



**Board of Directors Meeting
Elise Swanson, Chair
Virtual Meeting
Tuesday, May 4, 2021, 8 :00 AM**

1. Welcome Elise Swanson, Chair
 - a. Roll Call PEAR Strategies
2. Special Guests Featured Guests
 - a. Angie Gilbride: California Water Service (CalWater)
 - b. Maria Camacho: Los Angeles RAMS
3. Government Affairs Report SBACC Staff
 - a. AB 255 (Muratsuchi) COVID-19 Emergency Small Business Eviction and Rent Relief Act
 - b. AB 570 (Santiago) Dependent parent health care coverage
 - c. AB 650 (Muratsuchi) Employer-provided benefits: health care workers: COVID-19: hazard premium pay
 - d. AB 701 (Gonzalez) Warehouse Distribution Centers
 - e. AB 1028 (Seyarto) Telework Flexibility Act
 - f. AB 1251 (Muratsuchi) Local public health orders
 - g. SB 44 (Allen) California Environmental Quality Act: Streamlined Judicial Review- Transit Projects
 - h. SB 314 (Wiener) Bar and Restaurant Recovery Act
 - i. SB 449 (Stern) Climate-related financial risk
 - j. Virtual Sacramento
 - k. Coalitions and Matrix Review
4. Office Holders, Administrative Agencies and Community Partners - Please limit your reports to no more than 3 minutes.
 - a. U.S. Chamber of Commerce - Jennings Imel and Vartan Dijhanian
 - b. League of California Cities - Jeff Kiernan
 - c. Office of County Supervisor Janice Hahn- Jennifer LaMarque
 - d. South Bay Cities Council of Governments – Hon. Olivia Valentine
 - e. Office of Congresswoman Waters- Hamilton Cloud
 - f. Office of Congressman Lieu – Aurelia Friedman
 - g. Office of Senator Allen – Olina Wibroe-Benson

- h. Office of Senator Bradford - Nital Patel
- i. Office of Senator Lena Gonzalez
- j. Office of Assemblymember O'Donnell- Hina Ahmad
- k. Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi – Andrew DeBlock
- l. Office of Assemblymember Gipson- Victor Ibarra
- m. South Bay WIB - Chris Cagle

[Officeholder representatives, non-chamber members, and guests are respectfully asked to leave the meeting at this point]

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 5. Chair's Report | E. Swanson |
| a. Legislative Successes | |
| 6. Approval of Minutes | D. Knoll |
| a. April 2021 | |
| 7. Financial Report | C. Maender, Treasurer |
| a. Profit and Loss | |
| b. Balance Sheet | |
| c. Chamber Members | |
| 8. Adjournment/Announcements | All |
| a. Special thanks to everyone for attending | |
| 9. Upcoming meetings: | |

Next SBACC Meeting is Tuesday, June 1, 2021 at 8:00 am



Board of Directors Meeting

Elise Swanson, Chair

Virtual Meeting

Tuesday, April 6, 2021, 8:00 AM

E. Swanson, P. Donaldson, H. Rogers, K. Hernandez, J. Accamando, D. Hoffman, M. Waroneck, J. Harbeck, M. Hunt, J. Kiernan, S. Josel, B. Graham, G. Kivett, C. Gale, M. Garth, J. Imel, C. Gale, T. Maestro, K. Stroman, O. Valentine. B. Whittenbury, H. Butzen, J. Apodaca, D. Knoll, E. Hupp, D. Duperron, A. Forburger, Senecal, J. Heffernan, D. Leger, M. Hansen, J. Parton, L. Baglietto, M. Harsan, D. Leger, J. Apodaca, H. Butzine, C. Bos, F. Ochoa, P. Senecal, J. Heffernan, J. Parton,

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Welcome | Elise Swanson, Chair |
| a. Roll Call | PEAR Strategies |
| 2. Key Initiatives | Featured Guests |
| 3. Government Affairs Report | PEAR Strategies |
| a. AB 80 (Burke) Taxation: COVID-19 Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act: Federal Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 | |
| i. Motion to Support O. Valentine | |
| ii. 2 nd : D. Hoffman | |
| iii. No: D. Duperron | |
| iv. Abstain: K. Hernandez, E. Hupp | |
| b. AB 225 (Gray, Gallagher, and Patterson) Veterans and Military Spouse Licensure | |
| i. Motion to Support: O. Valentine | |
| ii. 2 nd : D. Knoll | |
| iii. Motion Carries | |
| c. AB 255 (Muratsuchi) Tenancy: commercial leases: COVID-19 rent relief | |
| i. Motion to Support: K. Stroman | |
| ii. 2 nd : M. Hansen | |
| iii. Motion Carries | |
| d. AB 1400 (Santiago) Guaranteed Health Care for All | |
| i. Motion to Oppose: D. Duperron | |
| ii. 2 nd : S. Josel | |
| iii. Motion Carries | |

- e. SB 15 (Portantino) Local Government Incentives to Rezone Idle Retail Sites for Workforce Housing
 - i. Motion to Support: D. Duperron
 - ii. 2nd: S. Josel
 - iii. Abstain- K. Stroman, B. Whittenbury
 - iv. E. Hupp No
- f. SB 44 (Allen) California Environmental Quality Act: Streamlined Judicial Review- Transit Projects
 - i. *Motion to Table*
 - ii. 2nd:
 - iii. Abstain B. Whittenbury
- g. SB 49 (Umberg) Tax Credit for State and Local Fees Paid by Closed Businesses
 - i. Motion to Support- Table and return
 - ii. 2nd:
- h. SB 467 (Wiener) Oil and gas: hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatments, steam flooding, water flooding, or cyclic steaming: prohibition: job relocation
 - i. Motion to Oppose P. Senecal
 - ii. 2nd: D. Hoffman
 - iii. Motion Carries
- i. Coalitions and Matrix Review
- 4. Office Holders, Administrative Agencies and Community Partners - Please limit your reports to no more than 3 minutes.
 - a. U.S. Chamber of Commerce - Jennings Imel and Vartan Dijhanian- April 8 SBA Grants are open.
 - b. League of California Cities - Jeff Kiernan- Reported on the dollars that may come to the South Bay.
 - c. Office of County Supervisor Janice Hahn- Jennifer LaMarque
 - d. South Bay Cities Council of Governments – Hon. Olivia Valentine
 - e. Office of Congresswoman Waters- Hamilton Cloud
 - f. Office of Congressman Lieu – Jennifer Harbeck: introduction and discussed the American Rescue Plan.
 - g. Office of Senator Allen – Olina Wibroe-Benson – SB 285 RE: Tourism
 - h. Office of Senator Bradford - Nital Patel
 - i. Office of Senator Lena Gonzalez
 - j. Office of Assemblymember O’Donnell- Hina Ahmad
 - k. Office of Assemblymember Muratsuchi – Andrew DeBlock
 - l. Office of Assemblymember Gipson- Victor Ibarra
 - m. South Bay WIB - Chris Cagle

[Officeholder representatives, non-chamber members, and guests are respectfully asked to leave the meeting at this point]

- 5. Chair's Report E. Swanson
 - a. Legislative Successes
- 6. Approval of Minutes D. Knoll
 - a. February and March
 - i. Motion to Support: M. Waroneck
 - ii. 2nd: F. Ochoa
- 7. Financial Report C. Maender, Treasurer
 - a. Profit and Loss
 - b. Balance Sheet
 - i. M. Garth
 - ii. H. Butzine
 - iii. Receive and file
 - c. Chamber Members
- 8. Adjournment/Announcements All
 - a. Special thanks to everyone for attending
- 9. Upcoming meetings:

Next SBACC Meeting is Tuesday, May 4, 2021 at 8:00 am

AB 255 (Muratsuch) COVID-19 Emergency Small Business Eviction and Rent Relief Act

Recommended Position

Watch

Background

Existing law provides that a tenant is guilty of unlawful detainer if the tenant continues to possess the property without permission of the landlord in specified circumstances, including when the tenant has violated the lease or rental agreement by defaulting on rent, and requires the tenant be served a 3 days' notice in writing to cure the default, as specified. Existing law provides that an unlawful detainer action is subject to the COVID-19 Tenant Relief Act of 2020, which provides tenants with specified temporary protections from eviction, if the default in the payment of rent is based upon COVID-19 rental debt, as defined.

Summary

This bill would require a landlord, who receives a statement signed by a commercial tenant, as defined, and supported by documentary evidence that evidences that the tenant requests emergency rent relief because the business of the commercial tenant has experienced a decrease in average monthly gross revenue of at least 50%, which is reasonably attributable to public health regulations adopted to address the COVID-19 pandemic, during the qualifying time period, as defined, as compared with the 12 months immediately preceding the qualifying time period, as defined, to conduct a good faith negotiation to form a plan to allow the commercial tenant a reasonable opportunity to repay COVID-19 lease debt while minimizing the hardship to the landlord.

The bill would prohibit, except as provided, a landlord from terminating a lease of a commercial tenant, before the date that is one year from the end of the qualifying period, who paid 25% of the amount due under the lease during the qualifying time period.

Status

Date	Action
04/20/21	Re-referred to Com. on JUD.
04/19/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on JUD. Read second time and amended.
03/26/21	Re-referred to Com. on JUD.
03/25/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on JUD. Read second time and amended.
03/25/21	Referred to Com. on JUD.

Date	Action
01/15/21	From printer. May be heard in committee February 14.
01/14/21	Read first time. To print.

AB 570 (Santiago) Dependent parent health care coverage

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Existing law, the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, provides for the licensure and regulation of health care service plans by the Department of Managed Health Care, and makes a willful violation of the act a crime. Existing law provides for the regulation of health insurers by the Department of Insurance. Existing law authorizes an individual or eligible employee to add a dependent to their health care service plan contract or health insurance policy, including adding a dependent outside of an initial enrollment period if certain criteria are met. Existing law defines “dependent” for these purposes to mean the spouse, registered domestic partner, or child of an individual with an individual contract or policy or an eligible employee with a small employer contract or policy.

