility assistance, wound care, and the administration of medication. Unfortunately, California is currently facing a DSP workforce shortage, which severely reduces supports and services for the IDD community. Low wages in exchange for this highly skilled labor are forcing workers to seek employment in other industries to make ends meet.

“AB 2414 addresses this issue by standardizing references to DSPs throughout state law, strengthening workforce recognition, enabling consistent data collection, and supporting more effective policy development. By ensuring DSPs are formally recognized in state law, this bill also increases access to supports and services for individuals with IDDs.”

Lanterman Act. In 1969, the Lanterman Act established that individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families have a right to receive the necessary services and supports required to live independently in the community. The Lanterman Act enumerates the rights of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities as well as the rights of their families, the services and supports available to these individuals, and how regional centers and service providers work together to provide these services and supports. The term “developmental disability” is defined as a disability that originates before a person reaches 18 years of age, is expected to continue indefinitely, and is a significant disability for the individual. Such disabilities include, among others: epilepsy, autism spectrum disorder, intellectual disability, and cerebral palsy. There are no

income-related eligibility criteria to access developmental services. The Department of Finance estimates that approximately 487,114 individuals will receive developmental services in 2025–26, increasing to 526,848 in 2026–27.

Regional Centers and Provider Vendorization. In addition to establishing the rights of individuals, the Lanterman Act also created California’s regional center system, comprised of 21 nonprofit regional centers throughout the state whose primary purpose is to connect individuals with services in the community. Regional centers contract with service providers, or vendors, to provide services to consumers. DDS and regional centers use the term “vendorization” to describe the approval process involved in preparing to provide services to regional center consumers, which typically involves obtaining additional licenses or approvals from other state and local agencies prior to becoming a vendor. Service providers must be vendored by a regional center before they can provide and be reimbursed for services.

Direct Support Professional Workforce. Service providers employ Direct Support Professionals, referred to in statute as direct *service* professionals, to work directly with consumers. Services and supports available to consumers may include independent and supported living, day programs, and employment services, among others. According to the Administration for Community Living:

[Direct Support Professionals] support people with disabilities in a wide variety of ways, based upon the unique needs of the person receiving support. Many provide assistance with activities of daily living, but their role is much broader than that. [Direct Support Professionals] may also provide job coaching and employment support, independent living skills training, assistance with accessing resources and opportunities in the community, and more. Without [Direct Support Professionals], many people with disabilities would not be able to live independently.

According to the Association of Regional Center Agencies, the number of Direct Support Professionals in California’s developmental services system is estimated at around 100,000.

DSP University. DSP University was established through the 2021 Budget Act to improve service quality, promote equity and culturally responsive services, strengthen the Direct Support Professional workforce, and support retention through career pathways. DSP University is a free, voluntary, statewide, competency-based training and certification program for Direct Support Professionals. It provides structured training through three tiers of training content,

including foundational understanding of the developmental services system, the individuals they support, and core knowledge and skills to encourage health, safety, and well-being; quality of life outcomes beyond safety and physical well-being; mandatory reporting training; and advanced specialization in specific areas of practice.

Participation in DSP University is voluntary. To be eligible, a Direct Support Professional must meet all of the following criteria:

- Primarily providing direct support to children and/or adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
- Providing support and supervision.
- Support individuals to learn new skills or continue to perform tasks independently.
- Ensuring optimal health and safety and assisting with household upkeep to maintain a clean, safe, and hazard-free environment.
- Assisting individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities with skills development, guidance, and personal assistance.
- Spending at least 50% of their work hours performing direct support tasks.
- Being funded by a regional center.

This bill defines a Direct Support Professional as an individual who receives compensation to provide direct support to children or adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities, is employed by a service provider receiving regional center funding, and spends at least 50% of their working time completing direct support tasks, as specified.

Comments

This bill defines Direct Support Professional and cleans up inconsistent references in statute. The definition of Direct Support Professional in this bill aligns with eligibility criteria for DSP University, which was established to enhance the quality of services and improve outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 1575 (Arambula) would change the word “consumer” to “person eligible for regional center services” throughout the Lanterman Act. AB 1575 is pending on the Senate Floor.

AB 2423 (Mathis, Chapter 904, Statutes of 2024) required DDS, commencing July 1, 2025, and every other year thereafter, to review and update the rate models included in the rate study for developmental services providers. AB 2423 required DDS to post the updated rate models on its internet website no later than January 1 of the following year and provided that adjustments to provider rates shall be contingent upon an appropriation.

AB 136 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 76, Statutes of 2021), a budget trailer bill, required DDS to develop and implement a Direct Support Professional training curriculum (DSP University) that promotes person-centered services that are culturally and linguistically sensitive and improves consumer outcomes.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Unknown General Fund cost pressures, potentially hundreds of thousands annually, to provide compensation associated with the training for direct support professionals.
- The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) indicates no fiscal impact for state operations since the department already utilizes the term “direct support professional” and is developing billing guidance to support enhanced, training-based compensation using existing funds.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

California Disability Services Association (source)

Association of Regional Center Agencies

California Respite Association

Manos

The Arc and United Cerebral Palsy California Collaboration

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0, 5/26/26

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

Prepared by: Diana Dominguez / HUMAN S. / (916) 651-1524
8/30/26 15:12:06

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2440
Author: Muratsuchi (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 27

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/17/26
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Choi, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Arts and Music in Schools—Funding Guarantee and Accountability
Act: allowable uses: pooled funding: certifications

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill makes various changes to the Arts and Music in Schools (AMS) Funding Guarantee and Accountability Act (Proposition 28) by authorizing local educational agencies (LEAs) to pool allocated funds across schoolsites, establishing a statutory methodology for demonstrating compliance with the supplement-not-supplant requirement, expanding reporting, certification, and transparency requirements, and revising the definition of arts education programs and allowable expenditures.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 replace the requirement that LEAs certify that all aspects of Proposition 28 have been “implemented properly” at each schoolsite with a requirement to certify that all provisions have been implemented in accordance with Proposition 28 requirements. The amendments also narrow the annual audit by deleting the requirement that auditors determine whether Proposition 28 funds were expended in accordance with the statutory requirements of Proposition 28, while retaining the requirement to determine whether funds were expended pursuant to the LEA’s certifications.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the AMS Funding Guarantee and Accountability Act (Proposition 28), which provides ongoing funding to supplement arts education programs in K-12 public schools. (Education Code (EC) § 8820)
- 2) Continuously appropriates an amount equal to 1% of the total state and local revenues received by LEAs in the preceding fiscal year that are included in the Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantee calculation for allocation pursuant to the AMS Act. (EC § 8820)
- 3) Requires AMS Act funds to be allocated by the CDE to LEAs and subsequently distributed to schoolsites based on a statutory formula. (EC § 8820)
- 4) Requires the principal or program director of each schoolsite to develop an expenditure plan for AMS Act funds. (EC § 8820)
- 5) Requires LEAs to annually certify that AMS Act funds are used to supplement, and not supplant, existing funding for arts education programs. (EC § 8820)
- 6) Requires LEAs with more than 500 pupils to expend at least 80% of AMS Act funds on certificated or classified employees providing arts education instruction, unless waived by CDE. (EC § 8820)
- 7) Requires annual audits of LEAs to include Proposition 28 funds received and distributed by the LEA and determine whether those funds were expended pursuant to specified LEA certifications and statutory requirements. (EC § 8820; EC § 41020)
- 8) Requires the State Board of Education to adopt content standards in visual and performing arts. (EC § 60605.1)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes LEAs to pool Proposition 28 funds across schoolsites, provided the LEA:
 - a) Complies with all applicable requirements of the Act;
 - b) Ensures expenditures for each schoolsite remain proportional to that school's allocation; and

- c) Complies with expenditure plans adopted for participating schoolsites.
- 2) Revises annual supplement-not-supplant certifications by requiring LEAs to calculate “existing funds available for arts education programs” and “current-year expenditures for arts education programs” using a specified methodology.
- 3) Requires LEAs, when calculating existing funds available for arts education programs, to:
 - a) Begin with prior-year arts education expenditures;
 - b) Exclude Proposition 28 expenditures;
 - c) Exclude expenditures from resources that are no longer available in the current year;
 - d) Include newly available resources that are spent on arts education programs, excluding Proposition 28 funds; and
 - e) Account for specified personnel-related cost savings.
- 4) Specifies that resources no longer available in the current year may include expired, reduced, discontinued, exhausted, or one-time private contributions, parent fundraising revenues, and federal or state funding sources.
- 5) Deems an LEA to be in compliance with the supplement-not-supplant requirement if current-year arts education expenditures, excluding Proposition 28 funds, equal or exceed the calculated amount of existing funds available for arts education programs.
- 6) Expands the definition of an “arts education program” to include curriculum, instructional materials, and professional development.
- 7) Requires arts education programs funded pursuant to Proposition 28 to be consistent with specified state arts standards, frameworks, and preschool learning foundations, as applicable.
- 8) Requires the annual governing board- or body-approved Proposition 28 report to be submitted and posted on or before September 30, in a manner determined by CDE.
- 9) Requires each schoolsite or preschool to post its Proposition 28 expenditure plan and information regarding granted waivers on its internet website, and

authorizes an LEA to instead require this information to be posted on the LEA's internet website.

- 10) Requires CDE to post approved waivers on its internet website.
- 11) Beginning with the 2027–28 fiscal year, requires an LEA to certify that all provisions of Proposition 28 have been implemented in accordance with the requirements of Proposition 28 at each of its schoolsites.
- 12) Eliminates the requirement that annual audits determine whether Proposition 28 funds were expended pursuant to specified statutory requirements, while retaining the requirement that audits determine whether funds were expended pursuant to the LEA's certifications.
- 13) Defines “existing funding” for purposes of the Act as revenue available in the current year.

Comments

Need for the bill. According to the author, “For too long, access to arts education has been inequitable, leaving many students without the benefits of a well-rounded curriculum. Proposition 28 marked a significant step forward by establishing a dedicated funding stream for arts and music education in schools. However, as local educational agencies (LEAs) have begun implementing the measure, key areas of the law have proven unclear.

“Specifically, additional clarity is needed regarding whether smaller LEAs may pool funds and how to comply with the ‘supplement, not supplant’ requirement. AB 2440 makes commonsense clarifications to Proposition 28 by authorizing LEAs to pool resources and codifying clear rules for maintaining baseline funding levels. These changes build on existing guidance from the California Department of Education and help ensure that the promise of Proposition 28 is implemented consistently and reaches students across the state.”

Proposition 28 represented a major new state investment in arts education.

Proposition 28, approved by voters in 2022, created an ongoing funding stream dedicated to expanding arts education opportunities in California public schools. The measure directs approximately 1% of annual Proposition 98 funding levels, roughly \$1 billion per year, to support arts education programs at schoolsites throughout the state. In addition to creating a substantial new funding source, Proposition 28 included numerous accountability provisions intended to ensure that funds expand access to arts education rather than replace existing local investments.

Early implementation has revealed uncertainty regarding allowable expenditures and compliance requirements. As LEAs have begun implementing Proposition 28, questions have arisen regarding how certain provisions of the initiative should be interpreted and administered. In particular, uncertainty has existed regarding whether schoolsites may combine or pool allocations to support shared staffing arrangements and how LEAs should demonstrate compliance with the initiative's supplement-not-supplant requirements. Because Proposition 28 includes significant fiscal penalties for noncompliance, many LEAs have sought additional guidance before committing funds. This bill largely seeks to codify implementation practices, establish clearer compliance standards, and expand certain reporting and transparency requirements in order to provide greater certainty regarding how the initiative's requirements should be applied.

The supplement-not-supplant requirement has become a central implementation challenge. One of the most significant accountability provisions in Proposition 28 requires LEAs to use the funds to supplement, rather than supplant, existing arts education spending. While the initiative established that requirement, it did not specify how LEAs should determine whether they have met it. Questions may arise when prior-year arts programs were supported by one-time grants, private donations, local fundraising efforts, or other funding sources that are no longer available. This bill establishes a methodology for calculating an LEA's baseline arts education spending and specifies which funding sources should be excluded from that calculation. By establishing a statutory framework for compliance, including specifying how LEAs should treat expired grants, fundraising revenues, discontinued funding sources, and certain personnel-related savings, the bill seeks to provide greater consistency and predictability for LEAs administering Proposition 28 funds.

Recent litigation underscores the importance of clear statutory guidance. The proper interpretation of Proposition 28's supplement-not-supplant requirement is currently the subject of ongoing litigation involving Los Angeles Unified School District. Although the courts ultimately will determine the merits of those claims, the dispute illustrates the challenges LEAs face when attempting to interpret broadly worded accountability provisions that lack detailed statutory direction. This bill represents a legislative effort to establish clearer statutory standards for demonstrating compliance with the supplement-not-supplant requirement and may reduce uncertainty for LEAs seeking to expand arts education programs while remaining compliant with Proposition 28.

Pooling authority may improve the practical use of Proposition 28 funds. Many schoolsites receive Proposition 28 allocations that are insufficient on their own to

support a full-time arts educator or specialized arts program. At the same time, schools continue to face staffing shortages in a number of instructional areas, including arts education. By expressly authorizing LEAs to pool funds across schoolsites while maintaining existing site allocation and accountability requirements, the bill may provide greater flexibility for LEAs to share personnel and resources among multiple schools. This approach may be particularly beneficial for smaller schools and districts seeking to maximize the impact of their Proposition 28 allocations.

Revising the Proposition 28 accountability framework. Proposition 28 currently requires annual audits to determine both whether funds were expended pursuant to LEA certifications and whether expenditures complied with specified statutory requirements. These amendments remove the latter requirement while adding, beginning in 2027–28, an LEA certification that all provisions of Proposition 28 have been implemented in accordance with the requirements of the initiative at each schoolsite. As a result, the bill shifts a portion of the compliance determination from the annual audit process to an affirmative certification by the LEA, while retaining auditor review of whether expenditures were made pursuant to the LEA’s certifications.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The California Department of Education (CDE) estimates ongoing General Fund costs of \$581,000 and 3.2 positions to implement the bill’s requirements.
- The bill’s changes to the AMS program would not result in additional costs and could possibly reduce workload for LEAs by revising various compliance requirements for the program.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

Alameda County Office of Education
California Arts Advocates
California County Superintendents
California Music Educators Association
California State PTA
California Teachers Association
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Debra Duardo

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 74-0, 5/21/26

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

Prepared by: Ian Johnson / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/30/26 14:44:16

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2493
Author: Petrie-Norris (D)
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE ENERGY, U. & C. COMMITTEE: 13-4, 6/30/26

AYES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Caballero, Gonzalez, Hurtado, McNERNEY, Reyes, Richardson, Stern, Wahab

NOES: Ochoa Bogh, Dahle, Grove, Strickland

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 57-17, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Electrical corporations: interconnection: Public Utilities
Commission: transmission development monitor.

SOURCE: American Clean Power-California
Union of Concerned Scientists

DIGEST: This bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to require specific actions to help accelerate interconnection of generating resources to electrical transmission facilities.

Senate floor amendments of 8/28/26 address requests from the Governor's Office.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has exclusive jurisdiction over the transmission of electricity in interstate commerce and over all facilities for the transmission or sale of electricity in interstate commerce.

