



**Government Finance & Administration Policy Committee Meeting**  
**CSAC 129<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting**  
**Thursday, November 16, 2023 | 9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**  
**Alameda County, California**

**Supervisor Amy Shuklian, Tulare County, Chair**  
**Supervisor Ryan Campbell, Tuolumne County, Vice Chair**  
**Supervisor Mani Grewal, Stanislaus County, Vice Chair**

- 9:30 a.m. I. Welcome and Introductions**  
*Supervisor Amy Shuklian, Tulare County, Chair*  
*Supervisor Ryan Campbell, Tuolumne County, Vice Chair*  
*Supervisor Mani Grewal, Stanislaus County, Vice Chair*
- 9:35 a.m. II. Navigating Modern Public Employer-Employee Relations:  
A Personnel Directors Panel - *Informational Item***  
Moderated by: *Supervisor Amy Shuklian, Tulare County*  
Panelists:  
*Tami Douglas-Schatz, Director, San Luis Obispo County Human Resources  
Department*  
*Alberto Lara, Director, Yolo County Human Resources Department*  
*Tamara Thomas, Director of Human Relations, Stanislaus County*
- 10:00 a.m. III. The 2024-25 Budget: California’s Fiscal Outlook - *Informational Item***  
Moderated by: *Supervisor Ryan Campbell, Tuolumne County*  
Speakers:  
*Carolyn Chu, Chief Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst’s Office*  
*Roberto Manchia, Chief Financial Officer, San Mateo County*  
*Jason Britt, County Administrative Officer, Tulare County*
- 10:30 a.m. IV. Statewide Initiative 23-0015A1: “Government Transparency Act” – ACTION ITEM**  
*Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate, CSAC*  
*Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Advocate, CSAC*
- 10:45 a.m. V. 2024 GFA Legislative Advocacy Priorities – ACTION ITEM**  
*Kalyn Dean and Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocates, CSAC*
- 10:55 a.m. VI. 2023 Legislative Review and the Year Ahead - *Informational Item***  
*Kalyn Dean and Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocates, CSAC*
- 11:00 a.m. VII. Adjourn**



*Scan the QR code for digital copies of the agenda materials:*

## ATTACHMENTS

---

### **Personnel Directors Panel – INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

Attachment One ..... CSAC Memo: Navigating Modern Public Employer-  
Employee Relations: A Personnel Directors Panel

### **The 2024-25 Budget: California’s Fiscal Outlook – INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

Attachment Two ..... CSAC Memo: California’s Fiscal Outlook

### **Statewide Initiative 23-0015A1: “Government Transparency Act” – ACTION ITEM**

Attachment Three ..... CSAC Memo: Statewide Initiative 23-0015A1:  
“Government Transparency Act”

### **2024 GFA Priorities – ACTION ITEM**

Attachment Four ..... CSAC Memo: GFA 2024 Legislative Advocacy Priorities

### **GFA 2023 Legislative Year in Review – INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

Attachment Five ..... CSAC Memo: GFA 2023 Legislative Year in Review

*Scan the QR code for digital copies of the agenda materials:*



---

**Attachment One**

**CSAC Memo: Navigating Modern Public Employer-Employee Relations:  
A Personnel Directors Panel**



OFFICERS

**President**

Chuck Washington  
Riverside County

**1st Vice President**

Bruce Gibson  
San Luis Obispo County

**2nd Vice President**

Jeff Griffiths  
Inyo County

**Past President**

Ed Valenzuela  
Siskiyou County



**CEO**

Graham Knaus

November 16, 2023

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration Policy Committee

From: Kalyn Dean, Legislative Advocate  
Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst

Re: **Navigating Modern Public Employer-Employee Relations: A Personnel Directors Panel – INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

---

**Summary:** This panel of county personnel directors will discuss best practices and learned experiences for handling the multiple pressures and escalations that have convened on county human resources departments in recent years. Panelists will explore how to strike a balance between employee rights and efficient, sustainable administration of local government.

**Guest Speakers:**

Tami Douglas-Schatz, Director, San Luis Obispo County Human Resources Department  
Alberto Lara, Director, Yolo County Human Resources Department  
Tamara Thomas, Human Relations Director, Stanislaus County

**Background:** The results of the last several legislative sessions have yielded the “perfect storm” of administrative and financial pressures on county human resources departments by expanding worker’s compensation presumptions, undermining and eroding the ability of local government employers to negotiate at the bargaining table, and expanding government liability for claims for damages.

CSAC and counties statewide are not disputing the rights of employees to access the worker’s compensation system, for employee labor organizations to bargain in good faith with employers, or to file claims for damages. State law has created a framework for these services and activities that has been honored by counties. However, these systems are complex and interconnected, and the scope, scale, and pace by which these systems are being changed without enough work with stakeholders and input from subject matter experts and often a one-size-fits-all approach will lead to harmful unintended consequences.