Summary

The bill would require a group or individual health insurance policy issued, amended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2022, that provides dependent coverage to make that coverage available to a parent or stepparent who meets the definition of a qualifying relative under Section 152(d) of Title 26 of the United States Code. Notably, the bill indicates if an employer offers dependent coverage, then that employer must accommodate this coverage change.

1. Requires a group or individual health plan contract or health insurance policy issued, amended, or renewed on or after January 1, 2022, that provides dependent coverage to make that coverage available to a parent or stepparent who meets the definition of a qualifying relative under Section 152(d) of Title 26 of the United States Code.
2. Expands the definition of dependent to include parent or stepparent in specified sections of existing law as it relates to small group access to contracts for health care services, non-grandfathered small employer plans or insurance, grandfathered small employer plans or insurance, and individual access to health care coverage.

According to the author, healthcare access for seniors was already an issue pre COVID-19, but now we see an even more urgent need. Prior to COVID- 19, an estimated 3 million Californians did not have healthcare insurance. Now, millions of Californians have lost healthcare coverage due to historic unemployment rates. The author states that this bill will provide health coverage to more Californians by ensuring dependent parents, including undocumented immigrants, are covered. The author concludes that by allowing adult children to add their dependent parents to their healthcare plan, working families will save a significant amount each year on healthcare costs.

Status

Date	Action
03/22/21	Re-referred to Com. on HEALTH.
03/18/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on HEALTH. Read second time and amended.
03/18/21	Referred to Com. on HEALTH.
02/12/21	From printer. May be heard in committee March 14.
02/11/21	Read first time. To print.

Arguments in SUPPORT

California Department of Insurance (CDI) the sponsor of this bill, states that this bill would increase health insurance access and affordability for older adults by enabling individuals to enroll their dependent parent(s) in their health insurance coverage. Currently, in the individual and group markets, children can be added as dependents to their parents' health insurance coverage. But this protection does not extend to dependent parents. Under existing law today, dependent parents of adult children are not allowed to be included in the same health insurance policy, resulting in the purchase of separate policies with separate deductibles and maximum out-of-pocket limits for the adult child and their dependent parents. According to CDI, allowing dependent parents of adult children to be covered in the same health insurance policy would reduce overall health care costs for the family by pooling these costs and making coverage more affordable, especially during this COVID-19 pandemic. It also represents a measure of equity among different types of dependent individuals for purposes of health insurance.

Families that obtain coverage under a single health insurance policy or certificate enjoy the economic protection of a combined family maximum out-of-pocket (MOOP) cost limit. This means that their medical expenses are aggregated towards a maximum amount, rather than each family member having to meet a separate MOOP. In addition, families typically have a combined family deductible, rather than a single deductible that each family member must meet.

Requiring health insurance companies to offer dependent coverage to older adults would allow families with dependent parents to include those parents on their health insurance policy. This will, in turn, enable the family to utilize a family deductible and cap their maximum out-of-pocket costs, thus reducing overall health care costs for working families and make it more likely that the dependent parents will be covered. This solution would not be based on an age requirement for the dependent parent but, rather, that the parent meets the federal definition of being a "qualifying relative." CDI writes that as California works to improve the health and

well-being of older adults, this bill will continue this effort by providing increased health coverage access.

Health Access California states that this bill will provide increased financial security for many older Californians by helping to bridge the gap for those who do not qualify for Medi-Cal. The unprecedented job loss associated with the COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the need to ensure affordable coverage options for those who lose employer sponsored insurance. The California Pan-Ethnic Health Network writes that even despite the ACA, communities of color are most likely to be uninsured. This is especially true for adults who are undocumented, who are excluded from Medi-Cal. This bill would give adults a much-needed tool to ensure their dependent parent(s) have health insurance especially at a time when their health needs change and increase.

Arguments in OPPOSITION

The California Chamber of Commerce (CCC), along with other organizations, write that it is anticipated this bill will cause health care costs to increase. Employer group health plans are already difficult for employers to afford. Typically, employer plans, particularly in the small group market, include employers that contribute an apportioned payment towards dependent premiums in addition to employee premium contributions. This bill would introduce older and higher premium dependents to already strained employer budgets and potentially discourage any dependent contributions or encourage lower contributions to all dependents. This is not a trend that should be encouraged as it could lead to more uncovered Californians.

Additionally, this bill must be considered in context as state lawmakers have introduced at least 14 benefit mandate bills this year that could increase premiums for employers and enrollees. According to the California Health Care Foundation, 18 million of 32.7 million insured Californians had health care coverage through an employer sponsored health plan in 2019. The average premium for family coverage has increased 22% over the last five years and 55% over the last 10 years. Since 2002, premiums for the average family health plan in the employer market have increased 133%. The 2020 Kaiser Family Foundation Employer Health Benefits Survey indicated that, for job-based coverage, the average annual premium for single coverage rose 4%, to \$7,470. The average annual premium for family coverage also rose 4%, to \$21,342, which is nearly one-third of the state's median family income. According to the CCC, California should not increase costs of health care coverage for employers and employees with another mandate.

Support

California Department of Insurance
(sponsor)

California Access Coalition
California Pan - Ethnic Health Network

Estrategia LLC
Health Access California
Justice in Aging
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

Opposition

California Chamber of Commerce
Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce

Corona Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce

Gilroy Chamber of Commerce
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce

National Federation of Independent
Business

North Orange County Chamber
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce

Southwest California Legislative Council

Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce

Tulare Chamber of Commerce

AB 650 (Muratsuchi) Employer-provided benefits: health care workers: COVID-19: hazard pay retention bonuses

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Existing law, the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014, requires employers to provide an employee, who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment, with paid sick days for prescribed purposes, to be accrued at a rate of no less than one hour for every 30 hours worked. Existing law authorizes an employer to limit an employee's use of paid sick days to 24 hours or 3 days in each year of employment. Existing law charges the Labor Commissioner, who is the Chief of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, with enforcement of various labor laws.

Summary

Imposes at least an estimated \$6 billion in direct payroll costs on healthcare providers through mandatory bonuses retroactive to January 1, 2021, which will jeopardize access to affordable healthcare due to the billions of dollars the healthcare industry has lost during the pandemic. Prohibits healthcare providers from reducing staff even if they are unable to afford to continue to pay those bonuses.

The bill would mandate extra pay for some health care workers, while excluding millions of other essential workers. This arbitrary mandate is inequitable for both workers and health care providers. The measure would impose billions of dollars in unfunded new costs on health care providers, many already financially reeling from the pandemic, and would jeopardize access to care at the worst possible time.

Health care workers are indeed heroes, serving our communities valiantly during the COVID-19 pandemic. That's why community clinics, hospitals, physician offices, and other providers have gone to great lengths and spent hundreds of millions of dollars to support and reward health care workers during the pandemic, while also making significant investments in safety equipment and protocols.

AB 650 singles out private hospitals, district hospitals, clinics, physicians' offices, surgery centers, and other providers for the extra pay mandate, but arbitrarily **EXCLUDES** tens of thousands of workers at county hospitals and clinics, University of California (UC) hospitals, as well as smaller clinics, physicians' offices, and health care providers with fewer than 100 employees.

Status

Date	Action
04/13/21	Re-referred to Com. on L. & E.
04/12/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on L. & E. Read second time and amended.
03/26/21	Re-referred to Com. on L. & E.
03/25/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on L. & E. Read second time and amended.
03/25/21	Referred to Com. on L. & E.
02/13/21	From printer. May be heard in committee March 15.
02/12/21	Read first time. To print.

Arguments in Support

SEIU California, sponsor of the bill, states, "AB 650 is necessary to help retain skilled and experienced health care workers in California. Even before the pandemic, California needed to expand its health care workforce as the aging population increases demand for health care services. Seven million Californian, the majority of them Latino, African American and Native American, already live in Health professional shortage areas.

Now many health care workers are reaching a breaking point and considering leaving the profession altogether, which will exacerbate access to care issues in our most vulnerable communities.

Health care worker turnover comes with high costs to train and replace workers and also jeopardizes patient care. One recent study found that high worker turnover at nursing homes contributed to the spread of COVID-19 by weakening infection control practices.

This is a critical time to incentivize health care workers to remain and to demonstrate to future health care workers that they will be supported during difficult public health crises."

Arguments in Opposition

The California Association for Health Services at Home argues in opposition, "While we have the deepest respect and appreciation for health care workers amid this pandemic, home health and hospice agencies which fall within the definition of provider in this bill are more financially challenged than ever before to care for patients in the home. For many months, hospital discharges to home health were at an all-time low due to the Department of Public Health's orders to cease non-essential surgeries. The bulk of home health patients come from

rehabilitative surgeries such as knee and hip replacements. Highly conservative estimates put the cost of this mandated bonus at more than \$6 billion statewide. Paying for this additional expense will drive the cost of care up at a time when many patients are financially struggling and are on fixed incomes. It is critical that those who need care can remain safely at home especially at a time when outbreaks of COVID are still threatening nursing homes and other congregate living settings. There is never a time when home care services should be priced out of the reach of those who need it most!”