(Federal Power Act §§201, 205, 206 (Title 16 United States Code (USC) 824, 824d, 824e))

- 2) Establishes and vests the CPUC with regulatory authority over public utilities, including electrical corporations. (Article 12 of the California Constitution)
- 3) Establishes the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (California Energy Commission (CEC)) and requires the CEC to assess trends in energy consumption and analyze the social, economic, and environmental consequences of trends. (Public Resources Code §25200 *et seq.*)
- 4) Establishes the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) as a nonprofit public benefit corporation and requires it to ensure efficient use and reliable operation of the electrical transmission grid. (Public Utilities Code §345)
- 5) Requires, under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions limit. Authorized CARB to include market-based compliance mechanisms to comply with the regulations. (Health and Safety Code §38500 *et seq.*)
- 6) Requires every electrical corporation that owns electrical transmission facilities to annually prepare, as part of the FERC Order 890 process, and submit to the CPUC, a report identifying any electrical transmission facility, upgrade, or enhancement that is reasonably necessary to achieve the Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) procurement requirements. Requires each electrical corporation that owns electrical transmission facilities to annually prepare, and submit to the CPUC, a report on any changes to previously reported in-service dates of transmission and interconnection facilities necessary to provide transmission deliverability to eligible renewable energy resources or energy storage resources that have executed interconnection agreements. (Public Utilities Code §399.13)
- 7) Authorizes the CPUC to supervise and regulate every public utility in the state and may do all things which are necessary and convenient in the exercise of such power and jurisdiction. (Public Utilities Code §701)
- 8) Requires the CPUC to report to the Legislature by November 1 of each year specified information in order to evaluate the progress of the state's electrical corporations in complying with the California RPS Program (Article 16

(commencing with Section 399.11) of Chapter 2.3). This includes a systemwide assessment of delays to interconnection or transmission approvals for eligible renewable energy resources or energy storage resources, based on the annual reports submitted to the CPUC by electrical corporations pursuant to Public Utilities Code §399.13. (Public Utilities Code §913.4)

This bill:

- 1) Defines “large electrical corporation” as defined in Public Utilities Code §3280.
- 2) Defines “transmission owner” as an entity, other than a large electrical corporation, that owns, controls, or is assigned or obligated to construct transmission facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the FERC and is assigned or obligated to construct a transmission or interconnection project that requires a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN) or permit to construct.
- 3) Requires each large electrical corporation and transmission owner, within one year following the adoption of a transmission plan by the CAISO through the transmission planning process (TPP), or a successor process, or within one year following the execution of a generator interconnection agreement, that is assigned or obligated to construct a project that requires approval by the CPUC to submit to the transmission development monitor at the CPUC a project specific schedule for the project, as provided. Provides that one-year period begins after the CAISO selects a project sponsor for competitive solicitation projects.
- 4) Requires the CPUC, on or before October 1, 2027, to establish a transmission development monitor within the CPUC.
- 5) Requires the transmission development monitor to monitor and review certain transmission- and interconnection-related facilities submitted by the large electrical corporation and transmission owners, the large electrical corporation’s and transmission owner’s progress on completing network upgrades following approval in a generator interconnection agreement or transmission plan approved by the CAISO, the large electrical corporation’s and transmission owner’s compliance with the schedule submitted to the transmission development monitor, and the large electrical corporation’s and transmission owner’s compliance with any remedial actions ordered by the CPUC, as specified.

- 6) Requires the transmission development monitor to report to the CPUC on an annual basis, as provided, and notify the CPUC within 15 days of identifying a material deficiency, as defined.
- 7) Requires the CPUC, within 90 days of receiving an annual report or notification of material deficiency to issue a resolution directing the large electrical corporation and transmission owner to take remedial actions material deficiencies identified by the transmission development monitor, as specified, but consistent with and not in exceedance of the CPUC's authority with respect to federal law.
- 8) Makes legislative findings and declares that Section 1 of the bill, which adds Section 769.4, to the Public Utilities Code, imposes a limitation on the public's right of access to the meetings of public bodies or the writings of public officials and agencies within the meaning of Section 3 of Article 1 of the California Constitution in order to protect the confidential and market-sensitive information of an entity subject to Section 1 of this act.

Background

SB 100/SB 1020 clean energy goals. With the adoption of SB 100 (De León, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) and SB 1020 (Laird, Chapter 361, Statutes of 2022) statute establishes the policy of the state that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 90% of all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2035, 95% of all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2040, 100% of all retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2045, and 100% of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2035. SB 100 increased the RPS requirement from 50% by 2030 to 60% of retail sales for each retail seller. SB 100 also required CARB, CEC, and CPUC to issue a joint report by January 1, 2021, and at least every four years, that describes technologies, forecasts, affordability, and system and local reliability. The report is required to include an evaluation of costs and benefits to customer rate impacts, as well as barriers to achieving the SB 100 policy. The first Joint Agency report was issued January 2021 and found that in order to meet the state's energy goals California will need to roughly triple its current electricity power capacity.

CAISO. The CAISO is a nonprofit public benefit corporation created by California statute as part of the effort to deregulate the electricity market in the late 1990s. The CAISO manages the flow of electricity across the high-voltage bulk power

system that makes up 80% of California's, and a small part of Nevada's, electric grid. CAISO is registered as both a transmission operator and balancing authority (BA) under federal reliability requirements. As with other BAs, the CAISO is regulated by federal statute and regulations with oversight by FERC and the North American Energy Reliability Corporation (NERC).

Transmission planning process. Each year, the CAISO conducts its TPP to identify potential system limitations as well as opportunities for system reinforcements that improve reliability and efficiency. The CAISO Transmission Plan provides a comprehensive evaluation of the CAISO transmission grid to address grid reliability requirements, identify upgrades needed to successfully meet California's policy goals, and explore projects that can bring economic benefits to consumers. The plan relies heavily on key inputs from state agencies in translating legislative policy into actionable policy driven inputs. The development of the transmission plan entails annual public stakeholder process that is conducted pursuant to the CAISO's FERC-approved tariff. It includes a three-phase process that leads to annual CAISO Board of Governor approval of transmission plan and associated transmission projects.

Forecasting by CEC and supply-side inputs by CPUC. The CEC conducts demand forecast that is used to inform several planning processes, including the CAISO's TPP. The demand forecast is often a 10-year (recently 15-year) outlook for electricity and natural gas sales, consumption, and peak and hourly electricity demand. Additionally, the CPUC provides energy resource supply-side inputs, including an annual resource portfolio, to inform the transmission planning by the CAISO.

Transmission Development Forum. The Transmission Development Forum is a recent joint effort between the CAISO and the CPUC to discuss and track Participating Transmission Owners expansion and network upgrade projects and schedules. The Transmission Development Forum creates a single forum to track the status of transmission network upgrade projects that affect generators and all other transmission projects approved in the CAISO's TPP. The effort allows for increased transparency for all stakeholders about transmission projects and enhances accountability of transmission owners by having them explain schedule changes, delays, and address stakeholders' questions.

Tracking Energy Development (TED) Task Force. The TED Taskforce is also a recent joint effort of the CPUC, CEC, CAISO, and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) to track new energy projects under

development. According to the CPUC, the objective is to build on the success of ad hoc 2021 efforts to provide energy resource project development support, as appropriate, and identify barriers and mitigation strategies to accelerate energy project development.

CAISO 20-year Transmission Outlook. The CAISO embarked on creating a 20-Year Transmission Outlook for the electric grid, in collaboration with the CPUC and the CEC, with the goal of exploring the longer-term grid requirements and options for meeting California's GHG reduction and renewable energy objectives reliably and cost-effectively. The CAISO also intends for the expanded planning horizon to provide valuable input for resource planning processes conducted by the CPUC and CEC, and to provide a longer-term context and framing of pertinent issues in the CAISO's ongoing annual 10-Year Transmission Plan. The 2024 20-Year Transmission Outlook estimates \$45 to \$65 billion in transmission costs to meet the state clean energy needs, load growth, and offshore wind generation development.

CAISO reforms of interconnection queue. The CAISO has also been instituting a number of reforms to address delays, particularly as the volume of projects entering the CAISO queue has grown significantly with the passage of federal legislation by the Biden administration to incentivize clean energy, state procurement directives, resource adequacy requirements, and clean energy targets. The CAISO has implemented a number of reforms through the Interconnection Process Enhancements to modify how projects enter and advance through the queue, including screening and prioritization criteria based on commercial readiness, system need, and project viability.

Historic buildout of energy resources, but concerns project delays can stymy progress. According to the CPUC's 2025 Annual RPS Report (November 2025), since 2020, over 24 gigawatts (GW) of new clean energy and storage resources have been interconnected to the CAISO grid, with nearly seven GW of these new resources coming online in 2024. The report further notes: "However, transmission project delays continue to be a concern in California, their impact on the interconnection of new RPS-eligible renewable generation needs to be assessed regularly." Last year, the Governor issued an Executive Order N-33-25, which ordered the CPUC to identify critical generation and storage resources in-development and coordinate with CAISO and utilities to expedite transmission development that support the connection of new resources. Additionally, SB 1174 (Hertzberg, Chapter 229, Statutes of 2022) requires electrical corporations that are participating transmission owners to submit annual data on transmission project

delays and their impact on RPS-eligible renewable generation and storage resources to the CPUC. The CPUC found the following based on the 2025 data:

- The majority of Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) in-development transmission projects have been delayed past their original in-service dates at 63% and 70%, respectively, with 64% reported in development transmission projects being delayed overall.
- There are 21.8 GW of RPS-eligible renewable generation and storage resources currently in development that depend on transmission projects that have already experienced a delay in coming online.
- Of these RPS-eligible renewable generation and storage resources, 13.2 GW have already been delayed or are at risk of delay due to delayed transmission project timelines, mostly driven by bundling dependencies, materials, and other issues.

Comments

Need for this bill. According to the author:

Federal clean energy tax credits worth billions of dollars to California ratepayers are on the verge of expiring, and the single greatest obstacle to capturing those savings is completion of the grid upgrades needed to connect new clean energy projects. The CPUC's own data shows that nearly two-thirds of these transmission upgrades are delayed, with some languishing for over a decade. AB 2493 creates the independent oversight and enforceable accountability mechanisms needed to break through these delays before it is too late.

Seeking legislative remedies to address delays in infrastructure build-out. The sponsors and supporters of this bill seek legislative remedies to address delays in interconnecting generating facilities to transmission and distribution grid. They note widespread delays in transmission projects, citing the CPUC's *2025 RPS Report* which found that 64% of in-development transmission projects are delayed past their original in-service dates, including PG&E at 63% and SCE at 70%, though San Diego Gas & Electric was excluded due to incomplete data. They further note the delay of 449 transmission projects with dependent generation, or storage is affecting 21.8 GW of clean energy and storage capacity. While they acknowledge there has been much attention to the issue at the CPUC and CAISO, the longstanding delays threaten grid reliability, clean energy progress, and the ability to access the sunseting federal tax credits that can reduce costs for

Californians. As such, the supporters seek legislative remedies to require auditing and enforcement actions of the electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs) progress to build-out the needed infrastructure.

Electric IOUs oppose the bill stating it singles them out while ignoring other responsible parties and conflicts with existing oversight. The electric IOUs raise concerns that the bill only focuses on their actions and no other responsible parties. They share that transmission and interconnection projects can often be delayed due to issues outside their control, including a project developer's lack of financing, lack of land rights, or component supply shortages. They also raise concerns that the approved projects in the CAISO TPP are mostly conceptual and often lack critical information that must be prepared prior to determining how (or if) to file for applicable permits. They noted there is extensive work related to engineering, costs, and contracts before the projects can begin the permitting process. They raise concerns that the strict deadlines for submitting requests will result in longer permitting timelines, not shorter.

Recent amendments expand this bill to include other entities that are assigned transmission obligations in order to respond to electric IOUs' concerns and Governor's Office request for greater visibility on project development. The amendments add entities who are not large electrical corporations, such as independent third party-owned transmission owners, who own, control, or are assigned or obligated to construct transmission facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the FERC and is assigned construct a transmission or interconnection project that requires a CPCN or a permit to construct by the CPUC. As such, the provisions of this bill to monitor and review information and authorize the CPUC to direct remedial action would apply to a broader universe of entities, including smaller electrical corporations, independent transmission owners (third parties not the electric IOUs), and any other entities. Given the federal government's authority, as exercised by FERC, to oversee transmission, the amendments also add that any enforcement action taken by the CPUC must be consistent with, and may not exceed its jurisdiction and authority under federal law. Thereby limiting the CPUC's actions to those already limited by federal law.

Recent amendments provide the CPUC with implementation flexibility and make explicit that any cost recovery is subject to just and reasonable review (where applicable). The amendments authorize the CPUC to modify the scope, objectives, or reporting requirements of the transmission development monitor's review as proposed by this bill. The CPUC may make these changes via resolution, however, only after notice and opportunity for public comment. As such, this amendment

authorizes the CPUC to make changes from the review and reporting of transmission projects prescribed by this bill. An additional amendment makes explicit that compliance with a remedial action ordered by the CPUC does not create a presumption that any cost incurred can be recovered from ratepayers, as it is still subject to a determination by the CPUC that it is just and reasonable. This amendment is intended to address concerns about the costs of remedial actions.

Prior/Related Legislation

(See Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications Committee Analysis.)

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, ongoing costs, possibly in the high hundreds of thousands of dollars annually (ratepayer funds), for the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to establish a transmission development monitor and otherwise implement the provisions of this bill.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

American Clean Power- California (Co-source)

Union of Concerned Scientists (Co-source)

Advanced Energy United

California Energy Storage Alliance

California Environmental Voters

California Wind Energy Association

Ceres

City of Berkley

City of San Diego

County of San Diego

EDF Power Solutions

ENGIE North America

Environmental Defense Fund

Fluence Energy Systems

Independent Energy Producers Association

Large-Scale Solar Association

Natural Resources Defense Council

Ormat

Sierra Club California

Solar Energy Industries Association

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to a coalition of organizations, including the co-sponsors of this bill and 14 other organizations listed above:

...California has set an ambitious goal to decarbonize its power grid by 2045. Realizing this goal depends on our ability to connect new clean power generation quickly and affordably. ...Unfortunately, the IOUs are falling behind on those upgrades, delaying the addition of new power to the grid. ...AB 2493 will help stabilize electricity prices and keep California's grid reliable by requiring the large IOUs to connect new clean energy projects faster. First, AB 2493 sets a deadline for the larger IOUs to initiate permitting for major grid upgrades. Second, the bill requires an independent auditor to assess the root causes of interconnection upgrades delays and report findings to the CPUC. ...An independent audit will provide the rigorous, consistent data that state regulators need to understand why projects are falling behind and what remedies will be most effective. Third, AB 2493 requires the large IOUs to develop solutions aligned with the auditor's findings, including facilities advanced equipment procurement to mitigate supply chain constraints, expanding opportunities for entities other than the large IOUs to complete certain upgrades, and implementing a prioritization framework to fast-track upgrades that affect 100 MW or more of clean energy capacity. Finally, the bill directs the CPUC to evaluate the large IOUs' progress in addressing interconnection delays in their rate requests and cost of capital applications.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to PG&E:

AB 2493 would not address the primary drivers of delays identified in numerous publications and discussed at length in the Assembly Utilities Hearing held on February 18th. This include delays related to land rights, procurement lead times, permitting timelines, and customer-driven project design changes. Instead, AB 2493 would (1) create jurisdictional conflicts and competing compliance obligations for utilities by directing corrective actions that may be inconsistent with FERC-jurisdictional requirements and CAISO planning and cost parameters; (2) duplicative existing CPUC and CAISO oversight and reporting frameworks, including the CPUC's Transmission Project Review Process under Resolution E-5252; (3) divert specialized

engineering and interconnection staff away from completing studies and executing network upgrades; (4) increase costs for customers without clear, reasonable cost recovery parameters; (5) raise security concerns by requiring public posting of audit reports that could include sensitive critical infrastructure information; and (6) focus on utilities without addressing end-to-end contributors to delay across all responsible parties (utilities, manufacturers, land-owners, developers, and federal, state & local agencies).