---

**Attachment Two**

**CSAC Memo: The 2024-25 Budget: California's Fiscal Outlook**



**OFFICERS**

**President**

Chuck Washington  
Riverside County

**1st Vice President**

Bruce Gibson  
San Luis Obispo County

**2nd Vice President**

Jeff Griffiths  
Inyo County

**Past President**

Ed Valenzuela  
Siskiyou County



**CEO**

Graham Knaus

November 16, 2023

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration Policy Committee

From: Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate  
Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst

Re: **The 2024-25 Budget: California’s Fiscal Outlook – INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

**Summary:** The committee will receive a briefing on the Legislative Analyst’s Office’s 2024-25 Fiscal Outlook for California. The briefing will include commentary and perspectives from county officials regarding the implications of the economic and fiscal forecast for county budgets and fiscal sustainability.

**Guest Speakers:**

Carolyn Chu, Chief Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst’s Office  
Roberto Manchia, Chief Financial Officer, San Mateo County  
Jason Britt, County Administrative Officer, Tulare County

**Background:** The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) is the California Legislature’s nonpartisan fiscal and policy advisor. The LAO’s annual Fiscal Outlook publication provides an independent assessment of the California state budget condition for the upcoming fiscal year. The publication also includes a forecast of the state’s longer-term condition, typically a three-year period following the upcoming fiscal year. The LAO’s [2023-24 Fiscal Outlook](#), published in November 2022, accurately forecasted the state’s budget deficit for fiscal year 2023-24. The 2024-25 Fiscal Outlook is expected to be published on Wednesday, November 15, 2023, and will include the LAO’s assumptions about the state’s economy for fiscal years 2024-25 through 2027-28 and how the state’s economy affects the state’s annual revenues and expenditures. As state and federal funds account for nearly half of county revenue<sup>1</sup> on average, fiscal forecasts and analysis of the state’s economic condition can help counties prepare balanced and sustainable budgets.

The LAO’s 2024-25 Fiscal Outlook was not publicly available as of the development of the agenda materials for the 2023 CSAC Government Finance and Administration Policy Committee Meeting. The [2024-25 Fiscal Outlook](#) will be accessible on the LAO’s website on or after November 15, 2023.

<sup>1</sup> [The State Controller's Office 2021-22 County Financial Data](#)

---

**Attachment Three**

**CSAC Memo: Statewide Initiative 23-0015A1: "Government Transparency Act"**



OFFICERS

**President**

Chuck Washington  
Riverside County

**1st Vice President**

Bruce Gibson  
San Luis Obispo County

**2nd Vice President**

Jeff Griffiths  
Inyo County

**Past President**

Ed Valenzuela  
Siskiyou County



**CEO**

Graham Knaus

November 16, 2023

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration (GFA) Policy Committee

From: Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate  
Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst

Re: **ACTION ITEM: Initiative 23-0015A1: "Government Transparency Act"**

---

**Recommendation**

CSAC staff recommend the committee forward a recommendation to the CSAC Executive Committee of opposition to the "Government Transparency Act" for the reasons outlined by staff in this memo.

**CSAC Ballot Measure Review and Position Process**

CSAC policy committees may recommend a position of support, oppose, or neutral on a measure, or it may take no position. The recommendation will be considered by the CSAC Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee's recommendation will be considered by the CSAC Board of Directors.

CSAC's [Policies and Procedures Manual](#) states that, in most circumstances, the Association will consider positions only on qualified ballot measures. However, it also provides for the CSAC Officers to direct a policy committee to review and make a recommendation on a proposed measure that has a direct impact on county governments, as is the case with this measure.

**Measure Status**

Filed with the Office of the Attorney General in August 2023, the "Government Transparency Act" ([full text](#)) is [sponsored](#) by Consumer Watchdog and intends to qualify for the statewide ballot in November 2024. Presently, the measure is cleared by the Attorney General's Office for circulation to gather signatures. The measure requires more than half a million signatures to qualify for the November 2024 ballot, which must be gathered and submitted to county governments by April 3, 2024. Counties are required to notify the Secretary of State within eight business days after a proposed measure's circulation deadline how many signatures were received ([Elections Code Section 9030\(b\)](#)).

**Measure Summary**

The Government Transparency Act would make sweeping changes to California's Public Records Act (PRA), the State Records Management Act, and the Legislative Open Records Act. The scope and scale of the changes to existing law affects all public agencies and levels of government, including the state, local governments, and the Legislature, among others. The measure reduces



the government's discretion to redact or withhold requests for sensitive or confidential information, requires compulsory posting of records even without a PRA request, and restricts the ability of government agencies to collect fees for PRA requests. Additionally, the measure amends state law to require the Legislature to automatically disclose all meetings with lobbyists.

### **Background**

The California PRA governs how specified public agencies disclose government records. The PRA law has been amended many times since its initial passage in 1968, however, the core objective remains to provide "access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business [which] is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state." (Government Code Section 7921). The provisions of the PRA are included in [Government Code Sections 7920-7931](#).

In 2014, California voters approved Proposition 42, which, among other provisions, amended the California constitution to discontinue the requirement that the state reimburse local governments for the cost to comply with PRA laws, or any subsequent PRA laws enacted by the Legislature. Prior to Proposition 42, costs for local governments to comply with the PRA were a reimbursable state mandate for which local governments could file annual claims with the State Controller's Office.