Supported

California State Council of Service
Employees International Union (Sponsor)
3 - Individuals
Alameda County Democratic Central
Committee
California Labor Federation
California League of United Latin American
Citizens
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Central Coast Labor Council
Engineers and Scientists of California
IFPTE Local 20
Fresno County Young Democrats

Fresno State College Democrats
Hayes Neighborhood
Health Care Workers
Indivisible Stanislaus
North Bay Jobs With Justice
North Bay Labor Council
North Valley Labor Federation
OPEIU Local 30
Organize Sacramento
San Francisco Young Democrats
San Mateo Labor Council
South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council
Staff Workers United 2599

Oppose

Adventist Health
Adventist Health White Memorial
Alhambra Hospital Medical Center
America's Physician Groups
Assisted Home Health, Hospice
Association of California Healthcare Districts
(ACHD)
At Home Nursing Care
Banner Lassen Medical Center
Barton Health
Beverly Community Hospital Association
Dba Beverly Hospital
California Assisted Living Association
California Association for Health Services At
Home
California Association of Health Facilities
California Association of Medical Product
Suppliers
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce

California Children's Hospital Association
California Dialysis Council
California Hospital Association
California Hospital Association/california
Association of Hospitals and Health Systems
California Medical Association
California Opioid Maintenance Providers
(COMP)
California Radiological Society
California Society of Pathologists
California Taxpayer Protection Committee
California Taxpayers Association (CALTAX)
California Urological Association
Canyon Ridge Hospital
Cedars Sinai
Central California Partnership for Health
Coast Plaza Hospital
Community Hospital of Huntington Park
Community Medical Centers
Corona Regional Medical Center

Del Amo Behavioral Health System of
Southern California
Developmental Services Network
District Hospital Leadership Forum
Eastern Plumas Health Care
Fairchild Medical Center
Fremont Hospital
Good Samaritan Hospital of Bakersfield
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital
AB 650
Page 5
Heritage Oaks Hospital
Hospice East Bay
Huntington Hospital
Jerold Phelps Community Hospital John C
Fremont Healthcare District John Muir
Health
Kindred Healthcare
Kindred Hospital San Francisco Bay Area
Kindred Hospitals - California
LA Downtown Medical Center
Leadingage California
Los Robles Health System
Mammoth Hospital
Marshall Medical Center
Mayers Memorial Hospital District
Memorial Hospital of Gardena
Memorialcare
Methodist Hospital of Southern California
Mission Healthcare
Modoc Medical Center
Monterey Park Hospital

Mountain Communities Healthcare District
Northbay Healthcare
Numerous Individuals
Orange County Business Council
Orchard Hospital
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Grove Hospital
Palmdale Regional Medical Center
Palo Verde Hospital
Parkview Community Hospital Medical
Center Pih Health
Pioneers Memorial Healthcare District
Placer County Taxpayers Association
Plumas District Hospital
Prime Healthcare
Providence Health Systems
Redlands Community Hospital
Regional Medical Center
Ridgecrest Regional Hospital
Riverside Community Hospital
Scripps Health
Seneca Healthcare District
Sharp Healthcare
Shasta Regional Medical Center
Sierra Vista Hospital
Stanford Health Care
Surprise Valley Health Care District
Tahoe Forest Health System
Temecula Valley Hospital
Tenet Healthcare Corporation
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Trinity Hospital
United Hospital Association
Valley Presbyterian Hospital
West Hills Hospital & Medical Center

AB 701 (Gonzalez) Warehouse Distribution Centers

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Under existing law, the California Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1973, the Division of Occupational Safety and Health investigates complaints that a workplace is not safe and may issue orders necessary to ensure employee safety. Under existing law, certain violations of that act or a standard, order, or special order authorized by the act are a crime.

Summary

Increased Cost and Unworkable Burdens on Warehouse Distribution Centers. Imposes unworkable disclosure requirements on warehouse distribution centers related to employee productivity and grants expansive authority to the State of California to dictate the operations and performance standards of employees at warehouse distribution centers.

This bill would require employers to provide to each employee, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject, including the quantified number of tasks to be performed, or materials to be produced or handled, within the defined time period, and any potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota. 701 would require, if the quota or the adverse consequences for failure to meet the quota have changed, the employer to provide the employee with a revised written description. The bill would prohibit an employer from taking adverse action against an employee for failure to meet a quota that has not been disclosed or for failure to meet a quota that does not allow a worker to comply with health and safety laws.

AB 701 starts with a false premise – that workplace performance metrics are inherently unsafe and correlated with workplace injuries. Productivity metrics are generally set based on past performance of employees in the aggregate, not an arbitrary, impossible standard set by the employer.

AB 701 applies beyond just the logistics industry into agriculture, retail, and other sectors where goods must be sorted and transported. The bill defines “warehouse distribution center[s]” using the following **North American Industry Classification System (NAICS)** codes:

- (1) 493110 for General Warehousing and Storage.
- (2) 423 for Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods.
- (3) 424 for Merchant Wholesalers, Nondurable Goods.
- (4) 454110 for Electronic Shopping and Mail-Order Houses.

Status

Date	Action
04/13/21	Re-referred to Com. on L. & E.
04/12/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on L. & E. Read second time and amended.
02/25/21	Referred to Com. on L. & E.
02/17/21	From printer. May be heard in committee March 19.
02/16/21	Read first time. To print.

Arguments in Support

The Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, co-sponsors of this bill, argue that “Warehouse workers come from communities hit hardest by COVID-19 and economic downturn. These backbreaking conditions have significant implications for our communities of color with warehouse workers in California being 54% Latino and 9.5% Black. These communities are already struggling with lack of access to healthcare, inability to quarantine, and disproportionate illness and death from COVID-19. Many workers see no other job options and feel they must accept unsafe conditions to keep a roof over their heads. California must demand better from these companies. The biggest employers impact conditions across the industry. Right now, competition among companies like Amazon and Walmart is driving down workplace safety across the logistics industry. If we raise standards at the biggest companies, we can create good jobs throughout the industry, particularly in the communities that need them most.”

Arguments in Opposition

A coalition of employer organizations, including the California Chamber of Commerce, argue in opposition that “[This bill] will create a new private right of action based on vague standards, increase PAGA litigation, create a never-ending presumption of retaliation, and is based on fundamental misunderstandings of performance metrics. Indeed, most jobs, across all industries, have some type of performance or production measurement to assist the employer in meeting the goals and obligations of the business to customers and business partners. There is nothing inherently nefarious about the use of such performance measures, in logistics or any other industry. [This bill’s] disclosure requirements are logistically infeasible for many warehouse operations. In the warehouse context, employees are generally paid on an hourly basis. Performance measures establish planning goals to meet the requirements of the work that needs to be performed. Some workers may have individualized metrics they try to achieve, some may have metrics assigned to their entire team or their shift, or some may have no metrics at all. The variety here is considerable – making a one-size-fits-all notice requirement infeasible.”

Support

California Employment Lawyers Association
California IATSE Council
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Labor Federation
California Rural Legal Assistance
Foundation, INC.
California State Council of Service
Employees International Union
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
(CoSponsor)
California Work & Family Coalition
Center for Workers' Rights
Center on Policy Initiatives
Central Coast Alliance United for A
Sustainable Economy
Centro Legal De LA Raza
Clean Carwash Campaign

Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
Communities for A Better Environment
Courage California
CPI
Democratic Socialists of America - Los
Angeles
Entertainment Union Coalition
Garment Worker Center
IATSE Local 80
Jobs to Move America
KIWA (Koreatown Immigrant Workers
Alliance)
LAANE (Los Angeles Alliance for A New
Economy)
Los Angeles County Federation of Labor
(CoSponsor)
National Employment Law Project

Oppose

Auto Care Association
California Beer and Beverage Distributors
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Farm Bureau
California Framing Contractors Association
California Grocers Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology
Association California Retailers Association

California Trucking Association
Cawa - Representing the Automotive Parts
Industry
Civil Justice Association of California
International Council of Shopping Centers
International Warehouse Logistics
Association
Naiop, the Commercial Real Estate
Development Association
Western Growers Association

AB 1028 (Seyarto) Telework Flexibility Act

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law, with various exceptions, generally establishes 8 hours as a day's work and a 40-hour workweek and requires the payment of prescribed overtime compensation for additional hours worked. The law regulates the wages, hours, and working conditions of any worker employed in any occupation, trade, or industry, whether compensation is measured by time, piece, or otherwise, except as specified.

Summary

Telecommuting: flexibility. Allows employee who is telecommuting the flexibility to choose their own schedule, choose when they take meal and rest breaks, and would eliminate the financial penalty against employers for providing that flexibility as well as PAGA penalties in certain circumstances.

AB 1028 seeks to benefit both employees and employers by providing more flexibility to employees and reducing the threat of litigation to an employer. AB 1028 would:

- Allow telecommuting employees to enter into an agreement with their employer to waive daily overtime up to 10 hours as well as split shift premiums so they can have more flexible work schedules
- Allow telecommuting employees to take meal and rest breaks at any time of the day where an employer has not otherwise set a meal or rest break schedule for the employee
- Encourage employers to offer employees the choice to take breaks at any time by temporarily prohibiting telecommuting employees from seeking PAGA penalties in a lawsuit about meal or rest breaks

Promoting flexible policies that allow employees to continue to be employed and earning income while working from home is needed now more than ever and is strongly supported by California voters.

Status

Date	Action
03/04/21	Referred to Coms. on L. & E. and JUD.
02/19/21	From printer. May be heard in committee March 21.
02/18/21	Read first time. To print.

AB 1251 (Muratsuchi) Local public health orders

Recommended Position

Support

Background

Existing law, the California Emergency Services Act (CESA), among other things, authorizes the Governor to proclaim a state of emergency in an area affected or likely to be affected. The CESA also authorizes the governing body of any city, county, or city and county, or an official designated by ordinance adopted by that governing body, to proclaim a local emergency, as provided. Existing law authorizes local health officials to take any preventative measures that may be necessary to protect and preserve the public health from any public health hazard during any state of emergency or local emergency.

Summary

Requires a public health order issued by the County of Los Angeles (LAC) local health officer (LHO) due to the COVID-19 pandemic to be based on data for each respective service planning area (SPA) and not on data for the entire LAC. Requires an order issued under this bill to include the data for each respective SPA upon which the order is based.

Defines a SPA to mean the subdivided areas of LAC intended to facilitate and improve local service and health care planning, as defined. Makes these provisions operative until the termination of the state of emergency proclaimed by the Governor on March 4, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. Finds and declares that to achieve the goals of developing and providing more relevant and data-based public health services during a statewide or local public health emergency, the LAC Department of Public Health public health orders, and the enforcement of these orders, must be based on data for each public health SPA and not on countywide data.