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 57-17, 5/26/26

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

NOES: Chen, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Ramos, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Castillo, Flora, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Nidia Bautista / E., U. & C. / (916) 651-4107
8/30/26 14:44:14

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2564
Author: Ward (D), et al.
Amended: 8/21/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 5-2, 6/22/26
AYES: Gonzalez, McNerney, Padilla, Reyes, Wiener
NOES: Jones, Ochoa Bogh
NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon, Umberg

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 42-21, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Surveillance pricing

SOURCE: California Federation of Labor Unions
Consumer Reports
TechEquity Action

DIGEST: This bill prohibits “surveillance pricing,” as defined, except as provided.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 remove references to “electronic surveillance technology,” add a series of additional exemptions from the bill, loosen some disclosure requirements, and clarify its interaction with other laws.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/17/26 refine the definition of “surveillance pricing” and reframe and expand the exclusions therefrom.

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) Provides that the secret payment of allowances of rebates, refunds, commissions, or unearned discounts, whether in the form of money or otherwise, or secretly extending to certain purchasers special services or privileges not extended to all purchasers upon like terms and conditions, to the injury of a competitor and where such payment or allowance tends to destroy competition, is unlawful. (Business (Bus.) & Professions (Prof.) Code § 17045.)
- 3) Establishes a general prohibition on unfair competition, known as the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), which covers any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising, and any act prohibited under the False Advertising Law. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits retailers from engaging in “surveillance pricing.”
- 2) Defines “surveillance pricing” as either of the following:
 - a) Offering or setting a customized price for a good if for a specific consumer or group of consumers, based, in whole or in part, on personally identifiable information, including personally identifiable information that is gathered, purchased, or otherwise acquired from a third party. The price must be determined, at least in part, through the use of any technology or computational process that uses statistical modeling, data analytics, AI, or other data processing techniques.
 - b) Random variations in prices to different consumers using a website, mobile application, or comparable online technology.
- 3) Provides that a retailer does not engage in surveillance pricing by doing any of the following:
 - a) Offering a customized discounted price to a consumer who is terminating or taking steps to terminate a subscription or membership with the retailer.

- b) Offering a customized discounted price to reestablish a consumer as a member, rewards program, or subscription enrollee if the retailer can demonstrate specified conditions.
- c) Offering a customized discounted price on a specific good to a consumer based on the consumer's prior purchase history if the retailer can demonstrate specified conditions.
- d) Offering a customized discounted price on a specific good to a consumer based on the consumer's saved goods if the retailer can demonstrate specified conditions.
- e) Offering a customized discounted price to a consumer who is a first-time visitor to a retailer's website or application if the retailer can demonstrate specified conditions.
- f) Offering a customized discounted price to a consumer for items the consumer has left in their online shopping cart if the retailer can demonstrate specified conditions.
- g) Offering a customized discounted price on equal terms if all of the following apply:
 - i) The customized discounted price is offered to any of the following groups of consumers:
 - (1) Consumers who affirmatively purchase or enroll in a loyalty, membership, or rewards program.
 - (2) Consumers who belong to a broadly defined group, as specified.
 - (3) Consumers who meet eligibility criteria, as specified.
 - ii) If the retailer exclusively offers a customized discounted price in stores, the current eligibility criteria, available customized discounted prices, and any conditions for receiving or earning the customized discounted price are clearly and conspicuously disclosed in all stores where the discount is available, as provided.
 - iii) If the retailer offers a customized discounted price online, the current eligibility criteria, available customized discounted prices, and any conditions for receiving or earning the customized discounted price are clearly and conspicuously disclosed on the retailer's website while the

- customized discounted price is offered. Disclosure is not required when the customized price is offered through a third-party promotional program, as provided.
- iv) The customized discounted price is made available on equal terms to all consumers who meet the disclosed eligibility criteria.
 - h) Setting a price or specific terms to extend credit, refusing to extend credit on specific terms, or refusing to enter into a transaction with a specific consumer or commercial enterprise, if the retailer is acting based on information contained in a consumer or commercial credit report, as provided.
- 4) Defines the relevant terms.
 - 5) Makes any waiver void and unenforceable.
 - 6) Finds and declares that it furthers the purposes of the California Privacy Rights Act.

Comments

Companies regularly and systematically collect, analyze, share, and sell the personal information of consumers. While this data collection can provide consumers various benefits, public fears about the widespread, unregulated amassing of personal information have only grown since privacy was made a part of California's Constitution. One particularly troubling area of this systematic data collection is utilization of this information to engage in differential pricing for consumers based on various elements of that information.

This bill prohibits this practice of "surveillance pricing," defined as offering or setting a customized price for a good for a specific consumer or group of consumers, based, in whole or in part, on personally identifiable information, including personally identifiable information that is gathered, purchased, or otherwise acquired from a third party. This bill provides that a retailer does not engage in surveillance pricing if a customized discount price is offered under a series of specified circumstances.

It should be noted that several other states are also taking action to combat surveillance pricing. Legislation has been introduced and passed through legislatures in four other states. This increased movement toward regulating this

practice is driven in part by polling that suggests consumers find surveillance pricing “fundamentally unfair” and support bans.¹

For a more thorough overview, please see the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee analysis of this bill, which is incorporated herein by reference.

This bill is sponsored by Consumer Reports, TechEquity, and the California Federation of Labor Unions. It is supported by a wide array of labor, advocacy, and low-income services groups, including the Western Center on Law and Poverty, Equal Rights Advocates, and LGBT Tech. It is opposed by various industry groups, including TechNet and Chamber of Progress.

According to the author, “With the rise of artificial intelligence and data collection, businesses increasingly use personal data to set prices, often leading to unfair and discriminatory pricing practices. This legislation aims to establish safeguards that ensure transparency, fairness, and consumer protections in pricing algorithms. AB 2564 will prohibit the practice of surveillance pricing by making it unlawful for businesses to use personal data when charging different prices for the same product or service, whether online or during in-store checkout.”

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/17/26)

California Federation of Labor Unions (co-source)

Consumer Reports (co-source)

TechEquity Action (co-source)

ACLU Cal Action

Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment Action

American Federation of Musicians, Local 7

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO

Buen Vecino

California Food and Farming Network

California Nurses Association

California School Employees Association

California Work and Family Coalition

Cameo Network

¹ *Strong Majority of Americans Want Corporations to End Deceptive Surveillance Pricing Schemes* (May 21, 2026) Groundwork Collaborative, <https://groundworkcollaborative.org/news/strong-majority-of-americans-want-corporations-to-end-deceptive-surveillance-pricing-schemes/>. All internet citations are current as of August 18, 2026.

Center for AI and Digital Policy
Center for Democracy and Technology
Center on Policy Initiatives
CFT- a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Federation of America
Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Watchdog
Courage California
Economic Security California Action
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Electronic Privacy Information Center
End Child Poverty California Powered by Grace
Equal Rights Advocates
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Greenlining Institute
Indivisible Ca: Statestrong
Institute for Local Self-reliance
Justice2jobs Coalition
Kapor Center Advocacy
LA Defensa
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
LGBT Tech
Nextgen California
Oakland Privacy
Parent Voices California
Privacy Defense Alliance
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse
Public Law Center
Secure Justice
SEIU California
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Smart - Transportation Division
Tech Oversight California
Tectonic Justice
UDW/AFSCME Local 3930
Ultraviolet Action
Western Center on Law & Poverty
1 Individual

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/17/26)

Association of National Advertisers
Building Owners and Managers Association of California
CalBroadband
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Grocers Association
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
Chamber of Progress
Civil Justice Association of California
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce
Internet.works
NAIOP California
Orange County Business Council
Technet
USTelecom - the Broadband Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: A coalition of legal services organizations, labor associations, civil rights organizations, and consumer, privacy, and family advocacy groups, including SEIU California write:

California consumers face a new and growing threat to fair pricing. Companies now possess the technology to collect vast amounts of consumer data and deploy artificial intelligence to charge each shopper a personalized price — one calibrated not to the market, but to the maximum that an individual can be made to pay. This practice, known as surveillance pricing, exploits detailed consumer profiles built from purchase histories, location data, browsing habits, and more.

Investigations have already uncovered real-world harms. Consumer Reports revealed that Kroger built 60-plus page profiles for individual consumers from loyalty program data to infer willingness to pay. ... A SFGate investigation found that the most popular hotel booking sites show prices substantially higher to San Franciscans using their online booking platforms compared with users browsing from less affluent cities, like Phoenix and

Kansas City. These are not isolated incidents — they reflect an industry trend. ...

While California consumers benefit from some privacy protections under the California Consumer Privacy Act, no existing federal or state law prohibits companies from using the data they collect to charge consumers individually different prices. AB 2564 closes this gap. Without legislative intervention, surveillance pricing will become the industry standard, disproportionately harming lower-income Californians who already face the highest costs of living in the nation and have the fewest alternatives.

AB 2564 protects sensible, transparently offered discounts—including for loyalty programs. The bill’s exemptions permit a vast array of discounts, and transparency provisions help ensure that discounts are not secretly discriminatory. The bill does not restrict businesses from offering lower prices — it prevents them from secretly charging higher ones based on personal data profiles.

The right to fair and affordable pricing should not be a privilege for the few but a fundamental protection for all Californians.²

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition led by the California Chamber of Commerce asserts:

AB 2564 prohibits “surveillance pricing,” which it loosely defines as “offering or setting a customized price for a good or service³ for a specific consumer or group of consumers, based, in whole or in part, on personally identifiable information collected through electronic surveillance technology...”

Notably, “electronic surveillance technology” is not actually defined in AB 2564. Instead, the bill only provides a list of examples that are “included,” but no description that would help a covered entity determine if the bill applied to the consumer information in their possession. A metaphor helps

² See *Consumer Reports Investigation Uncovers Kroger’s Widespread Data Collection* (May 21, 2025) Consumer Reports, <https://www.consumerreports.org/media-room/press-releases/2025/05/consumer-reports-investigation-uncovers-krogers-widespread-data-collection-of-loyalty-program-members-to-create-secret-shopper-profiles/>; Keith A. Spencer, *Hotel booking sites show higher prices to travelers from Bay Area* (February 3, 2025) SFGate, <https://www.sfgate.com/travel/article/hotel-booking-sites-overcharge-bay-area-travelers-20025145.php>.

³ The definition in the bill does not include “services.”

illustrate the problem with definitions that only say what they “include.” Imagine trying to define what is a “pet” - but the only definition is “Pets includes dogs or cats.” Such a definition provides no helpful guidance for anything not listed, such as bird or fish. Are those “pets?” Without a descriptive definition, it is impossible to know. Under AB 2564, the term “electronic surveillance technology” has the same problem – the definition does not describe what makes something an electronic surveillance technology. Instead, it only provides examples. Without a descriptive definition, employers will be left guessing what technologies are or are not covered by the bill.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 42-21, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pellerin, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Stefani, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Ávila Farías, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Calderon, Carrillo, Gipson, Irwin, Krell, McKinnor, Nguyen, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Solache, Soria

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / P., D.T., & C.P. / (916) 651-1548
8/24/26 10:59:21

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2575
Author: Ortega (D)
Amended: 8/21/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE: 8-2, 6/17/26

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

NOES: Valladares, Grove

NO VOTE RECORDED: Rubio

SENATE LABOR, PUB. EMP. & RET. COMMITTEE: 4-1, 6/24/26

AYES: Smallwood-Cuevas, Cortese, Durazo, Laird

NOES: Strickland

SENATE PRIV., DIGITAL TECH. & CONS. PROT. COMMITTEE: 6-2, 6/29/26

AYES: Gonzalez, McNerney, Padilla, Reyes, Umberg, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto, Ochoa Bogh

NO VOTE RECORDED: Cabaldon

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SENATE FLOOR: 40-0, 8/28/26

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, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto,
Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber
Pierson, Wiener

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 48-15, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Health care services: artificial intelligence

SOURCE: California Nurses Association
California Federation of Labor Unions

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits an employer from retaliating or discriminating against a worker based solely on the worker's override of, or reliance on, the output of a clinical decision support system; and 2) prohibits the failure of a health care worker to override an output of a clinical decision support system from being asserted as a superseding cause severing the defendant's liability for the alleged harm in a civil action against a defendant who developed or deployed a clinical decision support system that is alleged to have caused harm.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 deleted all provisions added to the Business and Professions Code related to a requirement that a health facility and other health providers that use or deploy a clinical decision support system for patient care to make information about these systems available to any licensed health care professional or other person that views outputs from a clinical decision support system.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/2026 moved provisions out of California Department of Public Health (CDPH) jurisdiction and instead to the Business and Professions Code, and aligned the definition of Clinical Decision Support Systems with other bills.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/20/26 permitted a health provider to satisfy the requirements relating to making information available about a clinical decision support system by using information supplied by the vendor, limited the enforcement of the information disclosure provisions to whether the information has been provided rather than the accuracy of the information, and excluded a policy that requires a worker to accept, defer to, or refrain from overriding the output of a clinical decision support system from being considered a duty that a health care employer can enforce without it being considered retaliation or discrimination

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires a health facility, clinic, physician's office, or office of a group practice that uses generative artificial intelligence (AI) to generate written or verbal patient communications pertaining to patient clinical information to ensure that those communications include a disclaimer, as specified, that indicates to the

patient that the communication was generated by generative AI, and clear instructions describing how a patient may contact a human health care provider, employee, or other appropriate person. Exempts communications generated by generative AI from this requirement if it is read and reviewed by a human licensed or certified health care provider. [Health and Safety Code §1339.75]

- 2) Defines the following terms for purposes of 1) above:
 - a) “Artificial intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments; and,
 - b) “Generative artificial intelligence” means AI that can generate derived synthetic content, including images, videos, audio, text, and other digital content.
- 3) Requires the Department of Technology to conduct, in coordination with other interagency bodies as it deems appropriate, a comprehensive inventory of all high-risk automated decision systems that have been proposed for use, development, or procurement by, or are being used, developed, or procured by, and state agency. Defines “high-risk automated decision system” as an automated decision system that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisions that have a legal or similarly significant effect, including decisions that materially impact access to, or approval for, housing or accommodations, education, employment, credit, health care, and criminal justice. [Government Code §11546.45.5]

This bill:

- 1) Defines “artificial intelligence” and “generative artificial intelligence” as having the same meaning as definitions described in Existing Law 5) above.
- 2) Defines “automated decision system” as a computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or AI that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision-making and materially impacts natural persons. Excludes from this definition a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identify and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.