Under current law, local governments have limited, prescriptive authority to levy fees to the public to process PRA requests.

### **Requirements included in the proposed measure and impacts on local & state government:**

#### ***Access to Governmental Agency Public Records***

- Requires agencies to provide records to a person requesting the records within 30 calendar days from the receipt of the request; or within 90 days only for "extraordinary circumstances."
- Prohibits assessing fees for the staff labor to procure records, including staff resources spent on searching, reviewing, or redacting records.
- Limits assessment of fees solely to the direct cost of duplicating records, or a fee of \$0.10 per page, whichever is less. This applies to physical and digital records.
- Strengthens requirements necessary to justify withholding or redaction of public agency records and further requires documents to be provided in redacted form, rather than deleting redacted portions.

#### ***Private Contractor Records***

- Clarifies that the Public Records Act applies to documents maintained by private contractors and vendors related to their work on behalf of public agencies.
- Includes specific language intended to address Anderson-Barker v. City of Los Angeles case, which found records created or maintained by a private contractor for work on behalf of a public agency is exempt from the PRA even when the agency has "a legal right to access" the records.

***Lawsuits for Past Violations of the Law***

- Allows for lawsuits for retroactive violations of the law, as amended by the initiative.
- Clarifies that judicial review of such lawsuits shall be *de novo*.

***Amends Language for Public Interest "Balancing Test" for Exemptions***

- Adds new requirement to provide written factual showing that provides "clear and convincing evidence" for withholding of records due to public interest.
- Requires proof that disclosure records typically protected by Evidence Code privileges (e.g., attorney-client communications; attorney work product, official records) would cause foreseeable harm to the interest protected by the exemption.

***Required Postings of Documents for Government Agencies***

- Requires agencies to post a broad, specified list of documents within 10 calendar days of their creation, on a webpage titled "Public Records Available for Review," or something similar.

Documents include:

- Settlement agreements;
- Court records in which the agency is a party;
- All contracts; and
- Annual budgets.

***Requirement to Retain Records for Minimum of Five Years***

- Expands the requirement for retention and preservation of documents for local and state government to no less than five years.

**Requirements included in the proposed measure and impacts on the legislature:**

***Disclosure of Lawmaker Meetings and Public Events***

- Would require California lawmakers to disclose the location, date, time, and purpose of meetings with lobbyists (including names and affiliations), public events, and fundraising events on their official internet website within five calendar days following the meeting or event.

***Legislative Records: Expands Definition and Access***

- Requires legislative records be provided to a person requesting the records within 30 calendar days from the receipt of the request; or within 90 days only for "extraordinary circumstances."
- Limits the costs or fees that may be assessed for providing legislative records to the public solely to direct costs of making copies and limits those costs to \$0.10 per page.
- Expands public access to legislative records to include individual lawmakers.
- Subjects records of the Legislature and Legislative Counsel to the retention and preservation requirements of State Records Management Act.

### ***Access To Lawmaker Misconduct Records***

- Designates that misconduct records and investigations of Legislators or legislative staff, as specified, are not confidential (with limited exceptions or authorization for redactions) and are considered legislative records under the new, expanded definition of legislative records.

### **Staff Comments**

#### ***The Status Quo Landscape***

To understand the scope of the disruption and administrative chaos that the Government Transparency Act would bring to local governments, it is paramount to understand the fundamental functions and challenges of the existing PRA system.

Counties take their responsibilities under the PRA seriously and respond to requests as completely and efficiently as they are capable. However, it has long been known to county officials that complying with the PRA under the status quo is a significant fiscal pressure and an administrative burden due to the complexity and prescriptive nature of the law. Counties routinely report that it is challenging to estimate and forecast the cost and staff time necessary to address PRA workload when building a balanced budget for future fiscal years. Local and national events often drive increases in PRA requests (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic, social unrest in response to the criminal justice system, the 2020 Presidential Election, etc.). Despite the often-significant administrative burden imposed by PRA requests, many counties have made significant efforts to streamline the process to make submitting PRA requests easier for the public.

Over the last several years, counties have reported a significant increase in the quantity and breadth of PRA requests. Furthermore, due to the modernization of how public sector work is conducted, there has been a significant increase in disclosable records (e.g., emails, text messages, inter-office direct chat messaging platforms, etc.). In response, there has been a proportionate increase in the complexity and sophistication of the work necessary to respond to PRA requests due to the staff time spent searching for records and redacting material that is exempt or prohibited from disclosure (e.g., confidential attorney-client correspondence, social security numbers, criminal history, trade secrets, medical records, etc.).

While the PRA is widely used for its intended purpose to ensure the public can scrutinize the decisions of public officials, including by private citizens, journalists, and researchers, governments have reported increased prevalence of PRA requests aimed at advancing business interests through data mining, use of the PRA as a discovery tool in litigation, and requests from other nations. The Government Transparency Act, as written, would further widen opportunities for exploitation and profiteering from government transparency.

### ***In The Aggregate***

CSAC staff estimates that the Government Transparency Act would significantly disrupt county government administration and will require vital county resources that would otherwise be used to improve services for local communities to instead be spent reviewing, redacting, and compiling records.