According to the author, LAC, with nearly 10 million residents in 2020, is comparable to the geographic size of the States of Delaware and Rhode Island combined, is the largest county in the United States in terms of population. To achieve the goals of developing and providing more relevant and data-base public health and clinical services, this bill would require the State of California, DPH, and counties to adopt public health orders, regulations, and guidelines, and the enforcement of such, to be based not on countywide data, but on data for public health SPAs.

Status

Date	Action
04/13/21	In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

Date	Action
04/06/21	Re-referred to Com. on HEALTH.
04/05/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on HEALTH. Read second time and amended.
03/22/21	Re-referred to Com. on HEALTH.
03/18/21	From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on HEALTH. Read second time and amended.
03/18/21	Referred to Coms. on HEALTH and E.M.
02/22/21	Read first time.
02/20/21	From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.
02/19/21	Introduced. To print.

OPPOSITION.

The Health Officers Association of California (HOAC) and the County Health Executives Association of California (CHEAC) are opposed to this bill and state they recognize the bill’s goal to base public health practice on the best available data. However, viruses do not recognize planning area borders. Individuals often live in one area and work in another. For example, a person may contract SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, from an infected person at their place of work in Rancho Palos Verdes - but for data purposes, they will be recorded as a case in their city of residence in Lynwood.

Another individual may attend church in Santa Monica and pass the virus to others there if proper precautions are not taken - even though they are officially recorded as a case in their city of residence in West Hollywood. HOAC and CHEAC further state that when it comes to non-pharmaceutical interventions such as physical distancing and capacity limits, the local health jurisdiction – in this case, the county – is the appropriate level of action. This is especially true for COVID-19, which can be spread by individuals who do not show symptoms and do not know that they are infectious. They conclude that the risk of spread of this novel virus increases if protective measures are not widely in place across the local health jurisdiction.

Support

None on file

Opposition

Health Officers Association of California
County Executives Association of California

SB 44 (Allen) California Environmental Quality Act: streamlined judicial review: environmental leadership transit projects

Recommended Position

Support

Background

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA establishes a procedure by which a person may seek judicial review of the decision of the lead agency made pursuant to CEQA.

Summary

For a handful of major projects that meet certain environmental standards, existing law provides for accelerated CEQA review and requires courts, to the extent feasible, to resolve judicial challenges arising from that process within 270 days of the filing of the administrative record. These provisions are intended to expedite beneficial development but entail potential tradeoffs with respect to the sufficiency of environmental review, the burden on courts, and access to justice for other litigants, a concern magnified by the judicial backlog arising from the COVID-19 pandemic.

This bill provides for expedited CEQA administrative and 270-day judicial review, including all appeals, for certain transit projects proposed by a public or private entity that meet specified environmental standards and comply with specified project-labor provisions. The bill is sponsored by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and supported by local governments, transit agencies, and labor organizations. The bill is opposed by the Judicial Council of California and Western Electrical Contractors Association (WECA). The Senate Environmental Quality Committee passed the bill by a vote of 7-0.

SB 44 provides expedited CEQA judicial review for mass transit projects only if they meet certain conditions, including:

- consistency with a region's sustainable communities' strategy and transportation plan;
- zero-emission operation of the transit project itself.
- direct reduction of greenhouse gases emissions, without using offsets;

AND

- reduction through the project of vehicle miles traveled in the corridor in which it operates.

Status

Date	Action
04/14/21	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 9. Noes 0.) (April 13). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/05/21	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on JUD.
03/25/21	Set for hearing April 13.
03/16/21	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on JUD. (Ayes 7. Noes 0.) (March 15). Re-referred to Com. on JUD.
03/03/21	Set for hearing March 15.
03/01/21	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on E.Q.
01/28/21	Referred to Coms. on EQ. and JUD.
12/08/20	From printer. May be acted upon on or after January 7.
12/07/20	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

SUPPORT

Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority (sponsor)
Bay Area Council
California State Association of Electrical
Workers,
California State Pipe Trades Council
California Transit Association
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban
Research Association
San Mateo County Transit District
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Solano Transportation Authority
Southern California Association of
Governments
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
Western States Council of Sheet Metal
Workers

OPPOSITION

Judicial Council of California
Western Electrical Contractors Association

SB 314 (Wiener) Alcoholic beverages

Recommended Position

Support

Background

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Act contains various provisions regulating the application for, the issuance of, the suspension of, and the conditions imposed upon alcoholic beverage licenses by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. Existing law generally provides that a violation of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is a misdemeanor.

Existing law authorizes the issuance of a caterer's permit, upon application to the department, to a licensee under an on-sale general license, an on-sale beer and wine license, a club license, or a veterans' club license, that authorizes the holder of the permit to sell alcoholic beverages at specified locations and events, including, among others, conventions, sporting events, and trade exhibits.

Summary

This bill authorizes the Department of Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) to, for 365 days from the date the Covid-19 state of emergency is lifted, allow licensees to continue to exercise license privileges in an expanded licensed area authorized pursuant to a Covid-19 temporary catering permit, as provided. In addition, the bill allows a licensed manufacturer to share a common licensed area with multiple licensed retailers, as specified. Further, the bill extends from 30 to 90 days by which a licensee must apply to the Department of ABC for specified event which permits specified licensees to provide their own alcohol free of charge at an invitation only event. Finally, the bill increases the number of times, from 24 to 52 in a calendar year, that the Department of ABC can issue a caterer's permit for use at any one location.

According to the author's office, "SB 314 will help California's events, restaurants, and bars recover economically from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic by creating more flexibility in how they can serve alcohol, including where they can serve alcohol, how they can share spaces with other businesses, and how frequently a catering permit can be used. The bill also implements a one-year grace period after the emergency order is lifted for businesses to continue expanded outdoor dining operations on their premises that locals have enjoyed throughout the pandemic. Combined with other critical measures, SB 314 will help the hospitality industry bounce back from the devastating impacts of the pandemic, enacting common sense reforms, restructuring outdated laws, and allowing businesses more opportunities to recover. These businesses make up a huge part of the fabric of our communities, and employ so many of our neighbors, so we must do everything in our power to ensure a quick recovery."

Status

Date	Action
04/20/21	From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 15. Noes 0.) (April 20). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.
04/15/21	Set for hearing April 20.
04/13/21	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on G.O.
02/22/21	Joint Rule 55 suspended. (Ayes 32. Noes 4. Page 272.)
02/22/21	(Ayes 32. Noes 4.)
02/22/21	Art. IV. Sec. 8(a) of the Constitution dispensed with.
02/17/21	Referred to Com. on G.O.
02/05/21	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 7.
02/04/21	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the City and County of San Francisco, “with indoor service severely limited to-date, outdoor dining on sidewalks and in curb lanes has been critical to the survival of San Francisco’s restaurants and bars over the past year. Even with the prospect of full indoor reopening in the near future, outdoor service will continue to play a vital role in helping these businesses pay off outstanding rent and other debts accrued during the pandemic. SB 314 is a critical piece of legislation that will directly respond to the immediate challenges facing San Francisco’s nightlife sector. The ability to continue serving alcohol in outdoor areas is vital to the industry’s survival. The bill’s catering reforms will help businesses statewide employ creativity to generate additional revenue during our economic recovery and in the years beyond.”

According to the California Travel association, “when the dust settles after the pandemic, many of our local businesses will be one step away from bankruptcy, and easing these restrictions will be critical to their success after the pandemic and beyond. California must ensure that our small restaurants and bars can remain open to the public for years to come by creating new and flexible ways to own and operate a business within the hospitality industry. We cannot continue weighing down our small businesses with unnecessary and outdated regulations that do not serve the public. SB 314 will act as a lifeline for many small businesses as we move out of the strict stay-at-home orders.”

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Alcohol Policy Alliance is opposed to SB 314, “because it is another over-reaching grab bag of disparate issues opportunistically promoted by

the alcohol industry. It is nothing more than a dangerous deregulation for the sake of corporate profits yet masquerading as phony [Covid-19] emergency management.”

SB 449 (Stern) Climate-related financial risk

Recommended Position

Oppose

Background

Existing law generally provides for the regulation of various financial institutions, including banks, credit unions, and finance lenders, by the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation. Existing law requires the Secretary for Environmental Protection to coordinate greenhouse gas emission reductions and climate-change activities in state government. Executive Order N-19-19 requires, among other things, the Department of Finance to create a Climate Investment Framework and to consult with the Office of Planning and Research on the framework.

Summary

Requires financial institutions to disclose and limit investments in assets that generate greenhouse gases. That includes any products in the supply chain.

Requires specified businesses formed or licensed in California with annual revenue of at least \$500 million to prepare and publish an annual climate-related financial risk report, as specified. Requires the Climate-Related Risk Disclosure Advisory Group established pursuant to Executive Order N-19-19 to analyze the reports and provide policy recommendations.

Requires covered entities with to prepare an annual climate-related financial risk report that includes identifying measures adopted to reduce and adapt to those risks. The report must be submitted to the Secretary of State (SOS) and made available to the public on the covered entity's own internet website.

There is a very real risk that compliance with **SB 449** will not align with federal regulations. Given the global nature of climate change, every effort should be made to assess and mitigate climate risks nationally. To impose state requirements lessens the overall effectiveness and leads to a patchwork of disjointed mandates producing confusing, contradicting and misleading information not to mention duplicative, redundant or contradicting reporting requirements at many levels.

The definition of "climate-related risk" is far too broad and potentially includes transactions beyond "investments" and the extension of credit. It appears to reach beyond lending and investments into concentrations in deposits and even physical storefront locations. In our view, the definition includes a whole panoply of industries operating in a wide range of businesses such as automobile dealers, manufacturing operations, agricultural businesses, utilities, recreation, transportation, retailers, commercial developments, hospitality venues, etc.

The costs of compliance would likely be huge, and not just in terms of time, effort, and expense for the covered entities but also the potential negative unintended consequences such as limiting financial institutions ability to make loans available to customers, for businesses to invest in research and development, upgrading facilities, training, infrastructure renewal, or expansion opportunities.