- 3) Defines “clinical decision support system” as an artificial intelligence system that produces a prediction, classification, recommendation, evaluation, or analysis that aids clinical decisionmaking related to timing of care, diagnosis or treatment. Specifies that it does include booking, canceling, and rescheduling appointments, appointment reminders, patient education and previsit materials and preparation, and payment processing, to the extent the independent performance of these activities by the system does not require a professional license.
- 4) Provides that it is the public policy of the State of California that a worker providing direct patient care be free to use their professional judgment to make assessments and decisions within their scope of practice as appropriate for their patients.
- 5) Prohibits an employer from retaliating or discriminating against a worker providing direct patient care using their professional judgment to make an assessment or decision within their appropriate scope of practice based solely on the worker’s override of, or reliance on, the output of a clinical decision support system.
- 6) Specifies that the protection in 5) above against employer retaliation or discrimination does not affect a worker’s duty do any of the following:
 - a) Meet the applicable standard of care;
 - b) Act within their scope of practice;
 - c) Exercise independent judgment in providing direct patient care;
 - d) Follow standard operating procedures or other policies established by the employer or by a California governmental department; or,
 - e) Comply with regulations governing the planning and implementation of patient care.
- 7) Excludes a policy, procedure, or protocol that requires a worker to accept, defer to, or refrain from overriding the output of a clinical decision support system, from being considered a duty for purposes of 6) above.
- 8) Requires a worker who is subject to retaliation or discrimination in violation of this bill to have the right to file a complaint with the Labor Commissioner against an employer who retaliates or discriminates against the worker.
- 9) Requires the Labor Commission to enforce the anti-retaliation and discrimination provisions of this bill, including investigating an alleged violation, ordering appropriate temporary relief to mitigate a violation or

maintain the status quo pending the completion of a full investigation or hearing, issuing a citation to an employer, and filing a civil action.

- 10) Requires the Labor Commissioner to determine whether an employer retaliated or discriminated against a worker, and to consider evidence relevant to the reasons the employer took the action alleged to be retaliation or discrimination, including evidence supporting the alternate reasons for the action, such as an alleged failure by the worker to satisfy a duty described in 6) above.
- 11) Specifies that the Labor Commissioner is not required to adjudicate or make a final determination of whether a worker met or failed to meet a duty described in 6) above. Specifies that a determination under these provisions is not determinative of any legal action for professional negligence or malpractice or disciplinary action against a professional license, and these provisions do not limit the authority of an appropriate licensing authority or a court.
- 12) Prohibits using as a defense, in an action against a defendant who developed, modified, selected, or deployed a clinical decision support system that is alleged to have caused harm to the plaintiff, and prohibits a defendant from asserting, that the failure of a licensed health care professional or other health care worker to override an output of a clinical decision support system is a superseding cause severing the defendant's liability for the alleged harm.
- 13) Specifies that the provision in 12) above does not limit or preclude a defendant from presenting any other affirmative defense, including evidence relevant to causation or foreseeability, or presenting other evidence relevant to the comparative fault of any other person or entity, including evidence that the defendant took reasonable precautions to prevent harm, as specified.
- 14) Specifies that the provision in 12) above does not apply to an action for injury or death against a licensed health care provider based upon professional negligence, as specified.

Background

According to the author of this bill:

Healthcare workers are facing new challenges as AI is integrated into their workplaces. They are pressured by employers to defer to AI systems that may be opaque, erroneous, or systemically biased. They face an added risk of professional and legal blame when they follow algorithmic recommendations that fail. This bill preserves healthcare workers' ability to

follow their professional judgment by prohibiting employer retaliation when a worker overrides or follows a recommendation. This bill requires that AI tools are used to support clinical judgement—not replace it, ensuring that human expertise and patient safety remain the focus of California’s healthcare system.

Generative AI in health care. According to a July 25, 2023 viewpoint article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, “Generative AI in Health Care and Liability Risks for Physicians and Safety Concerns for Patients,” generative AI is being heralded in the medical field for its potential to ease the long-lamented burden of medical documentation by generating visit notes, treatment codes, and medical summaries. This article stated that to date, no court in the U.S. has considered the question of liability for medical injuries caused by relying on AI-generated information. The article warned that to minimize risks, even medical professionals must exercise caution when relying on AI-generated information, due to the “black-box” nature of how these systems generate output, because it may be impossible for the physician to independently evaluate the accuracy of the AI’s output. An article in *Implement Science*, published in March 2024, stated that the utility and impact of generative AI in healthcare remain poorly understood, with concerns about ethical and legal implications, integration into healthcare service delivery, and workforce utilization. The American Medical Association (AMA) published “Principles for Augmented Intelligence Development, Deployment, and Use,” which was approved by the AMA Board of Trustees on November 14, 2023. According to this AMA document, as the number of AI-enabled health care tools and systems continue to grow, these technologies must be designed, developed, and deployed in a manner that is ethical, equitable, responsible, and transparent. The AMA notes that while the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates AI-enabled medical devices, many types of AI-enabled technologies fall outside the scope of FDA oversight, including AI that may have clinical applications, such as some clinical decision support functions. The AMA report specifically looked at transparency in use of AI-enabled systems, and stated that it is essential that use of AI in health care be transparent to both physicians and patients, and disclosure should contribute to physician and patient knowledge and not create unnecessary administrative burden. The AMA report states that when AI is utilized in health care decision-making, that use should be disclosed and documented in order to limit risks to, and mitigate inequities for, both physicians and patients. The AMA noted that while transparency does not necessarily ensure AI-enabled tools are accurate, secure, or fair, it is difficult to establish trust if certain characteristics are hidden. According to the AMA, when AI is used in a manner which directly impacts patient care, access to care, or medical decision-making, that use of AI should be disclosed and documented to both physicians and

patients. The opportunity for a patient to request additional review from a licensed clinician should be made available upon request. The AMA policy also states that AI tools or systems cannot augment, create, or otherwise generate records, communications, or other content on behalf of a physician without that physician's consent and final review.

Disclosure requirements at least partially based on federal standards for health information technology developers. The author and sponsors have pointed to standards adopted by the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC), which is part of the federal Department of Health and Human Services. As part of the final rule implementing the Electronic Health Record Reporting Program provision of the 21st Century Cures Act, on January 9, 2024, the ONC adopted certification requirements for a “decision support intervention (DSI),” which revised the “clinical decision support” criterion. According to the ONC, this final rule directly responds to the emergence of AI and machine learning-based predictive algorithms used to aid decision-making in health care. The ONC requirements apply to Predictive DSIs that are supplied by Certified Health IT developers. Predictive DSIs that are developed by a health system, or a third-party technology company are not subject to the requirements unless or until a Certified Health IT developer supplies a Predictive DSI as part of a Certified Health IT module. While the certification program is technically a voluntary program, health providers are required to use certified electronic health record technology to participate in incentive programs such as the Medicare Promoting Interoperability Program. Among the certification requirements for a Predictive DSI, are a list of source attributes that include many of the disclosure requirements in this bill, including funding source, description of output, intended use and population target, cautioned out-of-scope use, process used to ensure fairness, and description of the validation process, among other overlaps.

Racial bias in algorithms and AI. Several studies have identified risks of racial bias in algorithms and AI. An October 2019 article in the journal *Science*, “Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations,” found that Black patients assigned the same level of risk by the algorithm are sicker than White patients. The study estimated that this racial bias reduces the number of Black patients identified for extra care by more than half. According to the study, bias occurs because the algorithm uses health costs as a proxy for health needs, and because less money is spent on Black patients who have the same level of need, the algorithm falsely concludes that Black patients are healthier than equally sick White patients. The journal *NPJ Digital Medicine* published a study in 2023, “LLMs propagate race-based medicine,” that assessed four LLMs used in healthcare systems. The study found that all models had examples of perpetuating

race-based medicine in their response to questions. Models were not always consistent in their response when asked the same question repeatedly, and that based on their findings, these LLMs could potentially cause harm by perpetuating debunked, racist ideas.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee,

- Unknown ongoing costs, ranging in the low millions, for the Labor Commissioner's Office for state administration (Labor Enforcement and Compliance Fund). The actual costs would depend on a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the volume and nature of the complaints filed.
- Minor and absorbable costs for the Osteopathic Medical Board of California to oversee complaints.
- Minor costs for the Medical Board of California resulting from an increase in complaints (Medical Board Contingent Fund).
- Unknown ongoing costs for the University of California (UC) health centers, potentially low tens of millions (costs would be covered by UC health center revenues), for compliance.
- No significant fiscal impact to the California Department of Justice.
- Unknown, potential workload costs to the courts related to enforcement of civil penalties (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund). 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 increase the amount appropriated for trial court operations.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

California Nurses Association (co-source)

California Federation of Labor Unions (co-source)

Alameda County Democratic Party

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

California Alliance for Retired Americans

California Democratic Party

California Democratic Party Rural Caucus

California Faculty Association

California Federation of Teachers

California Pan - Ethnic Health Network

California School Employees Association

Consumer Watchdog

Engineers and Scientists of California, IFPTE Local 20

Health Access California
National Union of Healthcare Workers
Oakland Privacy
Osteopathic Medical Board of California
Peace and Freedom Party of California
Service Employees International Union California
Teamsters California
TechEquity Action
United Nurses Associations of California/Union of Health Care Professionals
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

Advanced Medical Technology Association
Adventist Health
America's Physician Groups
Association of California Life & Health Insurance Companies
Association of Dental Support Organizations
American Telemedicine Association Action
Biocom California
California Association of Health Facilities
California Association of Health Plans
California Chamber of Commerce
California Children's Hospital Association
California Dental Association
California Hospital Association
California Life Sciences
California Medical Association
California Podiatric Medical Association
California Primary Care Association Advocates
California Radiological Society
California Society of Pathologists
Central City Association of Los Angeles
Civil Justice Association of California
Connected Health Initiative
County of Ventura
Glendale Chamber of Commerce
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Kaiser Permanente
LAX Coastal Chamber of Commerce
Loma Linda University Health

Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
MemorialCare Health System
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
Ochin, Inc.
Orange County Business Council
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
Private Essential Access Community Hospital
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership
Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce
Scripps Health
Southwest California Legislative Council
Stanford Health Care
Sutter Health
TechNet
The Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Tri County Chamber Alliance
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
University of California

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is co-sponsored by the California Nurses Association/National Nurses United (CNA) and the California Federation of Labor Unions. According to CNA, as hospitals rapidly adopt AI-driven technologies that influence clinical decisions and working conditions, California must ensure that these tools support safe patient care rather than undermine professional standards or patient protections. CNA states that hospitals and clinics now use AI tools in electronic health records, clinical decision-support systems, remote monitoring platforms, staffing management software, and administrative workflows. California currently lacks clear guardrails governing the use of AI in health care settings, and evidence increasingly shows that many AI tools used in health care algorithms raise serious safety and accuracy concerns. CNA also argues that lack of transparency prevents clinicians and patients from understanding how AI systems influence care decisions, and that health care entities often provide little or no information about when AI tools are used, how they generate outputs, what data they rely on, or what limitations they carry. Without this information, nurses cannot fully evaluate the reliability of automated recommendations that appear in clinical workflows. Hospitals require nurses and other health care workers to rely on technologies chosen by their employers, yet when those systems make mistakes, clinicians often bear the consequences. CNA states that nurses increasingly spend hours reviewing, correcting, and verifying AI-generated documentation that may

contain errors or missing information. CNA nurses support tested and regulated technology that strengthens our ability to provide safe, high-quality care. However, we cannot allow technology to override professional judgment, justify unsafe staffing, or shift responsibility for corporate technology failures onto frontline caregivers. The California Federation of Labor Unions makes similar arguments, and points to a recent Virginia Tech study that found that AI systems designed to predict patient risk of death are failing to recognize critical inductions much of the time, demonstrating the risk that reliance on AI tools could mislead providers. However, the California Labor Federation states health care workers have few protections if they choose to disregard automated recommendations.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: This bill is opposed by a large coalition of health care provider organizations, and business organizations, including the California Hospital Association, the California Medical Association, the California Chamber of Commerce, Advanced Medical Technology Association, and others. Opponents state that AI utilized in clinical decision support systems has the potential to improve nearly every aspect of health care, and that these systems are the latest in a series of innovative resources that trained and experienced health care providers use to help their patients. Opponents point to a number of examples, including AI-assisted imaging tools that help radiologists identify suspicious findings in mammograms, chest scans, and pathology slides; tools that provide sepsis alerts, flag concerning imaging results, and offer clinical decision support to enable clinicians to better assess a patient's condition; and, AI-generated clinical summaries that are used to help with handoffs between nurses, physicians, and other licensed professionals. Opponents state that before any AI tool is deployed, it undergoes an extensive review process, including via multidisciplinary committees from the health care workers who will use it, standardized privacy and security assessments, and review of AI registries. No AI platform is continued for use in patient care without a thorough assessment and ongoing monitoring for effectiveness and safety. At every stage of clinical care, opponents state that health care professionals retain full oversight and responsibility. Health care providers do not deploy AI or related technologies to make care decisions; instead, they are used to assist and free up resources for patient care, reduce clinician burnout, and expand early warning systems. Opponents state that this bill would undermine patient-centric policies and conflict with medical staff rules and regulations by protecting any worker who provides direct patient care from reprimand or discipline. This bill would essentially create a new protected class of workers, allowing them to make independent, subjective decisions about patient care without accountability, so long as those decisions fall within their scope of practice. Opponents argue that this would effectively give any worker who provides care unfettered authority, even when the subjective judgment causes

patient harm. If a patient were to suffer harm, or even if harm is averted after a clinician “overrides” a tool’s output, the health facility would be unable to take corrective action, as doing so would be considered retaliation under this bill. Opponents state that this bill would force health providers to pull back AI tools that patients and clinicians currently rely on, and point to a 2025 review of 92 published studies that found AI tools are delivering meaningful improvements across the health care system, in real clinical settings. Opponents state that AI is not an aspiration in health care, but is a reality that is currently saving lives. We have a shared obligation to ensure that these tools continue to be developed and deployed responsibly, equitably, and transparently. This bill would not achieve those goals, but would create perverse liability incentives, undermine patient safety systems, impair clinical quality oversight, increase costs, and ultimately reduce patient access to beneficial technology.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 48-15, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Arambula, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Connolly, Davies, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Ávila Farías, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Lackey, Macedo, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Alvarez, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Gallagher, Gipson, Irwin, Nguyen, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Soria, Valencia

Prepared by: Vincent D. Marchand / HEALTH / (916) 651-4111
8/30/26 15:32:10

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2694
Author: Alvarez (D) and Pacheco (D), et al.
Amended: 8/27/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE: 6-0, 7/1/26
AYES: Pérez, Ochoa Bogh, Cabaldon, Cortese, Gonzalez, Reyes
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-11, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Public postsecondary education: community colleges: statewide
baccalaureate degree program

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill, contingent upon the enactment of SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026), revises the requirements governing applications for California Community College (CCC) baccalaureate degree programs and establishes separate processes for resolving objections filed by the California State University (CSU) and retains the existing written agreement process for objections filed by the University of California (UC) and expands annual reporting requirements, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 1) Revise the application requirements, including documentation of unmet workforce need and consultation with Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), CSU, and UC, 2) Require districts to explore partnerships with CSU and UC to expand access and avoid unnecessary duplication, 3) limit districts to three applications per academic year and require baccalaureate programs to preserve access to lower-division instruction, 4) establish separate objection process for CSU objections to be resolved through an LWDA workforce-need and capacity determination, 5) expand annual reporting to include objections, LWDA determinations, student outcomes, and program funding

and 6) make the changes operative January 1 2028, contingent upon SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) also taking effect.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Differentiates the missions and functions of public and independent institutions of higher education. Under these provisions:
 - a) The primary mission of the CSU is to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional education, including teacher education. The CSU is authorized to establish two-year programs only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees and the California Community Colleges (CCC) Board of Governors (BOG). The CSU is also authorized to jointly award the doctoral degree with the UC and with one or more independent institutions of higher education.
 - b) The UC provides undergraduate and graduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over graduate instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. The UC is also the primary state-supported academic agency for research.
 - c) The independent institution of higher education requires undergraduate and graduate instruction and research in accordance with their respective mission.
 - d) The mission and function of the CCC are to offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level, and the CCC is authorized to grant associate degrees. The CCCs are also required to offer learning supports to close learning gaps, English as a Second Language instruction, and adult noncredit instruction, and support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level. (Education Code (EC) § 66010.4)
- 2) Authorizes the CCC BOG, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish baccalaureate degree programs that do not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program offered by the CSU or UC. Allows for the approval of 30 CCC baccalaureate degree programs per academic year. Current law further requires the CCC Chancellor to consult with and seek feedback from the CSU Chancellor, the UC President, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities on proposed baccalaureate

degree programs, as specified, and establishes a mechanism for the assessment, consultation, and approval of programs where duplication is identified, as specified. (Education Code [EC] § 78040 et seq.)