Of the dozens of changes included in the 29-page measure, the most concerning impacts to county governance include the following:

- *Data mining* – increases opportunities to exploit a public transparency process for data mining for commercial benefit or criminal interest, including compromised personal information (more information included below).
- *Record retention* – The cost and administrative burden to store government documents for no less than five years will overwhelm government staff time and resources. According to the California Secretary of State’s Office regarding the [State Archives’ Electronic Records Program](#), “Maintenance of e-records can be just as costly and time consuming as creating the records in the first place. Data recovery for records that have not been maintained properly is also extremely expensive.” Furthermore, the measure’s records retention provisions conflict with state and federal law requiring destruction of public records within a shorter timeframe, including election laws requiring destruction of ballots.
- *Public-private partnership* – The measure’s reversal of an existing judicial decision that public contractor records are exempt from the PRA would harm the ability of local governments to contract for work on behalf of public agencies.
- *Fiscal Impacts* – In September 2023, the nonpartisan Legislative Analyst’s Office [reviewed the measure](#) and estimated that “this measure would result in net increased costs on state and local governments—likely reaching over \$1 billion annually depending on how this measure is implemented.”

### ***Increased Litigation Exposure***

Like all statewide ballot measures, it is nearly certain that the Government Transparency Act will result in significant litigation, in both the complexity and number of suits filed against public agencies. Pursuant to Government Code Section 7923.115, PRA requesters who prevail in litigation against public agencies are awarded attorney fees. Counties may recover costs for legal defense and attorney fees only if the requester’s case is “clearly frivolous,” which is a high legal standard to prove. Presently, public agencies often weigh the costs and benefits of settling lawsuits early to pay less attorney fees than risk litigation going to trial and incurring significant legal defense costs, even if the public agency is successful. While it is not possible to estimate the increased costs to counties for legal workload and attorney fees related to the Government Transparency Act, it is certain to be significant, especially with the acknowledgement that the measure authorizes lawsuits for retroactive violations of the law as amended by the initiative. The volume of staff time and resources necessary to address litigation resulting from this measure would displace other, existing legal workload. This is in addition to the substantial increase in legal work that will be required by the measure due to the rapid deadline to

produce records and the increase in records subject to the PRA that will require legal work to review and redact.

### ***Privacy and Cybersecurity Threats***

The imposition of short deadlines to complete PRA requests that don't allow sufficient time for review and exclusion or redaction of information, while increasing the threshold to justify exclusion or redaction, will compromise the protection of personal information of public officials and residents alike. Compromised personal information such as names, personal addresses, personal phone numbers, and more, as a result of poorly redacted or completely unredacted public records, will directly allow malicious actors to harass, embarrass, punish, or otherwise threaten victims of compromised personal information. Beyond personal implications, compromising information released via the PRA process will increase opportunities for cybercriminals to mine for the data necessary to breach government IT networks. As cyberattacks against local governments continue to increase in frequency and sophistication, the Government Transparency Act would erode the protection of an individual or an organization's sensitive data and financial assets from criminal access.

### **Recorded Support**

Consumer Watchdog ([Sponsor](#))

### **Recorded Opposition**

The Orange County Register Editorial Board ([Source](#))

### **Policy Considerations**

While the [CSAC platform](#) lacks statements regarding public records specifically, the Government Transparency Act would have severe impacts on several of the principles established in the platform. Specifically, the Government Transparency Act would undermine the tenets of efficient government that are established throughout the platform. Furthermore, the measure would undermine Chapter 1, Section 2 of the platform that encourages local agencies to resolve disputes without costly litigation in a way that buoys public confidence in local government. Instead, the measure will invite costly litigation, including litigation for past violations of the law that require *de novo* judicial review.

### **Materials and Resources for Further Reading**

- [Full text](#) of ballot measure 23-0015A1
- [Fiscal estimate and review of Initiative 23-0015A1](#) by the Legislative Analyst's Office as of September 21, 2023.
- The Orange County Register Editorial Board: [Wrong way to boost state transparency](#) (October 8, 2023)

---

**Attachment Four**

**CSAC Memo: GFA 2024 Legislative Advocacy Priorities**



OFFICERS

**President**

Chuck Washington  
Riverside County

**1st Vice President**

Bruce Gibson  
San Luis Obispo County

**2nd Vice President**

Jeff Griffiths  
Inyo County

**Past President**

Ed Valenzuela  
Siskiyou County



**CEO**

Graham Knaus

November 16, 2023

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration (GFA) Policy Committee

From: Kalyn Dean, Legislative Advocate  
Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate  
Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst

Re: **ACTION ITEM: 2024 GFA Legislative Advocacy Priorities**

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the committee approve the policy items described below as advocacy properties for the 2024 legislative session.

**Proposed 2024 Government Finance and Administration Legislative Priorities**

***Protecting Local Revenues and Fiscal Sustainability***

Counties need robust and reliable revenue sources to serve their communities. However, the limited abilities of counties to finance their services are constantly threatened by legislation or initiatives that aim to further reduce revenue opportunities or restrict the ability of voters to choose how they finance their community priorities. CSAC will continue to advocate against exclusions to property or sales and use taxes that reduce vital county revenue and fight to ensure the will of the voters is protected so communities can decide their own futures. CSAC will resist any action by the state to further divert local revenue streams to bridge the state’s budget deficits.