One of the key concerns is whether the bill would directly or indirectly insert factors other than the specific credit circumstances of the borrower or the borrower’s ability to pay into the credit making decision. We would argue this could have a very negative impact on California consumers and on affordable housing and open licensees to negative reactions from our regulators. There is real concern the bill could promote a new kind of “redlining” based on climate dictated factors such as only making loans on homes or developments that have solar panels installed. This is expensive and would disenfranchise an entire set of homeowners who cannot afford to install solar panels on their homes as a requirement of a refinance. The negative results of the past decade’s legislative effort to promote PACE financing and the subsequent need to enact additional protections to combat predatory bad actors, demonstrates the need to think through the problem carefully before acting.

Status

Date	Action
04/22/21	Set for hearing April 29.
04/22/21	Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on E.Q.
04/21/21	From committee: Do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on E.Q. (Ayes 6. Noes 2.) (April 21).
04/13/21	From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on B. & F.I.
04/06/21	Set for hearing April 21.
04/01/21	April 7 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author.
03/04/21	Set for hearing April 7.
02/25/21	Referred to Coms. on B. & F.I. and E.Q.
02/22/21	Joint Rule 55 suspended. (Ayes 32. Noes 4. Page 272.)
02/22/21	(Ayes 32. Noes 4.)
02/22/21	Art. IV. Sec. 8(a) of the Constitution dispensed with.

Date	Action
02/17/21	From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 19.
02/16/21	Introduced. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. To print.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT

The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) writes as sponsor of the bill:

California’s economy is increasingly vulnerable to the effects of climate change; from sea level rise impacting the coast, ongoing droughts affecting agriculture, fishing and critical ecosystems, and wildfires devastating entire communities. However, the financial and economic risks of climate change are not widely disclosed or evaluated to inform responsible investing and lending.

Federal requirements could still be years away, and will not encompass the range of entities covered by SB 449, state-chartered banks, other state licensed financial institutions, and insurance companies which are not publicly traded. California

has an important opportunity to lead and set the standard for assessing climate-

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION

A coalition of financial services companies and the California Chamber of Commerce write in opposition:

The measure is premature given the amount of activity happening at the federal and international levels. Both the executive and legislative branches have served notice that changes will be happening soon. The Securities and Exchange Commission is already reviewing their guidance documents on the topic. There is a very real risk that compliance with SB 449 will not align with federal guidance. Given the global nature of climate change, every effort should be made to assess and mitigate climate risks nationally. To impose state requirements lessens the overall effectiveness and leads to a patchwork of disjointed mandates producing confusing, contradicting and misleading information not to mention duplicative, redundant and contradicting reporting requirements at many levels.

Support

1000 Grandmothers for Future Generations
 350 Butte County
 350 Conejo / San Fernando Valley
 350 Hawaii
 350 New Orleans
 350 PDX (Portland, OR)
 350 Sacramento

350 Seattle
 350 Silicon Valley
 350 South Bay Los Angeles
 350 Ventura County Climate Hub
 Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet
 Alameda County Interfaith Climate Action
 Network California Coalition for Clean

Water & Reliability California League of Conservation Voters
California Water Research
Carbon Accountable
Ceres
Civic Sundays
Climate First: Replacing Oil & Gas (CFROG)
Climate Protection and Recovery Fund
Conejo Climate Coalition
Divest NJ Coalition (New Jersey)
E2 (Environmental Entrepreneurs)
East Valley Indivisibles

Indivisible Alta Pasadena
Indivisible CA Statestrong
Indivisible California Green Team
Indivisible Conejo
Indivisible Sacramento
Indivisible SanJose
Indivisible SanPedro
Indivisible Ventura
Lutheran Office of Public Policy
California Mendocino Women's Political Coalition
Mothers Out Front California
Natural Resources Defense Council
New Mexico Climate Justice

Elders Climate Action,
Norcal and Socal Chapters Environmental Defense Fund, Incorporated
Extinction Rebellion SF Bay
Feel the Bern San Fernando Valley
Democratic Club
Feminists in Action (formerly Indivisible CA 34 Womens)
Fossil Free California
Friends of Public Banking - Santa Rosa
Friends of The Climate Action Plan
Glendale Environmental Coalition

Peninsula Interfaith Climate Action
San Francisco Bay Physicians for Social Responsibility
San Jose Community Energy Advocates
Santa Barbara County Action Network
Sierra Club California
Socal350
Climate Action Solidarity INFO Service
Stand.earth
The Climate Center
TIAA Divest! From Climate Destruction
Together We Will - San Jose
55 Individuals

Opposition

California Association of Realtors
California Bankers Association
California Building Industry Association (CBIA) California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Credit Union League
California Mortgage Association
California Mortgage Bankers Association Western States Petroleum Association

SBACC Bill Matrix				
Measure	Coalition	Summary	Status / Location	Position
AB 61 Gabriel D		<p>Business pandemic relief. Would authorize the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to issue a third-party delivery license to a third-party delivery service for delivery to a consumer of alcoholic beverages from a restaurant licensed under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. The bill would require delivery by a third-party delivery licensee to be consistent with deliveries by licensees who are permitted by license privileges or by regulatory relief adopted by the department to sell off sale and deliver those alcoholic beverages to consumers. Because the violation of a provision of a license is punishable as a misdemeanor and the bill would create a new category of license, the bill would expand the definition of a crime, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program. (Amended: 4/14/2021 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 4/29/2021-From committee: Amend, and do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 15. Noes 0.) (April 27). Hearing: 5/3/2021 #17 ASS EMBLY SECOND READING FILE -- ASSEMBLY BILLS Location: 4/27/2021-A. APP R.</p>	Support
AB 62 Gray D		<p>Income taxes: credits: costs to comply with COVID-19 regulations. The Personal Income Tax Law and the Corporation Tax Law allow various credits against the taxes imposed by those laws. This bill would allow a credit against those taxes for each taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2021, to a qualified taxpayer, as defined, in an amount equal to the total amount paid or incurred during the taxable year by the qualified taxpayer to comply with the regulations adopted by the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board on November 19, 2020, relating to COVID-19 prevention and approved by the Office of Administrative Law. The bill also would state the intent of the Legislature to comply with the additional information requirement for any bill authorizing a new income tax credit. (Introduced: 12/7/2020 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 3/22/2021-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee. Location: 1/11/2021-A. REV . & TAX</p>	Support
AB 71 Rivas. Luz D		<p>Homelessness funding: Bring California Home Act. Would exempt any regulation, standard, criterion, procedure, determination, rule, notice, or guideline established or issued by the Franchise Tax Board to implement its provisions from the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. (Amended: 3/25/2021 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 4/29/2021-VOTE: Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on [Appropriations] (PASS) Location: 4/29/2021-A. APP R.</p>	Oppose
AB 80 Burke D		<p>Taxation: Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act: Federal Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021. Would exclude, for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 2019, from gross income any advance grant amount, as defined, issued pursuant to specified provisions of the CARES Act or the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, and covered loan amounts forgiven pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021. (Chaptered: 4/29/2021 html pdf)</p>	<p>Status: 4/29/2021-Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 17, Statutes of 2021. Location: 4/29/2021-A. CH APTERED</p>	Support
AB 84 Committee on Budget	Yes	<p>Employment: rehiring and retention: displaced workers. Would, until December 31, 2024, require an employer, as defined, to offer its laid-off employees specified information about job positions that become available for which the laid-off employees are qualified, and to offer positions to those laid-off employees based on a preference system, in accordance with specified timelines and procedures. The bill would define the term "laid-off employee" to mean any employee who was employed by the employer for 6 months or more in the 12 months preceding January 1, 2020, and whose most recent separation from active service was due to a reason related to the COVID-19 pandemic, ncluding a public health directive, government shutdown order, lack of</p>	<p>Status: 4/12/2021-From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 13. Noes 3.) (April 12). Hearing: 5/3/2021 #65 SEN ATE ASSEMBLY BILLS - THIRD READING FILE Location: 4/7/2021-S. THIR D READING</p>	Oppose

		business, a reduction in force, or other economic, nondisciplinary reason related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill would require an employer to keep records for 3 years, including records of communications regarding the offers. (Amended: 4/8/2021 html pdf)		
AB 95 Low D	Yes	Employees: bereavement leave. Would enact the Bereavement Leave Act of 2021. The bill would require an employer with 25 or more employees to grant a request made by any employee to take up to 10 business days of unpaid bereavement leave upon the death of a spouse, child, parent, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, or domestic partner, in accordance with certain procedures, and subject to certain exclusions. The bill would require an employer with fewer than 25 employees to grant a request by any employee to take up to 3 business days of leave, in accordance with these provisions. The bill would prohibit an employer from interfering with or restraining the exercise or attempt to exercise the employee’s right to take this leave. (Amended: 3/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/21/2021-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to suspense file. Location: 4/21/2021-A. APP R. SUSPENSE FILE	Oppose
AB 96 O'Donnell D		California Clean Truck, Bus, and Off-Road Vehicle and Equipment Technology Program. The California Clean Truck, Bus, and Off-Road Vehicle and Equipment Technology Program, upon appropriation from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, funds zero- and near-zero-emission truck, bus, and off-road vehicle and equipment technologies and related projects. The program provides that projects eligible for funding include, among others, technology development, demonstration, precommercial pilots, and early commercial deployments of zero- and near-zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty truck technology, and requires, until December 31, 2021, no less than 20% of funding made available for that purpose to support early commercial deployment of existing zero- and near-zero-emission heavy-duty truck technology. The program defines “zero- and near-zero-emission” for its purposes. This bill would extend the requirement that 20% of funding be made available to support early commercial deployment of existing zero- and near-zero-emission heavy-duty truck technology until December 31, 2026. (Amended: 3/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/8/2021-Coauthors revised. Location: 1/11/2021-A. TR A NS.	Support
AB 225 Gray D		Department of Consumer Affairs: boards: veterans: military spouses: licenses. Current law requires specified boards within the Department of Consumer Affairs to issue, after appropriate investigation, certain types of temporary licenses to an applicant if the applicant meets specified requirements, including that the applicant supplies evidence satisfactory to the board that the applicant is married to, or in a domestic partnership or other legal union with, an active duty member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is assigned to a duty station in this state under official active duty military orders and the applicant holds a current, active, and unrestricted license that confers upon the applicant the authority to practice, in another state, district, or territory of the United States, the profession or vocation for which the applicant seeks a temporary license from the board. Current law requires these temporary licenses to expire 12 months after issuance. Under existing law, some of the funds within the jurisdiction of a board consist of revenue from fees that are continuously appropriated. This bill would require the temporary licenses described above to expire 30 months after issuance. (Amended: 4/20/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 11. Noes 0.) (April 28). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/28/2021-A. APP R.	Watch
AB 230		Employment: flexible work schedules. Would enact the Workplace Flexibility Act of 2021. The bill	Status: 1/28/2021-Referred to Com. on L. & E.	Support