- 3) Requires the CSU Trustees to ensure that any changes in the admission criteria for campus admission comply with specified consultation, public meeting, notification and disclosure requirements, and prohibits any change from becoming effective until one year has elapsed, or six months, if the change is based upon the resources of the local service area of the affected campus. Applies these requirements to all changes in the admission criteria that affect eligibility of local service area applicants, including changes to transfer requirements and determinations regarding impact of majors. (EC § 89030.5)

This bill:

- 1) Requires the governing board of a community college district seeking authorization to offer a baccalaureate degree program to submit specified information for review by the CCC Chancellor and the CSU Chancellor and approval by the CCC BOG.
- 2) Requires an applicant that has not obtained a determination from the Secretary of the LWDA to submit specified documentation of unmet workforce need, including evidence of consultation with the LWDA.
- 3) Requires an applicant that has not obtained a determination from the LWDA Secretary to document consultation with CSU and UC regarding collaborative approaches to meeting regional workforce needs, including specified partnerships.
- 4) Requires an applicant to document that a proposed baccalaureate degree program is not substantially similar to a CSU program or that specified CSU transfer acceptance rate requirements have been satisfied and authorizes CSU to submit evidence regarding those requirements.
- 5) Limits a community college district to submitting no more than three applications for baccalaureate degree programs during an academic year.
- 6) Prohibits a district offering a baccalaureate degree program from displacing enrollment opportunities for students seeking associate degrees for transfer,

certificates, or noncredit instruction, and requires the district to maintain access to lower-division instructional offerings.

- 7) Requires the CCC Chancellor to notify CSU, UC, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities of proposed baccalaureate degree programs and authorizes CSU and UC to submit a written objection within 45 working days, or within 60 working days if more than 45 applications are received during a single application period.
- 8) Requires the LWDA Secretary, upon receipt of a CSU objection, to determine whether the proposed program addresses an unmet current or projected future workforce need and whether the substantially similar CSU program has sufficient capacity to meet regional workforce needs, as specified.
- 9) Prohibits establishment of the proposed program if the Secretary determines that it does not address an unmet current or projected workforce need and prohibits the district from submitting an application for a similar program for five years.
- 10) Requires the CCC Chancellor, upon receipt of a UC objection, to convene the applicant and UC to collaborate and establish a written agreement before the program is approved and prohibits referral of a UC objection to the LWDA Secretary.
- 11) Requires the CCC Chancellor's annual report to the Legislature to include determinations made by the LWDA Secretary and a summary of the funding sources supporting each approved baccalaureate degree program.
- 12) Makes the bill operative on January 1, 2028, and only if SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) is enacted and becomes effective on or before January 1, 2027.

Comments

Need for the bill. According to the author, "California's economic future depends on our ability to meet regional workforce demands while expanding equitable access to higher education. AB 2694 ensures that community college bachelor's degree programs remain responsive, affordable, and aligned with local labor market needs. By clarifying outdated statutory barriers, this bill helps students—especially those who are place-bound or underserved—access high-quality, four-year degree opportunities in their communities."

Companion legislation. This bill and SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) divide the proposed changes to the CCC baccalaureate degree program between two measures. SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) establishes the district eligibility tiers, program limits, regional duplication standards, and the process for obtaining an advanced workforce-need determination. AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026) applies those standards through the application and objection process, establishes the process for resolving CSU objections, retains the existing written-agreement process for UC objections, and expands annual reporting. AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026) becomes operative only if SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) is also enacted and takes effect, and double-jointing language integrates the two bills into a single statutory framework.

Differentiation of mission. The state has four segments of higher education: three public and one private. Each plays a vital and unique role for the state and its students. Their mission statements are outlined in state statute. The CCCs are to have an open admission policy and bear the most extensive responsibility for lower-division undergraduate instruction. Its primary area of mission includes academic and vocational instruction leading to associate degrees and university transfer, career technical education, and remedial education. The primary mission of the CSU is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree. The UC was granted the sole authority to offer doctoral degrees and is the state's primary research institution. Despite the differentiation of mission, the Legislature has authorized the CSU and CCCs to go beyond their original mission to offer doctoral degrees and baccalaureate degree programs, respectively, so long as programs do not duplicate those offered by the other segments with primary jurisdiction. This bill prohibits CCC baccalaureate programs from displacing opportunities for students seeking associate degrees, transfer degrees, certificates, or noncredit institutions and by requiring districts maintain access to lower-division offerings. SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) and this bill together allow for CCC baccalaureate degree growth while retaining guardrails intended to keep that growth tied to workforce and degree access gaps not met by the other segments.

Existing CCC Bachelor's program. SB 850 (Block, Chapter 747, Statutes of 2014) authorized the BOG, in consultation with the CSU and the UC, to establish a CCC baccalaureate degree pilot program. The pilot program included 15 participating CCC districts to offer one baccalaureate degree program each to meet local workforce needs, as long as it did not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program already offered by the CSU or the UC. The original pilot led to the statewide authorization established by AB 927 (Medina, Chapter 565, Statutes of 2021), which allows the CCC BOG to approve qualifying programs twice a year. Today,

as reported on the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office website, there are more than 50 approved CCC baccalaureate programs statewide, primarily in applied and workforce-related fields such as health care, industrial technology, and public safety. Specific degree offerings include respiratory care, mortuary science, industrial automation, and public safety management. These programs are intended to address unmet regional workforce needs rather than broad expansion into traditional academic fields of study. Since 2017, approximately 1,893 students have attained a CCC bachelor's degree, with 293 completed in the 2023-24 academic year. This bill broadens the circumstances under which community colleges may offer programs.

Growing tension over duplication. The debate surrounding CCC baccalaureate degrees has increasingly moved away from the administrative approval process established in statute to the legislative process. Existing law establishes an administrative process intended to evaluate proposed CCC baccalaureate degree programs based on required criteria, including workforce need and program duplication. Since enactment of the statewide program, disagreements regarding program duplication have resulted not only in formal objections during the Chancellor's review process, but also in district-specific legislation seeking authority to establish individual baccalaureate degree programs. In addition, community college districts have increasingly sought letters of support from Members of the Legislature as part of their applications, reflecting the growing role legislative advocacy has played in what was originally intended to be an evidence based administrative review process. The issue is not whether CCCs should continue offering bachelor's degrees, but rather how duplication, workforce need, and student access should be evaluated.

Separate CSU and UC objection processes. Existing law generally prohibits a CCC from offering a baccalaureate degree that duplicates a program already offered by CSU or UC. Current law applies the same consultation process when either CSU or UC objects to a proposed CCC program based on duplication concerns. This bill instead establishes different processes for each segment. A CSU objection is referred to the LWDA Secretary, who determines whether the proposal addresses an unmet current or projected future workforce need and whether the substantially similar CSU program has sufficient regional capacity. A favorable determination permits the proposal to proceed to the CCC Board of Governors, and a finding that there is no unmet need prevents the program and prohibits a similar application for five years. A district may also obtain a favorable workforce determination through the advanced process established in SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026). If granted, this bill exempts the district from additional workforce

documentation and the CSU objection process. A UC objection is not referred to LWDA. The CCC Chancellor must instead convene UC and the applicant to collaborate and establish a written agreement resolving the objection before approval.

Encouraging collaboration. This bill requires districts that do not obtain an advanced workforce determination to consult with CSU and UC and explore structured partnerships before independently establishing a new baccalaureate degree. Potential approaches include guaranteed transfer agreements, 2 + 2 articulation, dual enrollment pathways, credit for prior learning, shared facilities, co-location, and cross-location delivery. This encourages the segments to use existing institutional capacity where a partnership can meet the need.

Changes to program duplication standard in SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026). As mentioned, existing law generally prohibits a CCC from offering a baccalaureate degree that duplicates one already offered by CSU or UC. That prohibition serves two purposes. First, it preserves the differentiated missions established within California's higher education system. Second, it encourages public institutions to coordinate program offerings instead of competing for the same students. While SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026) establishes the "substantially similar" standard and the regional CSU duplication exception, AB 2694 (Alvarez, 2026) requires a district to document that its proposed program is not substantially similar to a CSU program or that the 75% transfer acceptance rate exception has been satisfied. CSU may submit their own evidence.

Impact on CCCs core mission. In previous discussions around authorizing the offering of CCC baccalaureate degrees, concerns were raised that broadening the CCC mission would diminish attention to transfer, associate degree completion, remedial education goals, and career technical education. In an effort to address this concern and limit potential impacts on the CCCs' core mission of the CCC, as well as on existing associate degree programs at local campuses, existing law established by AB 927 (Medina, Chapter 565, Statutes of 2021) limits the number of programs a CCC may offer to no more than 25% of the number of associate degree programs offered at the college. In addition to the performance-based program limits on the number of programs contained in SB 960 (Cabaldon, 2026), this bill limits each district to three applications per academic year and prohibits baccalaureate programs from displacing lower-division, certification, or noncredit enrollment opportunities. These safeguards attempt to balance additional bachelor's degree authority with the preservation of the CCCs critical mission.

Reporting. This bill continues annual reporting on approved CCC baccalaureate programs and adds information about LWDA determinations and the public and fee revenues supporting each program. The report also includes enrollment, completion, employment outcomes, collaborative efforts, and segment objections.

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

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

- The Community College Chancellor's Office indicates that the bill would not result in additional Proposition 98 General Fund costs to participating community college districts (CCDs) as the bill would operate within the fiscal conditions already established in statute for baccalaureate degree programs offered at community colleges. Additionally, the Community College Chancellor's Office indicates that while the bill may lead to an overall increase in the number of new baccalaureate degree programs being approved, it cannot increase per-student costs as current statute ties funding for these programs to the current community college marginal rate for a full-time equivalent student. Further, community college districts must demonstrate full financial and operational capacity, including staffing, student supports, and long-term sustainability, before receiving authorization to offer a baccalaureate degree program.
- Depending on the number of new community college baccalaureate programs that are authorized as a result of this bill, it could impact enrollment across UC and CSU campuses and pose significant General Fund cost pressures.
- The Community College Chancellor's Office may incur minor General Fund costs to complete the annual report and provide technical assistance.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

The Campaign for College Opposition

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

None received on this version

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-11, 5/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Ellis, Gallagher, Johnson, Macedo, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Arambula, Bryan, Dixon, Flora, Gabriel, Muratsuchi, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins

Prepared by: Olgalilia Ramirez / ED. / (916) 651-4105
8/28/26 11:53:36

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2717
Author: Caloza (D)
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: 12-1, 6/23/26
AYES: Cortese, Strickland, Archuleta, Arreguín, Dahle, Gonzalez, Grayson,
Menjivar, Richardson, Seyarto, Valladares, Wiener
NOES: Blakespear

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/26/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Outdoor advertising displays: arenas: exemptions

SOURCE: Los Angeles Dodgers LLC

DIGEST: This bill extends, commencing January 1, 2028, a previously issued authorization for outdoor advertising displays for designated professional sports arenas, as defined, until January 1, 2032, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Creates the Outdoor Advertising Act (OAA), a regulatory framework administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to govern installation and operation of outdoor advertising displays (i.e., billboards) that are visible from state highways. OAA and related regulations determine the size, illumination, orientation, and location of advertising displays adjacent to and within specified distances of interstate or primary highways, and, with some exceptions, specifically prohibit any advertising

display from being placed or maintained on property adjacent to a section of landscaped highway.

- 2) Regulates, as an “off-premises advertising display,” a display along a highway that generally advertises business conducted or services rendered or goods produced or sold at a location other than the property where the display is located. The Act does not apply to “on-premises advertising displays,” which generally advertise business conducted or services rendered or goods produced or sold at the location where the display is located and which are separately regulated.
- 3) Exempts advertising displays associated with sports arenas (capacity of 15,000 or more seats), as defined, from specific provisions of OAA, provided that advertising display only includes products, goods, or services sold within that area on a regular basis, or marketed or promoted in that area pursuant to a sponsorship marketing plan, provided that the display is authorized by January 1, 2021, by, or in accordance with, a local ordinance, as specified. Advertising for distilled spirits, tobacco, firearms, or sexually explicit material is not permitted.
- 4) Defines a "sponsorship marketing plan" as an agreement between the property owner, facility owner, facility operator, or occupant of the premises of an arena and a sponsor pursuant to which the sponsor is allowed to include its logo, slogan, and that the agreement for a duration of not less than 120 days.
- 5) Requires Caltrans, when renegotiating an agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) relating to advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to federally identified highway systems that specifies the state’s obligations for receipt of unreduced federal aid highway funds under federal law, to include among its priorities support for advertising displays at arenas.
- 6) Provides, by contractual agreement, for Caltrans to administer the federal Outdoor Advertising Control (OAC) program under the federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (HBA), which has restrictions similar to California’s OAA program, including maximum sign size, sign spacing, location, illumination, and content. If the state fails to properly administer the federal program, the state is subject to lose 10% of its federal highway funding.
- 7) Requires that if an advertising display associated with a sports arena is subject to a notice from the federal government that the display will result in the

reduction of federal highway funds, the authorization of the display shall cease. Failure to remove the advertising will result in a fine of \$10,000 per day until the advertising is removed.