***State-Imposed Mandate Reimbursement Reform and Debt Repayment***

Counties should be paid timely for implementing the state’s priorities. CSAC will renew efforts to secure repayment of the remaining debt owed to counties for services already rendered due to new or expanded program or service mandates (approximately \$980 million owed to local governments as of spring 2023). Furthermore, CSAC will actively work with the Governor’s administration and local government stakeholders to review the current mandate reimbursement system, identify potential alternatives to establish greater payment security, and reduce the potential for payment backlogs on services already rendered. To this end, CSAC will lead discussions and advocate for alternatives to the process for mandate determination, methodologies, and processes for mandate cost estimates, among other solutions.

***Resist Further Expansion of Workers’ Compensation Presumptions and Changes to Individual Elements of the Overall System***

Continued legislative efforts in expanding injuries or conditions for which a connection with employment is presumed but not proven threaten the equilibrium of the workers’ compensation system. Additionally, recent efforts have included substantial modifications to certain workers’ compensation system segments that will unfairly penalize employers and counties while detrimentally impacting the overall quality of care delivered. Instead, counties should champion data-driven reform to the entirety of the system to find the appropriate balance between employers and employees. This legislative interest continues to be heightened

in an era of the COVID-19 pandemic, wildfires, and police reform. By granting superfluous, costly benefits to workers for injuries that may not be job-related, the financial solvency of the system will be detrimentally impacted. For the system to function correctly, it relies on the contributions of employers and employees to roughly equal the amount paid out for injuries suffered on the job. To protect county employers, CSAC will:

- Oppose efforts to create new presumptions and to expand existing presumptions without data-driven evidence that the current system is unjust; and
- Educate policymakers about how the workers' compensation system operates and that the system currently covers employee injuries and conditions that are job-related.



---

**Attachment Five**

**CSAC Memo: GFA 2023 Legislative Year in Review**



OFFICERS

**President**

Chuck Washington  
Riverside County

**1st Vice President**

Bruce Gibson  
San Luis Obispo County

**2nd Vice President**

Jeff Griffiths  
Inyo County

**Past President**

Ed Valenzuela  
Siskiyou County



**CEO**

Graham Knaus

November 16, 2023

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration Policy Committee

From: Kalyn Dean, Legislative Advocate  
Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate  
Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst

**Re: INFORMATIONAL ITEM: 2023 GFA Year in Review**

Included below is a summary of the bills on which the Government Finance and Administration team has taken positions throughout the 2023-2024 legislative session.

A complete list of 2023 legislation that CSAC monitored and advocated for related to Government Finance and Administration is also available on the [CSAC website](#).

***Broadband***

***Chaptered***

**[AB 286 \(Wood\)](#) (Chapter 645, Statutes of 2023) - Supported**

**Broadband infrastructure mapping**

This measure increases the information that the California Public Utilities Commission must include in the California Interactive Broadband Map (maintained for years as part of their administering of the California Advanced Services Fund program). The map must now include the provider and speed of broadband services for each address in the state and must include features for residents to provide feedback and self-reported data. Governor Newsom signed AB 286 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[AB 965 \(Carrillo, J.\)](#) (Chapter 553, Statutes of 2023) - Removed Opposition**

**Batch broadband permit processing**

This measure requires local agencies to process broadband project permits simultaneously in batches if the local agency receives two or more broadband permit applications at the same time from the same applicant for substantially similar projects sites. The measure includes specified limitations on this new process and authorizes local agencies to impose fees to effectuate these requirements. Governor Newsom signed AB 965 on October 8, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

***Vetoed***

**[AB 41 \(Holden\)](#) – Removed Support**

**Telecommunications: The Digital Equity in Video Franchising Act of 2023**

This measure would have made changes to The Digital Infrastructure in Video and Cable Act of 2006 and rename it as The Digital Equity in Video Franchising Act of 2023. The changes were intended to prioritize equal access to broadband infrastructure and strengthen anti-discrimination standards for cable franchises, but significant amendments were made while in the second chamber. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 41 on October 8, 2023, stating that the measure does not go far enough to meaningfully increase digital equity in California.

## ***Brown Act***

### ***Chaptered***

#### **[AB 557 \(Hart\)](#) (Chapter 534, Statutes of 2023) – Co-Sponsored**

##### **Emergency remote meeting procedures**

This measure eliminates the sunset date on emergency remote meeting procedures and improves on those procedures by extending the timeframe necessary to renew emergency meeting procedures to 45 days, an increase from the former 30-day period. AB 557 ensures that county governments can respond to emergencies promptly without needing to first establish the rules for remote meetings. Governor Newsom signed AB 557 on October 8, 2023. While AB 557 will take effect on January 1, 2024, the provisions of [AB 361 \(Rivas, R.\)](#) (Chapter 165, Statutes of 2021) that first established the emergency remote meeting procedures furthered by this bill will remain in effect until that date.