Voepel R		would permit an individual nonexempt employee to request an employee-selected flexible work schedule providing for workdays up to 10 hours per day within a 40-hour workweek, and would allow an employer to implement this schedule without the obligation to pay overtime compensation for those additional hours in a workday, except as specified. The bill would require that the flexible work schedule contain specified information and the employer's and the employee's original signature. The bill would also require the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement in the Department of Industrial Relations to enforce this provision and adopt regulations. (Introduced: 1/12/2021 html pdf)	Location: 1/28/2021-A. L. & E.	
AB 255 Muratsuchi D		COVID-19 Emergency Small Business Eviction and Rent Relief Act. Would require a landlord, who receives a statement signed by a commercial tenant, as defined, and supported by documentary evidence that evidences that the tenant requests emergency rent relief because the business of the commercial tenant has experienced a decrease in average monthly gross revenue of at least 50%, which is reasonably attributable to public health regulations adopted to address the COVID-19 pandemic, during the qualifying time period, as defined, as compared with the 12 months immediately preceding the qualifying time period, as defined, to conduct a good faith negotiation to form a plan to allow the commercial tenant a reasonable opportunity to repay COVID-19 lease debt while minimizing the hardship to the landlord. The bill would prohibit, except as provided, a landlord from terminating a lease of a commercial tenant, before the date that is one year from the end of the qualifying time period, who paid 25% of the amount due under the lease during the qualifying time period. (Amended: 4/19/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/20/2021-Re-referred to Com. on JUD. Hearing: 5/4/2021 8:30 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY, STONE, Chair Location: 3/25/2021-A. JUD	watch
AB 257 Gonzalez, Lorena D	Yes	Food facilities and employment. Would enact the Fast Food Accountability and Standards Recovery Act or FAST Recovery Act. The bill would establish the Fast Food Sector Council (council), to be composed of 11 members to be appointed by the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Senate Rules Committee, and would prescribe its powers. The purpose of the council would be to establish industry-wide minimum standards on wages, working hours, and other working conditions related to the health, safety, and welfare of, and supplying the necessary cost of proper living to, fast food restaurant workers, as well as effecting interagency coordination and prompt agency responses in this regard. (Amended: 4/28/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/27/2021-A. APPR.	Oppose
AB 286 Gonzalez, Lorena D	Yes	Food delivery: purchase prices and tips. Would make it unlawful for a food delivery platform to charge a customer any purchase price, as defined, for food or beverage that is higher than the price set by the food facility. The bill would make it unlawful for a food delivery platform to retain any portion of amounts designated as a tip or gratuity. The bill would also require a food delivery platform to disclose to the customer and the food facility a cost breakdown of each transaction, including prescribed information. The bill would provide that a violation of the act constitutes unfair competition. The bill would make the provisions of the act severable. (Amended: 4/27/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/28/2021-Read second time. Ordered to third reading. Hearing: 5/3/2021 #69 ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE - ASSEMBLY BILLS Location: 4/28/2021-A. THIRD READING	Oppose
AB 365 O'Donnell D		Sales and use taxes: exclusion: zero-emission and near-zero-emission drayage trucks. Current sales and use tax laws impose taxes on retailers measured by gross receipts from the sale of tangible personal	Status: 2/12/2021-Referred to Com. on REV. & TAX. Location: 2/12/2021-A. REV. & TAX	Support

		property sold at retail in this state, or on the storage, use, or other consumption in this state of tangible personal property purchased from a retailer for storage, use, or other consumption in this state, measured by sales price. The Sales and Use Tax Law defines the terms “gross receipts” and “sales price.” This bill would exclude from the terms “gross receipts” and “sales price” for purposes of the Sales and Use Tax Law the amount charged for the purchase of a new or used drayage truck that qualifies, on or after January 1, 2021, for certain emission reduction programs. (Introduced: 2/1/2021 html pdf)		
AB 376 O'Donnell D		Alcoholic beverages: licenses: arts and crafts workshops. Would allow service of wine or beer by an arts and crafts workshop, if certain requirements are met. The bill would require, in this regard, that there be no extra charge or fee for the beer or wine, as described, that the servings be restricted to specified amounts, and that the wine or beer only be provided during business hours and, in no case later than 10 p.m. (Introduced: 2/1/2021 html pdf)	Status: 2/12/2021-Referred to Com. on G.O. Location: 2/12/2021-A. G.O.	Support
AB 385 Flora R		Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004: Would prohibit an aggrieved employee from maintaining an action on behalf of themselves or any other aggrieved employee under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 if certain conditions apply, including if the aggrieved employee has brought an action under the act in conjunction with, or in addition to, claims for monetary damages or penalties for violations of the Labor Code arising out of the same period of employment that occurred between March 4, 2020, and the state of emergency termination date, as defined. (Introduced: 2/2/2021 html pdf)	Status: 2/12/2021-Referred to Coms. on L. & E. and JUD. Location: 2/12/2021-A. L. & E.	Support
AB 513 Bigelow R		Employment: telecommuting employees. Would authorize an employee working from home or a remote location not at the physical location of the employer to receive legally required notices and postings electronically and sign or acknowledge certain documents electronically. The bill would also authorize an employee who works from home or a remote location to have any wages due at the time of separation of employment mailed to the employee using the address the employer has on file for the employee for sending notices. The bill would require the wages to be deemed paid on the date of mailing. (Amended: 3/17/2021 html pdf)	Status: 3/18/2021-Re-referred to Com. on L. & E. Location: 2/18/2021-A. L. & E.	Support
AB 530 Fong R		Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004: filing requirements. The Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 authorizes an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former employees to bring a civil action to recover specified civil penalties that would otherwise be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for the violation of certain provisions affecting employees. The act requires compliance with specified filing requirements by the aggrieved employee in order to bring the action, including providing notice to the agency and the employer with the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, and the facts and theories that support the alleged violations. This bill would also require the aggrieved employee to inform the employer which specific violations of the code are being brought under each subdivision of the act and to inform the employer if statutory right to cure provisions apply. (Introduced: 2/10/2021 html pdf)	Status: 2/18/2021-Referred to Coms. on L. & E. and JUD. Location: 2/18/2021-A. L. & E.	Support
AB 616 Stone D		Agricultural labor relations: labor representative elections: representation ballot card election. Current law requires the Agricultural Labor Relations Board	Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR.	Oppose

		to certify the results of an election conducted by secret ballot of employees in a collective bargaining unit to designate a collective bargaining representative, unless the board determines there are sufficient grounds to refuse to do so. Current law further provides that if the board refuses to certify an election because of employer misconduct that would render slight the chances of a new election reflecting the free and fair choice of employees, the labor organization shall be certified as the bargaining representative for the bargaining unit. This bill would refer to the secret ballot election as a polling place election. (Introduced: 2/12/2021 html pdf)	(Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Hearing: 5/5/2021 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Assembly Chamber ASSEMBLY APPR OPRIATIONS, GONZALEZ, LORENA, Chair Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	
AB 650 Muratsuchi D		Employer-provided benefits: health care workers: COVID-19: hazard pay retention bonuses. The Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014 requires employers to provide an employee, who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment, with paid sick days for prescribed purposes, to be accrued at a rate of no less than one hour for every 30 hours worked. Existing law authorizes an employer to limit an employee's use of paid sick days to 24 hours or 3 days in each year of employment. Current law charges the Labor Commissioner, who is the Chief of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, with enforcement of various labor laws. This bill, the Health Care Workers Recognition and Retention Act, would require a covered employer, as defined, to pay hazard pay retention bonuses in the prescribed amounts on January 1, 2022, April 1, 2022, July 1, 2022, and October 1, 2022, to each covered health care worker, as defined, that it employs. (Amended: 4/12/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose
AB 662 Rodriguez D	Yes	Mental health: dispatch and response protocols: working group. Would require the California Health and Human Services Agency to convene a working group, as specified, no later than July 1, 2022, to examine the existing dispatch and response protocols when providing emergency medical services to an individual who may require evaluation and treatment for a mental health disorder. The bill would require the working group to develop recommendations for improvements to those dispatch and response protocols and recommend amendments to existing law, including, but not limited to, the provisions governing involuntarily taking an individual into temporary custody for a mental health evaluation and treatment. The bill would require the working group to submit periodic reports to the Legislature every 6 months to update the Legislature on its progress, and to submit a final report of its recommendations to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2024. (Amended: 4/28/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/27/2021-A. APP R.	Support
AB 995 Gonzalez, Lorena D		Paid sick days: accrual and use. Current law authorizes an employer to use a different accrual method as long as an employee has no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period. Current law also provides that an employer may satisfy the accrual requirements by providing not less than 24 hours or 3 days of paid sick leave that is available to the employee to use by the completion of the employee's 120th calendar day of employment. This bill would modify the employer's alternate sick leave accrual method to require that an employee have no less than 40 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 200th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period. (Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose

		Introduced: 2/18/2021 html pdf)		
AB 1003 Gonzalez, Lorena D		Wage theft: grand theft. Current law defines the crime of grand theft as theft committed when the money, labor, or real or personal property taken is of a value exceeding \$950. Under existing law, grand theft is punishable either as a misdemeanor by imprisonment in a county jail for up to 1 year or as a felony by imprisonment in county jail for 16 months or 2 or 3 years, by a specified fine, or by a fine and that imprisonment. This bill would make the intentional theft of wages, as defined, in an amount greater than \$950 from any one employee, or \$2,350 in the aggregate from 2 or more employees, by an employer in any consecutive 12-month period punishable as grand theft. (Amended: 4/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/26/2021-Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/21/2021-A. APP R.	Neutral
AB 1028 Sevarto R		Telework Flexibility Act. Current law, with various exceptions, generally establishes 8 hours as a day’s work and a 40-hour workweek and requires the payment of prescribed overtime compensation for additional hours worked. This bill would permit an individual nonexempt employee to request an employee-selected remote work flexible work schedule providing for workdays up to 10 hours per day within a 40-hour workweek and would allow an employer to implement this schedule without the obligation to pay overtime compensation for those additional hours in a workday, except as specified. (Introduced: 2/18/2021 html pdf)	Status: 3/4/2021-Referred to Coms. on L. & E. and JUD. Location: 3/4/2021-A. L. & E.	Support
AB 1033 Bauer-Kahan D	Yes	California Family Rights Act: parent-in-law: small employer family leave mediation: pilot program. Current law, the Moore-Brown-Roberti Family Rights Act, commonly known as the California Family Rights Act, which is a part of FEHA, makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer, as defined, to refuse to grant a request by an eligible employee to take up to 12 workweeks of unpaid protected leave during any 12-month period for family care and medical leave, as specified. Current law defines family care and medical leave to include, among other things, leave to care for a parent. This bill would additionally include leave to care for a parent-in-law within the definition of family care and medical leave, and would make other conforming changes. (Amended: 4/29/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-Read second time and amended. Location: 4/27/2021-A. APP R.	Support
AB 1041 Wicks D	Yes	Employment: leave. Would expand the population that an employee can take leave to care for to include a designated person. The bill would define “designated person” to mean a person identified by the employee at the time the employee requests family care and medical leave. The bill would authorize an employer to limit designation of a person, as prescribed. (Amended: 4/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author. Location: 4/26/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose
AB 1074 Gonzalez, Lorena D		Employment: displaced workers. Current law establishes the Displaced Janitor Opportunity Act, which requires contractors and subcontractors, as defined, that are awarded contracts or subcontracts to provide janitorial or building maintenance services at a particular jobsite or sites, to retain, for a period of 60 days, certain employees who were employed at that site by the previous contractor or subcontractor, and offered continued employment if their performance during that 60-day period is satisfactory. Existing law authorizes an employee who was not retained, or the employee’s agent, to bring an enforcement action in a court of competent jurisdiction, as specified. Current law charges the Labor Commissioner, as Chief of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, with	Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Hearing: 5/5/2021 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Assembly Chamber ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS, GONZALEZ, LORENA, Chair Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose

		enforcing these provisions. This bill would rename the act the Displaced Janitor and Hotel Worker Opportunity Act and would extend the provisions of the act to hotel workers. The bill would redefine “awarding authority” under the act to include any person that awards or otherwise enters into contracts for hotel services including guest service, food and beverage or cleaning performed within the state, as specified. (Amended: 4/19/2021 html pdf)		
AB 1119 Wicks D	Yes	Employment discrimination. The California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), protects the right to seek, obtain, and hold employment without discrimination because of prescribed characteristics. FEHA makes various employment practices unlawful and empowers the Department of Fair Employment and Housing to investigate and prosecute complaints alleging unlawful practices. This bill would expand the protected characteristics to include family responsibilities, defined to mean the obligations of an employee to provide direct and ongoing care for a minor child or a care recipient. The bill would define additional terms for this purpose. (Amended: 4/21/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/22/2021-Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/20/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose
AB 1179 Carrillo D		Employer provided benefit: backup childcare. Would require an employer to provide an employee, on or after January 1, 2022, who works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment, with up to 60 hours of paid backup childcare benefits, to be accrued and used as provided. The bill would define “backup childcare” as childcare provided by a qualified backup childcare provider to the employee’s child when the employee’s regular childcare provider cannot be utilized, and “paid backup childcare” as an employee benefit consisting of the employer paying for a qualified backup childcare provider to provide backup childcare for an employee’s child that is compensated at the state minimum wage or the federal minimum wage, whichever is higher. (Introduced: 2/18/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Hearing: 5/5/2021 9 a.m. - <i>State Capitol, Assembly Chamber ASSEMBLY APPR OPRIATIONS, GONZALEZ, LORENA, Chair</i> Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose
AB 1182 Stone D	Yes	Product liability: products purchased online. Current law exempts a manufacturer or seller from liability, except as provided, in any action for injury or death caused by a product, other than an action based on a manufacturing defect or breach of an express warranty, if the product is inherently unsafe and the product is known to be unsafe by the ordinary consumer who consumes the product with the ordinary knowledge common to the community and the product is a common consumer product intended for personal consumption, as specified. This bill would, in any strict products liability action, make an electronic place that, by contract or other arrangement with one or more third parties, engages in specified acts strictly liable for all damages proximately caused by a defective product that is purchased or sold through the electronic place to the same extent as a retailer would be liable for selling the defective product in the retailer’s physical store, regardless of whether the electronic place ever takes physical possession of, or title to, the defective product. (Introduced: 2/18/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author. Location: 3/4/2021-A. JUD.	Oppose
AB 1192 Kalra D	Yes	Employment information: worker metrics. Current law establishes within the Labor and Workforce Development Agency the Department of Industrial Relations, one of the purposes of which is to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of California, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment. This bill would	Status: 4/26/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (April 22). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/22/2021-A. APP R.	Oppose

		establish a program in, and administered by, the agency and would require employers with more than 1,000 employees in California, as provided, to submit various statistics regarding those employees to the agency. The bill would further require the agency to collect the worker-related statistics annually and, after collection, to assign each employer to one of the 24 industries in the Global Industry Classification Standard system. (Amended: 4/5/2021 html pdf)		
AB 1400 Kalra D		Guaranteed Health Care for All. The Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, provides for the licensure and regulation of health care service plans by the Department of Managed Health Care. Current law provides for the regulation of health insurers by the Department of Insurance. Current law provides for the Medi-Cal program, which is administered by the State Department of Health Care Services, under which qualified low-income individuals receive health care services. The Medi-Cal program is, in part, governed and funded by federal Medicaid program provisions. This bill, the California Guaranteed Health Care for All Act, would create the California Guaranteed Health Care for All program, or CalCare, to provide comprehensive universal single-payer health care coverage and a health care cost control system for the benefit of all residents of the state. (Introduced: 2/19/2021 html pdf)		Status: 2/22/2021-Read first time. Location: 2/19/2021-A. PRI NT Oppose
AB 1465 Reves D	Yes	Workers' compensation: medical provider networks study. Would require the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation, on or before January 1, 2023, to submit a study to the Legislature, the committees of the Senate and Assembly with jurisdiction over workers' compensation, and the Division of Workers' Compensation on delays and access to care issues in medical provider networks. The bill would require the study to compare specified data for injury claims in which a worker was treated by a medical provider network to that data for injury claims in which a worker was treated by a provider who is not part of a medical provider network. (Amended: 4/26/2021 html pdf)		Status: 4/29/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 13. Noes 0.) (April 29). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/29/2021-A. APP R. Oppose
ACA 1 Aguiar-Curry D		Local government financing: affordable housing and public infrastructure: voter approval. The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, city and county, or special district to levy an ad valorem tax to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing, or the acquisition or lease of real property for those purposes, if the proposition proposing that tax is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as applicable, and the proposition includes specified accountability requirements. (Introduced: 12/7/2020 html pdf)		Status: 4/22/2021-Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and APPR. Location: 4/22/2021-A. L. GOV. Oppose
SB 15 Portantino D		Housing development: incentives: rezoning of idle retail sites. Current law establishes, among other housing programs, the Workforce Housing Reward Program, which requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to make local assistance grants to cities, counties, and cities and counties that provide land use approval to housing developments that are affordable to very low and low-income		Status: 4/5/2021-April 5 hearing: Placed on APPR suspense file. Location: 4/5/2021-S. APPR . SUSPENSE FILE Support