- 8) Provides that responsibility for ensuring that the signs are compliant with the law is responsibility of the city or county which authorized the signs and that the city or county shall indemnify Caltrans for all costs incurred to ensure compliance.

This bill:

- 1) Commencing January 1, 2028, extends an authorization date for advertising displays for designated professional sports arenas, as defined, with a capacity of 15,000 or more seats to January 1, 2032, by, or in accordance with, a local ordinance or other discretionary approval, including, but not limited to, a specific plan or sign district adopted in connection with the approval of the arena that benefits the arena and that is adopted by the city, county, or city and county, bears the name or logo of the arena, and is visible when approaching offramps from the interstate, primary, or state highways used to access the premises of the arena. An arena shall not be permitted more than two advertising displays allowed under this measure.
- 2) Provides the exemption would be limited to an arena fully constructed or under construction before January 1, 2027, as specified.
- 3) Provides the advertising displays are exempt from specific provisions of OAA, provided that the billboards are used exclusively either to advertise products, goods, or services sold by persons on the premises of an arena on a regular basis, or to advertise products, goods, or services marketed or promoted on the premises of an arena pursuant to a sponsorship marketing plan, as specified.
- 4) Requires Caltrans to make a determination that an outdoor advertising display approved by the provisions specified in this bill does not cause a reduction in federal funds or is inconsistent with any federal requirements, as specified. Further requires Caltrans to request FHA to make and submit the abovementioned determination if Caltrans is unable to make the determination.
- 5) Provides, this bill would require certain advertising displays placed pursuant to the exemption for one arena to be located at least 5,000 feet from an advertising display authorized pursuant to the exemption for another arena.
- 6) Defines "Premises of an arena" means either of the following:

- a) A venue for indoor or outdoor sports, concerts, or other events.
 - b) Any development project or district encompassing the venue, adjacent to it, or separated from it only by public or private rights-of-way, the boundaries of which have been set by the city, county, or city and county in which the arena is located. The development project or district shall be contiguous and shall not extend more than 1,000 feet beyond the arena structure or any structure physically connected to the arena structure. Further provides clarification to mean the Los Angeles Convention Center, as specified.
- 7) Defines “Sponsorship marketing plan” means an agreement between the property owner, facility owner, facility operator, or occupant of the premises of an arena and a sponsor pursuant to which the sponsor is allowed to include its logo, slogan, or advertising on advertising displays and that meets both of the following conditions:
- a) The sponsorship marketing plan is for a period of not less than 120 days.
 - b) The sponsorship marketing plan grants the sponsor the opportunity to display its logo, slogan, or advertising in the interior of structures on the premises of an arena, or conduct promotions, public relations, or marketing activities on the premises of an arena.
- 8) Includes provisions to avoid chaptering out conflicts.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of the bill.* According to the author, “California is home to some of the most iconic sports and entertainment venues in the world—from stadiums like Dodger Stadium to Levi’s Stadium—but many facilities need updated tools to remain competitive in today’s modern landscape. AB 2717 extends the existing sunset provision to January 1, 2032, ensuring that professional sports arenas can continue seeking local government approval to install off-site advertising displays tied to their operations. As California prepares to host major global events like the 2028 Summer Olympics, it is critical that our stadiums and arenas are equipped to meet the moment. Beyond economic benefits, these displays can serve the public good—supporting civic uses like voting centers and community events, and delivering critical information such as Amber Alerts and emergency notifications. AB 2717 ensures our venues remain both economically viable and responsive to the needs of the communities they serve.”

- 2) *OAA: A history.* Since 1933, Caltrans has enforced OAA which contains comprehensive standards and regulations for outdoor advertising displays. Caltrans regulates the placement of outdoor advertising displays visible from California highways. Outdoor advertising displays require a permit from Caltrans if they are within 660 feet from the edge of the right-of-way and viewed primarily by persons traveling on the main-traveled way of the freeway. In order to enforce the requirements for outdoor advertising under HBA and the State's OAA, Caltrans regularly inspects freeways and highways that are part of the National Highway System.

The OAA regulates the size, illumination, orientation, and location of advertising displays adjacent to and within specified distances of interstate or primary highways, and, with some exceptions, specifically prohibits any advertising display from being placed or maintained on property adjacent to a section of landscaped highway.

The Act generally does not apply to “on premises” advertising displays, which include those advertising the sale of the property upon which it is placed or that advertise the business conducted, services rendered, or goods produced or sold on the property. Local governments regulate on-premises displays, except for certain safety requirements. Lastly, existing law includes a number of exceptions to OAA and assigns Caltrans the responsibility of reviewing and permitting signs that qualify for these exceptions.

- 3) *OAA exemptions for arenas.* The basis for the professional sports arena (capacity of 15,000 or more seats) exemption governing permitted off-site billboard advertising was established in 2013 (SB 31, Padilla, Chapter 542, Statutes of 2013). The intent was to support the financing of sports arenas by creating alternatives to public funding. The exemption was later clarified to limit advertising displays to products, goods, or services that are either sold within the arena on a regular basis or marketed and promoted there under a sponsorship marketing plan of at least one year. This clarification was viewed as a compromise addressing concerns from both arena developers—seeking to maximize advertising revenue—and traditional outdoor advertising companies, which faced newly funded competition from arena-based displays in locations previously unavailable to the outdoor industry and advertisers.

Over the years, several attempts were made to extend the 2021 exemption sunset. Most recently, in 2022, SB 1309 (Durazo) would have extended the

authorization date for advertising displays for designated professional sports arenas with a capacity of 15,000 or more seats to January 1, 2028. The exemption would have been limited to arenas constructed or under construction before January 1, 2023, and would have required that the display be in accordance with a local ordinance or other discretionary approval. SB 1309 was ultimately vetoed by the Governor. Many of the provisions specified in this bill, AB 2717, mirror the provisions included in SB 1309.

- 4) *HBA of 1965*. The HBA was created to protect the public investment, promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve the natural beauty of highways in the nation. The HBA specifies that states have the responsibility to enforce provisions regarding the placement and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays and devices along the Interstate and National Highway System. The state of California enforces the provisions of federal law through a compact that was developed between the state and the federal government in 1967. Federal law also includes a penalty for states that violate the HBA by reducing all federal highway transportation funds by a designated percentage – thus, if the state fails to properly administer the federal program, the state is subject to a sanction that would reduce its federal highway funding allocations by 10%.

In attempt to avoid any federal violations, this bill contains provisions that requires Caltrans to determine if an outdoor advertising display locally approved under this measure violates federal requirements. An outdoor advertising display would be prohibited from being constructed / erected if Caltrans makes a determination that the display violates federal requirements.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Caltrans estimates costs in the range of \$150,000 for additional staff resources to review whether a proposed display conforms with local ordinances or other discretionary approvals and with state and federal law. Specifically, Caltrans must determine whether proposed displays conform with federal requirements or agreements and will not cause a reduction in federal funds, and/or make requests to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to make those determinations. Actual Caltrans administrative costs would depend upon the number of reviews and associated inspections that are conducted in a given year. (State Highway Account)

- Caltrans further notes the potential risk of federal sanctions that would reduce federal highway allocations by up to \$580 million, to the extent Caltrans does not maintain effective control of outdoor advertising. Staff notes that this bill includes a provision requiring Caltrans, before authorizing a display to be placed, to make a determination that a proposed display will not cause a reduction in federal aid funds, or to request that FHWA make that determination, which should mitigate the risk of federal sanctions.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

Los Angeles Dodgers LLC (Source)

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/13/26)

City of Inglewood (unless amended)

Scenic America

Western Electrical Contractors Association

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0, 5/26/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, 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, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Hart, Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez, Valencia

Prepared by: Manny Leon / TRANS. / (916) 651-4121

8/30/26 15:06:10

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2727
Author: Nguyen (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/30/26
AYES: Arreguín, Seyarto, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 7-0, 8/13/26
AYES: Cervantes, Seyarto, Cabaldon, Dahle, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/28/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Corrections: parole and prerelease treatment

SOURCE: Orange County District Attorney's Office
Sacramento County District Attorney's Office

DIGEST: This bill requires that individuals convicted of specified sex crimes are 65 years of age or older and have served a minimum of 25 years on their current sentence in order to be eligible for the Elderly Parole Program; makes the sexually violent predator (SVP) referral process applicable to indeterminately sentenced individuals; and provides that the change to the SVP referral process is retroactive regardless of the date an individual was sentenced or the date the offense was committed.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 reduce the length of time a person can be held past their scheduled release date for purposes of completion of an SVP evaluation from 180 days to 90 days.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 require the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) to review a sexual dangerousness screening for a person who is indeterminately sentenced for a sexually violent offense prior to reviewing or considering the person's parole suitability; outline the process and requirements for the sexual

dangerousness screening; require BPH to refer a person granted parole whose sexual dangerousness screening indicates the person may qualify as an SVP to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) for an SVP evaluation; allow BPH to order a person referred to DSH for an SVP evaluation to remain in custody for up to 180 days past the person's scheduled release date in order to complete the evaluation when there are fewer than 180 days prior to the person's scheduled release date to complete the full evaluation; require, effective January 1, 2027, the California Department for Corrections and Rehabilitation to recalculate the Elderly Parole Eligible Dates for individuals convicted of specified sex offenses and to cancel parole hearings that were previously scheduled based solely on the Elderly Parole statutory criteria in effect prior to that date; and add a training requirement for BPH commissioners and deputy commissioners on sex offender behaviors, risks, and treatment.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Requires the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) to meet with each incarcerated person during the sixth year prior to the person's minimum eligible parole date (MEPD) for the purposes of reviewing and documenting the person's activities and conduct pertinent to both parole eligibility. Requires that the BPH provide the person with information about the parole hearing process, legal factors relevant to his or her suitability or unsuitability for parole, and individualized recommendations for the person regarding his or her work assignments, rehabilitative programs, and institutional behavior during the consultation. (Penal [Pen.] Code, § 3041, subd. (a)(1).)
- 2) Provides that one year prior to the incarcerated person's MEPD, a panel of two or more commissioners or deputy commissioners shall meet with the person and shall normally grant parole. (Pen. Code, § 3041, subd. (a)(2).)
- 3) Requires that an incarcerated person be released upon a grant of parole, subject to all applicable review periods. Prohibits the release of an incarcerated person who has not reached their MEPD unless the person is eligible for earlier release pursuant to their youth offender parole eligibility date or elderly parole eligible date. (Pen. Code, § 3041, subd. (a)(4).)
- 4) Requires the BPH to grant parole to an incarcerated person unless it determines that the gravity of the current convicted offense or offenses, or the timing and

gravity of current or past convicted offense or offenses, is such that consideration of the public safety requires a more lengthy period of incarceration for this individual. (Pen. Code, § 3041, subd. (b)(1).)

- 5) Prohibits a person imprisoned under a life sentence from being paroled until they have served the greater of the following: 1) a term of at least seven calendar years; or 2) a term as established pursuant to any other law that establishes a minimum term or minimum period of confinement under a life sentence before eligibility for parole. Requires that notwithstanding this provision of law, an incarcerated person found suitable for parole pursuant to a youth offender parole hearing or an elderly parole hearing be paroled regardless of the manner in which BPH sets release dates pursuant to other provisions of current law, as applicable. (Pen. Code, § 3046, subs. (a) & (c).)
- 6) Establishes the Elderly Parole Program, to be administered by BPH, for purposes of reviewing the parole suitability of any incarcerated person who is 50 years of age or older and has served a minimum of 20 years of continuous incarceration on the person's current sentence, serving either a determinate or indeterminate sentence. Defines "elderly parole eligible date" as the date on which an incarcerated person who qualifies as an elderly offender is eligible for release from prison. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subs. (a) & (b).)
- 7) Requires the BPH to give special consideration to whether age, time served, and diminished physical condition, if any, have reduced the elderly incarcerated individual's risk for future violence, when considering the person's release. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subd. (c).)
- 8) Requires the BPH to consider whether the incarcerated person meets or will meet the criteria for the Elderly Parole Program. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subd. (d).)
- 9) Requires the BPH to set the time for a subsequent elderly parole hearing if parole is not granted. Provides that no subsequent elderly parole hearing is necessary if the offender is released pursuant to other statutory provisions prior to the date of the subsequent hearing. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subd. (f).)
- 10) Excludes the following individuals from elderly parole eligibility: a person who was sentenced pursuant to the "Three Strikes" law; a person who was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole or death; a person who was convicted of first-degree murder of a peace officer who was killed while engaged in the performance of their duties, and the individual knew, or

reasonably should have known, that the victim was a peace officer engaged in the performance of their duties, or the victim was a peace officer or a former peace officer, and was intentionally killed in retaliation for the performance of their official duties, as defined. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subds. (g) & (h).)

- 11) Provides for the civil commitment for psychiatric and psychological treatment of an individual incarcerated in state prison found to be a sexually violent predator (SVP) after the person has served his or her prison commitment. (Welfare and Institutions Code [Welf. & Inst. Code], § 6600, et seq.)
- 12) Defines a “sexually violent predator” as “a person who has been convicted of a sexually violent offense against one or more victims and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6600, subd. (a)(1).)
- 13) Requires the Secretary of California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), when they have determined that an individual who is in custody (who is either serving a determinate prison sentence or whose parole has been revoked, and who is not in custody for the commission of a new offense committed while the individual was serving an indeterminate term in a state hospital as an SVP) may be an SVP, to refer the person for evaluation at least six months prior to that individual’s scheduled release date for release from prison. Allows the referral to be made less than six months prior to the person’s scheduled release date if the person was received by CDCR with less than nine months of their sentence to serve, or if the person’s release date is modified by judicial or administrative action. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (a)(1).)

This bill:

- 1) Changes the Elderly Parole Program eligibility criteria for individuals convicted of the following crimes or sentenced under the following statutes, by requiring that such a person is 65 years of age or older and has served a minimum of 25 continuous years on their current sentence:
 - a) Aggravated sexual assault of a child (i.e., commits rape; rape or sexual penetration, in concert; sodomy; oral copulation; or sexual penetration on a child under 14 and seven or more years younger than the person).

- b) Sexual intercourse or sodomy with a child who is 10 years of age or younger.
 - c) Oral copulation or sexual penetration with a child who is 10 years of age or younger.
 - d) One Strike Sex Offense statute.
 - e) Habitual sexual offender statute.
- 2) Makes the SVP referral process applicable to indeterminately sentenced individuals.
- 3) Provides that the change to the SVP referral process is retroactive regardless of the date an individual was sentenced or the date the offense was committed.