## ***Elections***

### ***Chaptered***

#### **[AB 398 \(Pellerin\)](#) (Chapter 398, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

##### **Requesting replacement ballots by phone**

This measure improves the ease of voting by mail for voters who never received, lost, or destroyed their ballots by allowing elections official to provide a replacement vote-by-mail ballot to a voter without the need for the voter to provide a specified statement under penalty of perjury. Effectively, the measure allows voters to request a replacement ballot by phone. Governor Newsom signed AB 398 on October 10, 2023, and it will take effect on January 1, 2024.

#### **[AB 764 \(Bryan\)](#) (Chapter 343, Statutes of 2023) – Removed Opposition**

##### **Local redistricting**

This measure revises the FAIR MAPS Act of 2019 to make changes to the laws dictating local redistricting processes. Governor Newsom signed AB 764 on October 7, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

#### **[AB 910 \(Wilson\)](#) (Chapter 669, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

##### **Qualifications and documentation for county auditor candidates**

This measure improves clarity for the qualifications for the office of county auditor and expands the documentation that must be submitted to a county elections official by a candidate for specified county offices and for a candidate's name to be printed on the ballot for a direct primary. Governor Newsom signed AB 910 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[AB 1037 \(Berman\)](#) (Chapter 673, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

**Electronic signature verification for vote-by-mail ballots**

This measure permits voters to electronically address a missing or mismatched signature on their vote-by-mail ballots, at the discretion of local elections officials. The measure allows, but does not require, local elections officials to implement these new provisions that expand existing methods to addressing missing or mismatched signatures on vote-by-mail ballots. Governor Newsom signed AB 1037 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[SB 386 \(Newman\)](#) (Chapter 870, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

**Referendum signature verification**

This measure extends the signature verification period for local election officials to make determinations of the number of qualified signatures on state and local petitions. The measure extends the signature verification period from 30 days to 60 days, under certain specified circumstances. Governor Newsom signed SB 386 on October 13, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[SB 485 \(Becker\)](#) (Chapter 611, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

**Election worker protections.**

This measure clarifies and broadens existing law that prohibits interfering with individuals in public positions that are conducting an election or conducting a canvass or interfering with voters exercising their right to vote. Governor Newsom signed SB 485 on October 8, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

***Vetoed***

**[AB 1248 \(Bryan\)](#) -- Opposed**

**Independent redistricting commissions**

This measure would have required counties with populations of 300,000 or above to create an independent redistricting commission for the 2030 redistricting process and every decennial sentence thereafter. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 1248 on October 7, 2023, citing concerns about state-mandated reimbursable costs.

***Government Liability***

***Chaptered***

**[AB 452 \(Addis\)](#) (Chapter 655, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

**Elimination of statute of limitations for childhood sexual assault**

This measure eliminates the statute of limitations to bring a civil action against an employer where there has been a claim against an employee of that organization for alleged child sexual abuse that occurs on or after January 1, 2024. Governor Newsom signed AB 452 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[SB 558 \(Rubio\)](#) (Chapter 887, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

**Extension of statute of limitations for retroactive claims of childhood sexual abuse**

This measure extends the statute of limitations relating to child sexual assault to allow for retroactive liability and revives expired claims against an employer where there has been a claim against an employee of that organization for penal code violations involving alleged child sexual abuse material (CSAM) prior to January 1, 2024. Victims of CSAM now have up to 10 years from the discovery of the material, or until they reach the age of 40, whichever comes first, to pursue legal action. This measure also expands the definition of childhood sexual assault to include obscene images of minors. Governor Newsom signed SB 558 on October 13, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

## ***General Government***

### ***Chaptered***

**[AB 1637 \(Irwin\)](#) (Chapter 877, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

#### **Uniform domains for local government websites and email addresses**

This measure requires cities and counties to ensure that their Internet website utilizes a “.gov” domain or a “.ca.gov” domain, and to ensure that each email address provided to its employees utilizes a “.gov” or a “.ca.gov” domain name. Governor Newsom signed AB 1637 on October 13, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2029.

**[SB 878](#), [SB 879](#), [SB 880](#), (Committee on Governance & Finance) (Chapters 30, 31, and 32, Statutes of 2023) - Supported**

#### **Annual administrative clean-up of public agency bond statute**

The annual Validating Acts protect investors from the chance that a minor error might undermine the legal integrity of a public agency’s bond. The three Validating Acts cure typographical, grammatical, and procedural errors. Governor Newsom signed these bills on June 29, 2023. The First Validating Act (SB 878) validates errors made before the date on which the bill is chaptered. The Second Validating Act (SB 879) became operative on September 1, validating mistakes made after SB 878 is chaptered. The Third Validating Act (SB 880) will take effect on January 1, 2024, covering the period between SB 879’s operative date and the end of 2023.