		households. This bill, upon appropriation by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act or other statute, would require the department to administer a program to provide incentives in the form of grants allocated as provided to local governments that rezone idle sites used for a big box retailer or a commercial shopping center to instead allow the development of housing, as defined. (Amended: 3/8/2021 html pdf)		
SB 62 Durazo D	Yes	Employment: garment manufacturing. Current law makes garment manufacturers liable for guaranteeing payment of wages to employees of their contractors. This bill would expand the definition of garment manufacturing to include dyeing, altering a garment’s design, and affixing a label to a garment. The bill would prohibit any employee engaged in the performance of garment manufacturing to be paid by the piece or unit, or by the piece rate, except as specified. The bill would impose statutory damages of \$200 against a garment manufacturer or contractor, payable to the employee, for each pay period in which the employee is paid by the piece rate. (Amended: 4/8/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/20/2021-April 19 hearing: Placed on APPR suspense file. Location: 4/20/2021-S. APP R. SUSPENSE FILE	Oppose
SB 74 Borgeas R	Yes	Keep California Working Act. Current law establishes the Office of Small Business Advocate within the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development for the purpose of advocating for the causes of small business and to provide small businesses with the information they need to survive in the marketplace. This bill, the Keep California Working Act, would establish the Keep California Working Grant Program. The act would require the Small Business Advocate to administer the program and award grants, as specified, to small businesses and nonprofit entities that meet specified criteria, including that the entity has experienced economic hardship resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (Amended: 3/11/2021 html pdf)	Status: 3/11/2021-Set for hearing April 19. April 19 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author. From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on B., P. & E.D. Location: 1/28/2021-S. B., P. & E.D.	Support
SB 93 Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review	Yes	Employment: rehiring and retention: displaced workers: COVID-19 pandemic. Would, until December 31, 2024, require an employer, as defined, to offer its laid-off employees specified information about job positions that become available for which the laid-off employees are qualified, and to offer positions to those laid-off employees based on a preference system, in accordance with specified timelines and procedures. The bill would define the term “laid-off employee” to mean any employee who was employed by the employer for 6 months or more in the 12 months preceding January 1, 2020, and whose most recent separation from active service was due to a reason related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including a public health directive, government shutdown order, lack of business, a reduction in force, or other economic, nondisciplinary reason related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill would require an employer to keep records for 3 years, including records of communications regarding the offers. (Chaptered: 4/16/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/16/2021-Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State. Chapter 16, Statutes of 2021. Location: 4/15/2021-S. CHAPTERED	Oppose
SB 95 Skinner D		Employment: COVID-19: supplemental paid sick leave. Would provide for COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave for covered employees, as defined, who are unable to work or telework due to certain reasons related to COVID-19, including that the employee has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19. The bill would entitle a covered employee to 80 hours of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave if that employee either works full time or was scheduled to work, on average, at least 40 hours per week for the employer in	Status: 3/19/2021-Approved by the Governor. Chaptered by Secretary of State. Chapter 13, Statutes of 2021. Location: 3/18/2021-S. CHAPTERED	Oppose

		the 2 weeks preceding the date the covered employee took COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave. The bill would provide a different calculation for supplemental paid sick leave for a covered employee who is a firefighter subject to certain work schedule requirements and for a covered employee working fewer or variable hours, as specified. (Chaptered: 3/19/2021 html pdf)		
SB 213 Cortese D		Workers' compensation: hospital employees. Current law, until January 1, 2023, creates a rebuttable presumption of injury for various employees, including an employee who works at a health facility, as defined, to include an illness or death resulting from COVID-19, if specified circumstances apply. This bill would define "injury," for a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital, to include infectious diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and respiratory diseases. The bill would create rebuttable presumptions that these injuries that develop or manifest in a hospital employee who provides direct patient care in an acute care hospital arose out of and in the course of the employment. The bill would extend these presumptions for specified time periods after the hospital employee's termination of employment. Beginning January 1, 2023, the bill would include COVID-19 in the definitions of infectious and respiratory diseases. (Amended: 3/4/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/20/2021-April 19 hearing: Placed on APPR suspense file. Location: 4/20/2021-S. APP R. SUSPENSE FILE	Oppose
SB 230 Portantino D		State Water Resources Control Board: Constituents of Emerging Concern Program. Would require the State Water Resources Control Board to establish, maintain, and direct an ongoing, dedicated program called the Constituents of Emerging Concern Program to assess the state of information and recommend areas for further study on, among other things, the occurrence of constituents of emerging concern (CEC) in drinking water sources and treated drinking water. The bill would require the state board to convene, by an unspecified date, the Science Advisory Panel to review and provide recommendations to the state board on CEC for further action, among other duties. The bill would require the state board to provide an annual report to the Legislature on the ongoing work conducted by the panel. (Introduced: 1/19/2021 html pdf)	Status: 3/22/2021-March 22 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author. Location: 3/15/2021-S. APP R.	Support
SB 260 Wiener D	Yes	Climate Corporate Accountability Act. Would require the State Air Resources Board, on or before January 1, 2023, to develop and adopt regulations requiring United States-based partnerships, corporations, limited liability companies, and other business entities with total annual revenues in excess of \$1,000,000,000 and that do business in California, defined as "reporting entities," to publicly disclose, starting in 2024 on a date to be determined by the state board, and annually thereafter, their greenhouse gas emissions, categorized as scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, as defined, from the prior calendar year. (Amended: 4/19/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/28/2021-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 2.) (April 27). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/28/2021-S. APP R.	Oppose
SB 335 Cortese D	Yes	Workers' compensation: liability. Current law prohibits a claim for workers' compensation from being maintained unless within 30 days after the occurrence of the injury, the injured person, or in case of the death, a dependent, or someone on the injured person's or dependent's behalf, serves notice of the injury upon the employer. Current law also requires an injured employee, or in the case of death, a dependent, or an agent of the employee or dependent, to file a claim form with the employer. Under current law, except for specified injuries, if liability is not	Status: 4/30/2021-Set for hearing May 10. Hearing: 5/10/2021 9 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, PORTANTINO, Chair Location: 4/27/2021-S. APP R.	Oppose

		rejected within 90 days after the date the claim form is filed with the employer, the injury is presumed compensable and the presumption is rebuttable only by evidence discovered subsequent to the 90-day period. This bill would reduce those 90-day time periods to 45 days and, for certain injuries or illnesses, including hernia, heart trouble, pneumonia, or tuberculosis, among others, sustained in the course of employment of a specified member of law enforcement or a specified first responder, would reduce those time periods to 30 days. (Amended: 3/10/2021 html pdf)		
SB 342 Gonzalez D	Yes	South Coast Air Quality Management District: board membership. Current law establishes the South Coast Air Quality Management District vested with the authority to regulate air emissions from stationary sources located in the South Coast Air Basin and establishes a district board, consisting of 13 members. This bill would add 2 members to the district board, appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly. The bill would require the 2 additional members to reside in and work directly with communities in the South Coast Air Basin that are disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to high levels of pollution and issues of environmental justice. The bill would also require a candidate for these positions to meet other specified requirements. (Amended: 4/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/28/2021-Set for hearing May 6. Hearing: 5/6/2021 <i>Upon adjournment of Session - Senate Chamber SENATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE, MCGUIRE, Chair</i> Location: 4/12/2021-S. GOV . & F.	Oppose
SB 378 Gonzalez D	Yes	Local government: broadband infrastructure development project permit processing: microtrenching permit processing ordinance. Would require a local agency to allow, except as provided, microtrenching for the installation of underground fiber if the installation in the microtrench is limited to fiber. The bill would also require, to the extent necessary, a local agency with jurisdiction to approve excavations to adopt or amend existing ordinances, codes, or construction rules to allow for microtrenching. By imposing new duties on local agencies with regard to the installation of fiber, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. (Amended: 4/12/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/26/2021-VOTE: Do pass as amended, but first amend, and re-refer to the Committee on [Appropriations] (PASS) Location: 4/26/2021-S. APP R.	Support
SB 467 Wiener D		Oil and gas: hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatments, steam flooding, water flooding, or cyclic steaming: prohibition: job relocation. Would revise the definition of “well stimulation treatment” to include steam flooding and water flooding. The bill would prohibit the issuance or renewal of a permit to conduct hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatment, steam flooding, water flooding, or cyclic steaming for the extraction of oil and gas beginning January 1, 2022, and would prohibit new or repeated hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatments, steam flooding, water flooding, or cyclic steaming, except as conducted pursuant to a permit lawfully issued before that date. The bill would prohibit all hydraulic fracturing, acid well stimulation treatments, steam flooding, water flooding, cyclic steaming, or other well stimulation treatments beginning January 1, 2027. (Amended: 3/22/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/13/2021-April 13 set for first hearing. Failed passage in committee. (Ayes 4. Noes 3.) Reconsideration granted. Location: 2/25/2021-S. N.R. & W.	Oppose
SB 657 Ochoa Bogh R		Employment: electronic documents. Current law regulates the wages, hours, and working conditions of any worker employed in any occupation, trade, or industry, whether compensation is measured by time, piece, or otherwise, except as specified. This bill would provide that, in any instance in which an employer is required to physically post information, an employer may also distribute that information to employees by email with	Status: 4/29/2021-Read third time. Passed. (Ayes 36. Noes 0.) Ordered to the Assembly. In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk. Location: 4/29/2021-A. DES K	Support

		the document or documents attached. The bill would specify that this does not alter the employer's obligation to physically display the required posting. (Amended: 4/22/2021 html pdf)		
SB 662 Archuleta D	Yes	Energy: transportation sector: hydrogen. Current law requires the PUC, in cooperation with the Energy Commission, the State Air Resources Board, air quality management districts and air pollution control districts, electrical and gas corporations, and the motor vehicle industry, to evaluate and implement policies to promote the development of equipment and infrastructure needed to facilitate the use of electric power and natural gas to fuel low-emission vehicles, as provided. This bill would require the PUC to additionally evaluate and implement policies to promote the development of equipment and infrastructure needed to facilitate the use of hydrogen to fuel low-emission vehicles, as provided. (Amended: 4/19/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-From committee: Do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 6. Noes 0.) (April 29). Hearing: 5/3/2021 #20 SEN ATE SENATE BILLS - SECOND READING FILE Location: 4/29/2021-S. APP R.	Support
SB 727 Leyva D	Yes	Labor-related liabilities: direct contractor. Current law requires, for contracts entered into on or after January 1, 2018, a direct contractor, as defined, making or taking a contract in the state for the erection, construction, alteration, or repair of a building, structure, or other private work, to assume, and be liable for, any debt owed to a wage claimant or third party on the wage claimant's behalf, incurred by a subcontractor at any tier acting under, by, or for the direct contractor for the wage claimant's performance of labor included in the subject of the original contract. Current law limits the direct contractor's liability under those provisions to extend only to any unpaid wage, fringe or other benefit payment or contribution, including interest owed and provides that liability does not extend to penalties or liquidated damages. This bill would extend, for contracts entered into on or after January 1, 2022, the direct contractor's liability to penalties, liquidated damages, and interest owed by the subcontractor on account of the performance of the labor, except as provided. (Amended: 4/29/2021 html pdf)	Status: 4/29/2021-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR. Location: 4/28/2021-S. APP R.	Oppose

Total Measures: 48

Total Tracking Forms: 48