Background

Elderly Parole. As the result of severe prison overcrowding, the Three-Judge Court ordered CDCR to implement several population reduction measures, including to “[f]inalize and implement a new parole process whereby inmates who are 60 years of age or older and have served a minimum of twenty-five years of their sentence will be referred to the Board of Parole Hearings to determine suitability for parole.” (February 10, 2014 Order, 2:90-cv-0520 LKK DAD PC, 3-Judge Court, *Coleman v. Brown, Plata v. Brown*) In response to the order, BPH created the Elderly Parole Program and began holding elderly parole hearings on October 1, 2014. Incarcerated individuals with determinate terms as well as those sentenced to life with the possibility of parole are eligible for the program. (CDCR, *Elderly Parole Hearings*, available at <<https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/bph/elderly-parole-hearings-overview/> .) Incarcerated individuals who are sentenced to life without the possibility of parole, or who are sentenced to death are not eligible for the program. (*Ibid.*)

AB 1448 (Weber, Chapter 676, Statutes of 2017), codified the Elderly Parole Program. However, AB 1448 narrowed the eligibility criteria by excluding individuals who were sentenced pursuant to the “Three Strikes” law or who were convicted of first-degree murder of a peace officer from the Elderly Parole Program. (Pen. Code, § 3055, subds. (g) & (h).) AB 3234 (Ting), Chapter 334, Statutes of 2020, expanded the eligibility criteria for elderly parole. Specifically, AB 3234 lowered the minimum age at which an incarcerated individual is eligible for elderly parole from 60 to 50 and the amount of time that must be served from 25 years to 20 years. Incarcerated individuals who meet the eligibility criteria of the court-ordered Elderly Parole Program but who are excluded from the statutory

Elderly Parole Program are eligible for elderly parole consideration under the court-ordered program. (BPH, *Elderly Parole Fact Sheet* (Mar. 2022), p. 1 available at <https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/bph/wp-content/uploads/sites/161/2022/03/Elderly-Parole-Fact-Sheet3_18-1.pdf .)

The most recent data on recidivism rates for individuals released through the Elderly Parole Program indicate that the three-year conviction rate for all individuals released via the program during fiscal year 2019-2020 is 1.8%, and the three-year conviction rate for individuals released via the program the same year who had an indeterminate term is 0.6%. (CDCR, Office of Research, *Recidivism Rates for Individuals Released Through Board of Parole Hearing Processes in Fiscal Year 2019-20* (Jul. 2025), p. 6 available at <<https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/research/wp-content/uploads/sites/174/2025/07/FY-2019-20-BPH-Supplemental-Recidivism-Report.pdf> .)

Sexually Violent Predator Act. The Sexually Violent Predator Act (SVPA) established an extended civil commitment scheme for sex offenders who are about to be released from prison but are referred to DSH for treatment in a state hospital because they have suffered from a mental illness which causes them to be a danger to the safety of others. The initial screening is conducted by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the Board of Parole Hearings. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (b).) If a determination is made that the person is likely a sexually violent predator, CDCR is required to refer to the person to DSH for a full evaluation. (*Ibid.*)

Under existing law, a person may be deemed an SVP if: the person has been convicted of specified sex offenses against one or more victims; the person has been diagnosed with a mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that the person will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior; and, two licensed psychiatrists or psychologists concur in the diagnosis. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 6600, subd. (a), 6601, subd. (d).) If DSH finds that the person meets the criteria to be considered an SVP, the case is referred to the county's designated counsel who may file a petition for civil commitment. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6601, subd. (i).) Once a petition has been filed, a judge holds a probable cause hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6602.) If probable cause is found, the case proceeds to a trial at which the prosecutor must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the person meets the statutory criteria to be considered an SVP. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 6604.) If the prosecutor meets this burden, the person can be civilly committed to a DSH facility for treatment.

This bill has two components: changing the Elderly Parole eligibility criteria for individuals convicted of certain felony sex offense and making the SVP referral process applicable to indeterminately sentenced individuals.

First, this bill changes the Elderly Parole Program eligibility criteria for individuals convicted of the following crimes or sentenced under the following statutes, by requiring that such persons are 65 years of age or older and have served a minimum of 25 continuous years on their current sentence:

- Aggravated sexual assault of a child (i.e., commits rape; rape or sexual penetration, in concert; sodomy; oral copulation; or sexual penetration on a child under 14 and seven or more years younger than the person).
- Sexual intercourse or sodomy with a child who is 10 years of age or younger.
- Oral copulation or sexual penetration with a child who is 10 years of age or younger.
- One Strike Sex Offense statute.
- Habitual sexual offender statute.

Under current law, these individuals are eligible for the statutory Elderly Parole Program once a person reaches the age of 50 and has served a minimum of 20 continuous years on their current sentence. As mentioned earlier in the analysis, these individuals are eligible for the court-ordered Elderly Parole Program once the person reaches the age of 65 and has served a minimum of 25 continuous years on their current sentence.

This bill additionally makes the mandatory SVP referral process applicable to indeterminately sentenced individuals. Under current law, only individuals who were determinately sentenced (i.e., a person who was sentenced to a finite term of years such as 10 years as opposed to an open-ended sentence such as 15 years-to-life) are referred for SVP evaluation. Finally, this bill makes the change to the SVP referral process retroactive regardless of the date an individual was sentenced or the date the offense was committed.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Major annual costs in the millions of dollars to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) for extended incarceration of the affected population. A person sentenced for one of the specified sex offenses is eligible for

elderly parole consideration at age 50 after 20 years served. This bill delays eligibility to age 65 after 25 years served. At CDCR's average per capita incarceration cost of approximately \$138,000 annually, each additional year of incarceration for an affected individual represents a cost of that magnitude. Aggregate costs will depend on the size of the affected population and the extent to which current-law elderly parole grants would otherwise have resulted in release. CDCR notes that some affected individuals may remain eligible for earlier parole consideration through youth offender parole or their minimum eligible parole date, which partially offsets the delayed-eligibility effect.

Annual costs to the California Correctional Health Care Services for geriatric medical care for the affected population. Incarcerated individuals over age 55 incur substantially higher healthcare costs than the general CDCR population due to age-related chronic conditions, long-term care needs, and end-of-life care.

Annual costs in the low millions of dollars for expanded SVP screening and referral workload. The bill's elimination of the determinate-term limitation on SVP referrals would require CDCR to conduct SVP screenings and referrals for indeterminately sentenced persons with qualifying offenses in advance of parole hearings.

Projected \$4.13 million annually to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) for expanded SVP evaluations. Eliminating the determinate-term limitation on SVP referrals expands the universe of inmates potentially subject to evaluation to include indeterminate-term inmates up for parole, and the new referral authority in the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) adds an additional referral pathway. Assuming BPH will refer these incarcerated persons to DSH for SVP evaluation before granting parole at the same rate they do for incarcerated persons who have already been granted parole, DSH estimates it would need to evaluate approximately 250 additional individuals referred each year. To do so, DSH would require ten SVP evaluators, one senior psychologist supervisor, and two analyst positions. Further, if the two initial evaluators disagree on whether the individual meets SVP criteria, two independent evaluators must complete another evaluation. Based on the current 10% rate of difference of opinions, DSH would need to fund 50 additional independent evaluations (25 cases of differing opinion, requiring two additional evaluators per case).

Projected \$10.23 million to \$20.46 million annually to treat additional SVP patients. If DSH assumes 10 percent to 20% of the anticipated 250 additional SVP evaluations result in positive SVP determinations, DSH SVP commitments would

increase by 25 to 50 patients annually. Since SVP patients' length of stay is about 12 years, this would significantly impact DSH bed space. As of March 2026, DSH had a total population of 954 SVP patients. Based on FY 2024-25 expenditures, the average cost of inpatient treatment per day at DSH is \$1,121. All available units at DSH-Coalinga are activated and serving SVP patients, incarcerated persons from CDCR, and Offender with Mental Health Disorder (OMD) patients. Depending upon the actual number of SVP patients referred to DSH as a result of this bill, DSH may need to relocate OMD patients to other DSH facilities, which may impact overall bed availability in the DSH system for other patient types. To the extent DSH will need to contract for additional bed capacity to meet these needs, there are additional unknown costs. (General Fund)

Unknown costs to trial courts, county district attorneys, and county public defenders for SVP commitment proceedings generated by the expanded referral population. SVP proceedings are resource-intensive, often involving years of litigation, multiple expert evaluations, and probable cause hearings. These county costs are potentially reimbursable by the state, subject to a determination by the Commission on State Mandates. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The FY 2026-27 Budget appropriated \$70 million to backfill revenue reductions (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

Orange County District Attorney's Office (co-source)
Sacramento County District Attorney's Office (co-source)
California Police Chiefs Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Chief Probation Officers' of California
Peace Officers Research Association of California
Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

ACLU California Action
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Public Defenders Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Fair Chance Project
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Initiate Justice
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
San Francisco Public Defender
Smart Justice California
UnCommon Law

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 5/28/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bryan, Caloza, Elhawary, Garcia, Jackson, McKinnor, Quirk-Silva, Celeste Rodriguez, Sharp-Collins, Ward

Prepared by: Stephanie Jordan / PUB. S. /916-651-4118
8/30/26 14:44:15

**** END ****

THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2760
Author: Sharp-Collins (D), Lee (D) and Schultz (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

PRIOR SENATE VOTES NOT RELEVANT PURSUANT TO SENATE RULE
29.10(c)

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 8/26/26
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-2, 8/27/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle
NO VOTE RECORDED: Richardson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Not relevant

SUBJECT: Law enforcement: wearable electroshock devices

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits law enforcement agencies, as defined, from using wearable electroshock devices, as defined, within the state of California; 2) prohibits a law enforcement agency from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices; and 3) requires law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 change the definition of “wearable electroshock device” to include “taser energy weapon” rather than “taser”; delete the term “and operated using a trigger finger” from the description of devices that are not “wearable electroshock devices”; add a requirement that the California Department of Justice Division of Law Enforcement conduct a study on the safety

and community impacts of wearable electroshock devices to be completed by January 1, 2029; and add a sunset date for the bills provisions of January 1, 2030.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 fix drafting errors, refine the bill's definitions, and add co-authors.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 delete the prior version of the bill and insert a new bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Declares the intent of the Legislature that the authority to use physical force, conferred on peace officers by existing law, is a serious responsibility that shall be exercised judiciously and with respect for human rights and dignity and for the sanctity of every human life, and that every person has a right to be free from excessive use of force by officers acting under color of law. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 835a, subd. (a)(1).)
- 2) Includes a legislative finding and declaration that the decision by a peace officer to use force shall be evaluated carefully and thoroughly, in a manner that reflects the gravity of that authority and the serious consequences of the use of force by peace officers, in order to ensure that officers use force consistent with law and agency policies. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (a)(3).)
- 3) Authorizes a peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that a person to be arrested has committed a public offense to use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (b).)
- 4) Permits a peace officer who is authorized to make an arrest and who has stated their intention to do so to use all necessary means to effect the arrest if the person to be arrested either flees or forcibly resists. (Pen. Code, § 843.)
- 5) Requires each law enforcement agency to maintain a policy that provides a minimum standard on the use of force which, among other elements, must include all of the following:
 - a) A requirement that officers utilize de-escalation techniques, crisis intervention tactics, and other alternatives to force when feasible.

- b) A requirement that an officer may only use a level of force that they reasonably believe is proportional to the seriousness of the suspected offense or the reasonably perceived level of actual or threatened resistance.
 - c) A requirement that officers immediately report potential excessive force to a superior officer when present and observing another officer using force that the officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer.
 - d) A requirement that officers promptly provide, if properly trained, or otherwise promptly procure medical assistance for persons injured in a use of force incident, when reasonable and safe to do so.
 - e) Training standards and requirements relating to demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the law enforcement agency's use of force policy by officers, investigators, and supervisors.
 - f) Training and guidelines regarding vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, children, elderly persons, people who are pregnant, and people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities. (Government (Gov.) Code, § 7286, subd. (b).)
- 6) Prohibits a law enforcement agency from authorizing the use of a carotid restraint, as defined, by any peace officer employed by that agency. (Gov. Code, § 7286.5, subd. (a).)
- 7) Prohibits a law enforcement agency from authorizing techniques or transport methods that involve a substantial risk of positional asphyxia. (Gov. Code, § 7286.5, subd. (b).)
- 8) Prohibits, generally, law enforcement agencies from using kinetic energy projectiles and chemical agents, as defined, to disperse any assembly, protest or demonstration. (Pen. Code, § 13652, subd. (a).)
- 9) Prohibits peace officers who carry electroshock devices from holstering or carrying those devices on the same lateral side of the officer's body as the officer's primary firearm is holstered or otherwise carried. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (a).)
- 10) Defines "electroshock device" to mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (b)(1).)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a law enforcement agency—defined as any local agency that employs a peace officer, any law enforcement agency of another state, or any federal law enforcement agency—from using wearable electroshock devices, as defined, within the state of California.
- 2) Prohibits a law enforcement agency—defined as any agency, department, or other entity of the state or any political subdivision thereof that employs any peace officer—from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices.
- 3) Requires law enforcement agencies—defined as any agency, department, or other entity of the state or any political subdivision thereof—to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.
- 4) Defines “wearable,” for the purposes of this bill, to mean any clothing or accessory item.
- 5) Defines, by cross reference to existing law, “electroshock device” to mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (b)(1).)

Background

From the outset of President Trump’s second term, his Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and altered the immigration system at an unprecedented scale. ICE has used aggressive tactics in federal immigration enforcement during President Trump’s second term, especially here in California. Hundreds of federal agents conducted raids and immigration sweeps across Los Angeles, detaining and arresting individuals through “at large” arrests on the street, and often through blatant racial profiling. (*Trump’s immigration crackdown upended life in California. It continues as the new year begins* (Dec. 29, 2025) CalMatters <https://calmatters.org/justice/2025/12/immigration-2025-year-in-review/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Federal agents often conducted raids in civilian clothing or military uniforms, and often while masked, heavily armed, and without providing identification. There have also been numerous reports of federal agents using excessive force and causing injury and property damage while conducting these raids, as well as reports that agents have denied those detained access to legal counsel. Such tactics were used during Operation Metro Surge, a joint operation of ICE and Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) that took place throughout Minnesota

(though primarily in the Twin Cities area) beginning in December 2025 and concluding early February 2026. During this operation, federal immigration officials employed harsh, confrontational, and arguably illegal tactics to make arrests, serve warrants, conduct raids and contain protesters. (*Minneapolis, MN: Operation Metro Surge. Sanctuary Information, December 2025* (Dec. 2025) Immigrant Legal Resource Center <https://www.ilrc.org/immigration-enforcement/federal-tracking/large-scale-raids/minneapolis-mn-operation-metro-surge> [as of Aug. 24, 2026]; *Judge Partially Blocks Operation Metro Surge Tactics Against Protesters in Minnesota* (Jan. 17, 2024) JURIST News <https://www.jurist.org/news/2026/01/judge-partially-blocks-operation-metro-surge-tactics-against-protesters-in-minnesota/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Operation Metro Surge also resulted in the shooting of three civilians by federal immigration agents, two of which were fatal: the killings of Alex Pretti and Renee Good.