## ***Labor Relations***

### ***Chaptered***

**[AB 1484 \(Zbur\)](#) (Chapter 691, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

#### **Temporary public employees and collective bargaining**

This measure inflexibly mandates that temporary employees must be included within the same bargaining unit as permanent employees; and that the wages, hours, plus terms and conditions of employment for both temporary and permanent employees must be bargained together in a single memorandum of understanding. Governor Newsom signed AB 1484 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[SB 428 \(Blakespear\)](#) (Chapter 286, Statutes of 2023) - Supported**

#### **Temporary restraining orders and protective orders for employees**

This measure will allow an employer to seek a temporary restraining order on behalf of an employee who is being harassed by a third party such as a member of the public. This bill provides an effective balance of providing employers with the tools they need to protect their employees from undue harassment as a result of their jobs, while ensuring that the public retains the right to respectfully engage with their government. Governor Newsom signed SB 428 on September 30, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2025.

**SB 525 (Durazo) (Chapter 890, Statutes of 2023) - Removed Opposition**

**Increased minimum wage for health care workers**

This measure raises the minimum wage broadly across the health care sector to \$25 per hour for hourly workers and increases the salaries of full-time employees to no less than 150% of the health care worker minimum wage or 200% of the state’s applicable minimum wage, whichever is greater. Based on employer size, county population size, and hospital governmental payor mix, this measure utilizes a phased-in approach over several years. Once the \$25 per hour is reached, the minimum wage must increase annually by 3.5 % or the United States Consumer Price Index, whichever is lower. See tiers and timeline below. This measure applies to county hospitals, clinics (with county clinics exempted from the clinic provisions in the bill), mental health facilities, and correctional health facilities. Governor Newsom signed SB 525 on October 13, 2023. Counties can delay implementing these provisions until January 1, 2025.

<p><b>Early Adoption</b> Any covered health care facility employer with 10,000 or more full-time equivalent employees, OR A covered health facility owned, affiliated, or operated by a county with a population of more than 5 million.</p>	June 1, 2024 – May 31, 2025	June 1, 2025 – May 31, 2026	June 1, 2026 and thereafter
	\$23 per hour	\$24 per hour	\$25 per hour
<p><b>Mid-Adoption</b> Any covered health care facility employer with county population size 250,000 to 5 million.</p>	June 1, 2024 – May 31, 2026	June 1, 2026 – May 31, 2028	June 1, 2028 and thereafter
	\$21 per hour	\$23 per hour	\$25 per hour
<p><b>Late Adoption</b> Any covered health care facility with a population of less than 250,000.</p>	June 1, 2024 – May 31, 2033	June 1, 2033 – Thereafter	
	\$18 per hour with 3.5 percent increases annually	\$25 per hour	

**[SB 553 \(Cortese\)](#) (Chapter 289, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

**Workplace violence prevention plans**

This measure requires employers, including public employers, to create workplace violence prevention plans with several specified, prescriptive elements. Governor Newsom signed SB 553 on September 30, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

***Vetoed***

**[AB 504 \(Reyes\)](#) - Opposed**

**Striking as a human right**

This measure would have declared the acts of sympathy striking and honoring a strike line a human right, disallowing provisions in public employer policies or collective bargaining agreements going forward that would limit or prevent an employee's right to sympathy strike. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 504 on October 8, 2023.

**[SB 799 \(Portantino\)](#) - Opposed**

**Unemployment benefits for striking workers**

This measure would have allowed striking workers to draw unemployment benefits after two weeks of strike action. Governor Newsom vetoed SB 799 on September 30, 2023, citing the fiscal pressures that this measure would result in, exacerbating California's outstanding federal unemployment insurance debt trending to be nearly \$20 billion by the end of this year.

***Retirement***

***Chaptered***

**[AB 1020 \(Grayson\)](#) (Chapter 554, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

**Disability retirement presumption expansion**

This measure changes the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 (CERL) by expanding the scope of medical conditions and employment-related presumptions for disability retirement for firefighters, members in active law enforcement, and public safety members who have completed five years or more of service, for conditions that arise out of and in the course of employment; establishing parity between the CERL and the workers' compensation presumptions in the Labor Code. Governor Newsom signed AB 1020 on October 10, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

**[SB 548 \(Niello\)](#) (Chapter 307, Statutes of 2023) - Supported**

**Option for counties and courts to separate retirement systems**

This measure creates a voluntary option for interested counties and courts to establish a separate California Public Employment Retirement System contract for court employees, on or after January 1, 2024. Governor Newsom signed SB 548 on October 4, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

***Workers' Compensation***

***Chaptered***

**[SB 623 \(Laird\)](#) (Chapter 621, Statutes of 2023) - Opposed**

### **Worker's compensation presumption expansion**

This measure significantly expands California's current workers' compensation presumption for post-traumatic stress disorder to public safety dispatchers and communications workers until January 1, 2029. Governor Newsom signed SB 623 on October 8, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024.

#### ***Vetoed***

#### **[AB 1213 \(Ortega\)](#) - Opposed**

### **Calculation of workers' compensation temporary disability payments**

This would have required that when a utilization review denial of treatment is overturned by an independent medical review or by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, any temporary disability payments received during this period would not be included in the maximum aggregate calculation of temporary disability payments. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 1213 on October 8, 2023, citing a lack of data to justify the change.