In August of 2026, DHS published plans to spend up to \$20 million to supply ICE officers with gloves that can deliver electric shocks. (Sara Braun, *Alarm over \$20m plan to supply ICE officers with electric-shock gloves*, The Guardian (Aug. 24, 2026) <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/aug/24/ice-officers-electric-shock-gloves> [as of Aug. 27, 2026].) Such gloves are already used across the country by various police departments and even in schools. (Wilkins, *Horrificed School District Pleads Police to Stop Using Electric Shock Torture Gloves on Students* (Aug. 22, 2026) Futurism <https://futurism.com/science-energy/school-district-police-electric-shock-torture-gloves> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) While the devices are marketed as nonlethal and safe for the heart, a pending lawsuit alleges a 43-year-old man died in 2024 after he was shocked 27 times with the gloves and 13 more times by a Taser at a jail in Richmond, Kentucky. (Foley, *ICE's plan to give officers electric shock gloves draws outrage and fears of misuse* (Aug. 13, 2026) PBS NewsHour <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/ices-plan-to-give-officers-electric-shock-gloves-draws-outrage-and-fears-of-misuse> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) An internal investigation found two of the glove shocks lasted 45 and 99 seconds apiece — far more than the manufacturer's recommended 15-second limit. The manufacturer notes that the devices can cause sudden death, increase in blood pressure, changes in blood chemistry, increase in respiration and heart rates, changes in heart rhythm, increase in adrenaline, and, the longer the exposure, the greater the potential risk. (Compliant Technologies, *Gen 3 & Gen 4 G.L.O.V.E. Produce User Guide*, Nov. 1, 2024, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uee38Qfyr46ZqjUPzRs_axR7ITv3jQtM/view [as of Aug 27, 2026].)

In 1989, the U.S. Supreme Court set the standard for reasonable use of force in law enforcement. The general rule for how much force a law enforcement officer can

use in response to a given situation is determined by a reasonableness test, requiring the careful balancing of the force against the countervailing government interest at stake. (*Graham v. Connor* (1989) 490 U.S. 386, 396.) The central question of this legal inquiry is whether the amount and type of force applied was reasonably necessary in light of the police need to prevent the subject from engaging in whatever conduct it was that they were engaging in at the time the force was used. Three important factors to that test are: 1) the severity of the crime at issue; 2) whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others; and 3) whether the person is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.

In 2019, California refined its use of force statutes in order to provide clearer guidance to law enforcement and the public, specifically regarding when the use of deadly force is appropriate. Namely, AB 392 (Weber, Chapter 170, Statutes of 2019), specified the circumstances in which deadly force is and is not appropriate, and SB 230 (Caballero, Chapter 285, Statutes of 2019), required law enforcement agencies to update their training and policies with specific requirements regarding use of force, including a requirement that an officer may only use a level of force that they reasonably believe is proportional to the seriousness of the suspected offense or the reasonably perceived level of actual or threatened resistance. (Gov. Code, § 7286, subd. (b).)

This bill prohibits law enforcement agencies from using wearable electroshock devices within the state of California. This bill also prohibits a law enforcement agency from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices and requires law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

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

The Senate Appropriations Committee writes:

“Unknown, potentially minor one-time costs to state and local law enforcement agencies (General Fund, local funds) to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of a wearable electroshock device.”

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/28/26)

ACLU California Action

All of US or None (HQ)

Alliance San Diego

Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA)

California Association of Black Lawyers
California Coalition for Sheriff Oversight (CCSO)
California Community Foundation
California Faculty Association
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Nurses Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
County of San Diego Fourth District Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe
Courage California
Disability Rights California
Drug Policy Alliance
Equality California
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Grace Institute - End Child Poverty in CA
Justice2Jobs Coalition
La Defensa
Legal Aid At Work
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
Prosecutors Alliance Action
Secure Justice
Smart Justice California, a Project of Beyond Impact
United Domestic Workers/AFSCME Local 3930
Western Center on Law & Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

Arcadia Police Officers' Association
Brea Police Association
Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)

Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Sacramento County Sheriff Jim Cooper

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /916-651-4118
8/30/26 15:01:34

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 165
Author: Kalra (D)
Introduced: 3/25/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-0, 6/18/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: The 2026 International Day of Yoga

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes June 21, 2026, as the 2026 International Day of Yoga in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) 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 36,000,000 Americans estimated to practice yoga regularly, and one in three Americans have at least tried yoga once.
- 2) Yoga brings strength, stability, and unity within the body, mind, and emotions. Recent studies suggest that yoga-based interventions can be an effective treatment for various health conditions and mental health disorders and can complement traditional medical interventions and therapy. Regular yoga practitioners report benefits such as reduction in stress, positive increase in temperament, being physically stronger, and reduced inflammation, pain, and stiffness.
- 3) This year marks the 12th International Day of Yoga and people worldwide use this celebratory day to raise awareness of the history, benefits, and teachings of yoga.

This resolution recognizes June 21, 2026, as the 2026 International Day of Yoga in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/23/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/23/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 63-0, 6/18/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alvarez, Bains, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Haney, Johnson, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Papan, Patel, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Soria, Tangipa, Wicks

Prepared by: Aizenia Randhawa / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/24/26 14:17:30

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 173
Author: Carrillo (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/8/26
Vote: 21

SENATE BUS., PROF. & ECON. DEV. COMMITTEE: 7-0, 6/8/26
AYES: Wahab, Archuleta, Arreguín, Caballero, Grayson, Menjivar, Smallwood-Cuevas
NO VOTE RECORDED: Choi, Niello, Strickland, Umberg

SUBJECT: Sister state: State of Jalisco

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recommits to formalizing the sister state relationship between the State of Jalisco in Mexico and the State of California.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law establishes, via Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 (Heuso, Resolution Chapter 70, Statutes of 2014) a sister state relationship with the State of Jalisco in Mexico and California, acknowledging the economic opportunities in high technology manufacturing, agriculture, tourism, amongst other important industries.

This resolution:

- 1) Recognizes the mutually beneficial educational, economic and culture exchanges between the State of Jalisco and State of California.
- 2) Continues the long-standing cross-national collaboration and goodwill between California and Jalisco in addressing immigration policies while maintaining liberties and due process for all residents in California granted by the state Constitution regardless of immigration status.

3) Promotes mutual respect for the residents of the bordering states.

Background

This resolution recommits to formalizing the sister-state relationship between California and Jalisco by embracing the shared investments in high technology manufacturing, agriculture ties, and cultural traditions and tourism. Recognized as “Mexico’s Silicon Valley”, Guadalajara, located in the State of Jalisco, is the largest technology center in Mexico, known as a major Latin and North American hub, and is a main producer of software, electronics and digital products. This burgeoning electronics market aligns with California’s technology sector promoting job creation and sustainable innovation in both regions. The cultural traditions and heritage that originated in Jalisco have permeated California in displays of mariachi music, charreadas (Mexican rodeos), the Mexican Hat Dance, and the wide brimmed sombrero. The culinary exports from Jalisco to California include a variety of tequilas grown from the indigenous agave plant found in Mexico and a plethora of native dishes, including the meat stew dish of birria.

The historical United States Bracero Program brought agricultural laborers from Jalisco to California enriching the economic relationship and encouraging a deep-rooted generational connection between the states that continues to this day, particularly in agricultural areas located in the Central Valley and in the larger urban areas of Los Angeles. Today, this vast migration connects California and Jalisco through established family networks, cultural ties and shared prosperity encouraging Jalisco immigrants and their relatives to integrate into all sectors of business, participate in their community and contribute to their shared heritage and culture through music, the arts, cultural festivals and cuisine.

ACR 173 supports cooperative research by universities in California and Jalisco enriching this bi-national relationship by promoting bilateral economic development and stimulating employment in Mexican immigrant communities benefiting the residents in both states.

This resolution recognizes the vested interests and economic relationship between the States of Jalisco and California, promotes sustained goodwill and collaboration by continuing bilateral cooperation in the face of shifting federal policies on immigration enforcement, while maintaining mutual respect and honoring civil liberties for the residents in both regions.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/8/26)

Asociacion De Jaliscienses Unidos En Accion (AJUA)
Mexican-American Policy Alliance

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/8/26)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: Asociacion De Jaliscienses and Unidos En Accion (AJUA) write in support, “The relationship between California and Jalisco simply makes sense. Cross-border economic ties translate into real benefits for workers, businesses, and families on both sides – so investing in local-level collaboration is a practical, high impact approach. ACR 173 truly aligns with our mission to preserve and promote the Mexican roots in the United States, supporting the migrant community through services, education, culture, guidance and social programs that improve their quality of life.”

The Mexican-American Policy Initiative notes in support, “This state sisterhood is a natural next step in cementing the strong relationship between Jalisco and California. Over 1 million people of Jalisco origin live in California. Jalisco and California share more than just people—they also share a rich, beautiful history shaped by culture and language. A sister-state relationship between the two would create opportunities to promote and share cultural and tourism experiences, while also encouraging joint business growth and workforce development collaboration.”

Prepared by: Anna Billy / B., P. & E.D. /
6/10/26 16:52:25

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 176
Author: Elhawary (D), et al.
Introduced: 4/15/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: Second Chance Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Second Chance Month in California.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) Every individual is endowed with human dignity and value. Redemption and second chances are values of California. Restorative justice through healing and rehabilitation can help uplift society.
- 2) An estimated 8 million residents of California have a criminal record. About 35,000 Californians return to their communities from prison every year.
- 3) For individuals returning to their communities from prison or jail, gaining meaningful employment is one of the most significant predictors of successful reentry and has been shown to reduce future criminal activity.
- 4) Many individuals who have been incarcerated struggle to find employment and access capital to start a small business because of collateral consequences, which are sometimes not directly related to the offenses the individuals committed or any proven public safety benefit.
- 5) An individual who has been convicted of certain crimes is often barred from receiving the financial aid necessary to acquire additional skills and knowledge through some formal education programs.
- 6) Those barriers can have an impact on public safety by contributing to recidivism.

- 7) The designation of April 2026 as Second Chance Month may contribute to increased public awareness about the impact of collateral consequences and the need for closure for individuals with a criminal record who have paid their debt.

This resolution proclaims the month of April 2026 as Second Chance Month in California.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/8/26)

None received

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
5/13/26 16:27:54

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 199
Author: Kalra (D) and Patel (D)
Introduced: 5/6/26
Vote: 21

SUBJECT: India's Independence Day

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution recognizes August 15, 2026, as India's Independence Day and urge all Californians to join in celebrating India's independence.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) India's Independence Day is celebrated on August 15 of each year to commemorate its independence. It was celebrated by 400 million Indians in 1947 and today is celebrated by over one billion people living in India and many people living in other parts of the world, including California, which is home to the largest population of Asian Indians in the United States.
- 2) India's Independence Day is one of the most important national holidays in India. The biggest event of the day takes place in Delhi, where the Prime Minister hoists the national flag at the Red Fort, delivers a nationally televised speech that highlights the achievements of the government, discusses current issues and future plans for progress, and pays tribute to the leaders of India's struggle for freedom.
- 3) The local community of people in California who hail from India, or with ancestral ties to India, continually demonstrate the greatness and beauty of their homeland, and their contributions are notable and reflect success in many industries and community activism.
- 4) Ever since August 15, 1947, India's nonviolent struggle for freedom, its rejection of terrorism and extremism, and its belief in democracy, tolerance, and the rule of law have been an inspiration and beacon of hope for people around the world.

This resolution recognizes August 15, 2026, as India's Independence Day and urges all Californians to join in celebrating India's independence.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 100 (Kalra, 2025) – Held on inactive file.

ACR 214 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 170, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 90 (Kalra, Resolution Chapter 154, Statutes of 2023)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/11/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/11/26)

None received

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

8/12/26 14:01:52

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 207
Author: Kalra (D) and Patel (D)
Introduced: 5/18/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 7/2/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: California Hindu American Awareness and Appreciation Month

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution designates the month of October 2026 as California Hindu American Awareness and Appreciation Month. The measure would also recognize and acknowledge the significant contributions made by Californians of Hindu heritage to the state and seek to increase awareness and understanding of the Hindu American community, and would condemn all hate crimes and bias incidents against Hindu Americans, Hindu temples and centers, and places of significance to the Hindu American community.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) California and the nation have been influenced by the extraordinary cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity of its residents.
- 2) The year 2026 marks the 133rd anniversary of when Hinduism was officially introduced to the United States by Swami Vivekananda in 1893 at the World's Parliament of Religions in the City of Chicago, and the 126th anniversary of when he founded the Vedanta Society in the City of San Francisco, California, in 1900.
- 3) Despite their positive contributions to California and this nation, Hindu Americans face stereotypes and misconceptions about their heritage and have been the targets of bullying, discrimination, hate speech, and bias-motivated crimes.

- 4) According to the California vs Hate program within the Civil Rights Department, 23 percent of all religiously motivated hate incidents in the state reported to the hotline were directed at Hindus.

This resolution recognizes and acknowledges the significant contributions made by Californians of Hindu heritage to our state, and by adoption of this resolution, seeks to increase awareness and understanding of the Hindu American community.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 216 (Kalra, Chapter 182, Statutes of 2024)

ACR 91 (Kalra, Chapter 144, Statutes of 2023)

ACR 209 (Kalra, 2022); Died in Senate Rules Committee.

ACR 103 (Kalra, Chapter 8, Statutes of 2022)

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/5/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/5/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 70-0, 7/2/26

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

Prepared by: Destiny Bustos / SFA / (916) 651-4171
8/5/26 15:18:27

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

THIRD READING

Bill No: ACR 211
Author: Celeste Rodriguez (D), et al.
Introduced: 5/21/26
Vote: 21

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-0, 6/4/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Zoot Suit Riots

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This resolution commemorates every June as the annual anniversary of the Zoot Suit Riots.

ANALYSIS: This resolution makes the following legislative findings:

- 1) The Zoot Suit Riots were a series of conflicts that occurred in June 1943 in the City of Los Angeles between United States servicemen and Mexican American youths, the latter of whom wore outfits called zoot suits.
- 2) Pressures related to the United States involvement in World War II contributed to the racial tensions that preceded the riots. As part of the war effort, by March 1942, the United States had begun rationing various resources. Restrictions on wool had a direct effect on the manufacture of wool suits and other clothing. This exacerbated racial tensions, as Mexican American youths wearing the zoot suits were seen as un-American because they were deliberately ignoring the rationing regulations.
- 3) During the period from 1942 through 1943, the news media continued to portray the zoot-suiters as dangerous gang members who were capable of murder. It was in this racially charged atmosphere that the conflict between predominantly White servicemen stationed in southern California and Mexican American youths in the area began.
- 4) The worst of the rioting occurred on the night of June 7, 1943, when thousands of servicemen and citizens prowled the streets of the downtown area of the City

of Los Angeles, attacking zoot-suiters as well as members of minority groups who were not wearing zoot suits.

- 5) The fact that considerably more Mexican Americans than servicemen were arrested, upward of 600 of the former, according to some estimates, fueled criticism of the Los Angeles Police Department's response to the riots from some quarters.

This resolution commemorates every June as the annual anniversary of the Zoot Suit Riots.

Related/Prior Legislation

ACR 84 (Wendy Carillo, 2024) – Held in Senate.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/15/26)

None received

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/15/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 65-0, 6/4/26

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

NO VOTE RECORDED: Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Alvarez, Bains, Castillo, Chen, Flora, Garcia, Mark González, Johnson, McKinnor, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Valencia

Prepared by: Hunter Flynn / SFA / (916) 651-4171
6/15/26 14:57:49

**** END ****

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 ****