## ***Revenue and Taxation***

### ***Chaptered***

#### **[AB 537 \(Berman\)](#) (Chapter 805, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

### **Short-term rental fee disclosure**

This measure prohibits a short-term rental from being advertised or offered at a room rate that does not include all required fees or charges. The measure also makes a knowing violation of those provisions subject to a civil penalty of up to \$10,000 and authorizes enforcement of those provisions via an action brought by a city attorney, district attorney, county counsel, or the California Attorney General. Governor Newsom signed AB 537 on October 13, 2023, which will take effect on July 1, 2024.

#### **[SB 96 \(Portantino\)](#) (Chapter 595, Statutes of 2023) – Supported**

### **Historic venue restoration funds**

This measure creates a dedicated funding source for infrastructure improvements for historic venues, as defined. The measure requires five percent of the total gross receipts of taxable sales resulting from specified events at historic venues be reallocated from the state to the jurisdictions that operate and maintain these historic venues, to be used for infrastructure improvements. Governor Newsom signed SB 96 on October 8, 2023, which will take effect on January 1, 2024, and sunsets on July 1, 2030.

### ***Held***

#### **[AB 321 \(Wilson\)](#) - Supported**

### **State Sales and Use Tax exemption for zero-emission public transportation ferries**

This measure would have established, from January 1, 2024 until January 1, 2029, a new exemption for the purchase of zero-emission ferries by public transit agencies from the state portion of the sales and use tax. Ultimately, this measure was held in Assembly Committee on Appropriations Suspense File and died.

## ***Constitutional Amendments Introduced in the Legislature***

### ***Passed***



**[ACA 1 \(Aguiar-Curry\) \(Chapter 173, Statutes of 2023\)](#) – Supported**

**Voter approval thresholds for affordable housing and public infrastructure**

This constitutional amendment would reduce the voter threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent for bond and special tax measures that help fund critical infrastructure, affordable housing projects, and permanent supportive housing for persons at risk of chronic homelessness. These changes would create parity for counties and other local governments for voter approval thresholds already granted to school districts. The legislature passed ACA 1 on September 14, 2023. Now that this measure has passed the Legislature, it will go before the California voters on the November 2024 statewide ballot for consideration. Constitutional amendments introduced in the Legislature do not require the Governor’s approval.

**[ACA 13 \(Ward\)](#) – Supported**

**Voter approval thresholds for constitutional amendments**

Currently, a simple majority of voters can decide to raise voter approval thresholds for future ballot measures (e.g., to at least two-thirds). This constitutional amendment would require any future initiative measure that would amend the constitution to increase voter approval requirements by the same proportion of voters. In addition, this measure guarantees in the state constitution the ability of local governments to submit advisory questions to voters. Ultimately, this measure was approved in both houses on September 14, 2023, and was held at the desk until November 1, 2023, so that it will not automatically be placed on the March 2024 ballot, but instead will be placed on the November 2024 ballot.

***Two-Year Bills***

Although the first year of the 2023-24 Legislative Session has concluded, bills that failed to pass pursuant to the 2023 legislative deadlines are still eligible for action in 2024. These bills are generally categorized into two different categories. First, measures that remain in the same chamber they originated are subject to a truncated timeline often referred to as the “House of Origin” deadline. These bills must be moved out of their assigned policy committees by January 12th and must be passed out of their house of origin by January 31st. However, measures that have already been approved in their house of origin and are pending in the second chamber are subject to the same deadlines as newly introduced legislation. The following measures are bills that CSAC’s GFA team took a position on in 2023 and became “two-year” bills that will be monitored over the next year.

**[AB 24 \(Haney\)](#) Emergency response: opioid antagonist kits.**

*CSAC Position: Removed opposition.*

**[AB 78 \(Ward\)](#) Grand juror compensation**

*CSAC Position: Oppose Unless Amended.*

**[AB 415 \(Rodriguez\)](#) Emergency Fairgrounds Communications Grant Act.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[AB 597 \(Rodriguez\)](#) Workers’ compensation: first responders: post-traumatic stress.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[AB 684 \(Ta\)](#) County veterans service officers: additional resources.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[AB 735 \(Berman\)](#) Workforce development. utility careers.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[AB 817 \(Pacheco\)](#) Open meetings. teleconferencing. subsidiary body.**

*CSAC Position: Co-sponsor.*

**[AB 972 \(Maienschein\)](#) Local assistance and grant program streamlining workgroup.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[AB 1156 \(Bonta\)](#) Workers' compensation: hospital employees.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[AB 1249 \(Ta\)](#) Sales and use taxes: exemption: tax holiday: school supplies.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[AB 1713 \(Gipson\)](#) Local agencies: federal funds reports.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[SB 16 \(Smallwood-Cuevas\)](#) Civil rights. discrimination. enforcement.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[SB 252 \(Gonzalez\)](#) Public retirement systems: fossil fuels: divestment.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[SB 375 \(Alvarado-Gil\)](#) Employment: employer contributions: employee withholdings: COVID-19 regulatory compliance credit.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*

**[SB 399 \(Wahab\)](#) Employer communications: intimidations.**

*CSAC Position: Oppose.*

**[SB 534 \(Padilla\)](#) Equitable access to job opportunity pilot program.**

*CSAC Position: Support.*