

ALERT

Legislative Session Wraps

CalChamber and Strategic Partners Secure Big Wins for Business



Jennifer Barrera

On September 30, Governor Gavin Newsom concluded review and action on more than 1,200 bills sent to his desk as part of the 2024 regular legislative session. This

year represented many major legislative wins for the California Chamber of Commerce working on behalf of California employers and I want to thank our members for their partnership in working to secure so many achievements for the business community.

Much of the credit goes to our policy team and other leading business organizations and local chambers who were critical strategic partners, helping us to effectively make the case for business with both legislators and the Governor this year.

PAGA Reform

One of the biggest success stories of 2024 was CalChamber’s efforts to negotiate important reforms to California’s Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). Alongside a robust coalition of business leaders, including California New Car Dealers Association, California Restaurant Association, California Retailers Association, Western Growers Association, and Airlines for America, CalChamber worked with labor and legislative leadership to forge meaningful change that will improve California’s business climate.

The resulting agreement has been called “monumental” and Governor Newsom’s signature on the two bills that encompassed the PAGA reform deal represented a successful conclusion to months of hard work and compromise among all parties. The new policies coming out of the reform measures will create more fairness in the process for small businesses and, importantly, incentivize them to understand and comply with labor laws that affect their workforce to the benefit of all.

Commentary

By Jennifer Barrera

Governor’s Action on CalChamber Priority Bills

CalChamber had major success on the artificial intelligence (AI) front as well. Our efforts to fight the most problematic bills that would have stifled California’s innovation economy were largely successful and a number of AI bills the CalChamber supported were signed into law.

The CalChamber helped secure a veto of **SB 1047 (Wiener; D-San Francisco)**, a bill that threatened to shut down the AI economy, as well as urging the Governor to sign CalChamber-sponsored **AB 2876 (Berman; D-Palo Alto)** on AI literacy.

Our policy team also contributed heavily to forging a compromise on critical goods movement legislation. **AB 98 (J. Carrillo; D-Palmdale)**, signed into law by Governor Newsom, will help California avoid the negative economic and environmental impacts that would

have arisen from much more stringent and unworkable legislation while still addressing community concerns. While any bill of this magnitude is expected to have future clean up, the bill will help maintain California’s position as a leader in both economic innovation and environmental stewardship.

A recap of CalChamber’s legislative agenda for 2024 shows that 51 support bills were signed by the Governor, 21 oppose bills vetoed and 30 oppose bills were signed. Of 18 identified CalChamber Job Killer bills in 2024, only one made it to the Governor’s desk. That bill — **SB 399 (Wahab; D-Hayward)**— was signed by the Governor as expected.

Importantly, overall, the business community fared very well, largely due to strong engagement by CalChamber, allied business groups, our local chamber partners and our advocacy-level member companies.

Major Policy Wins

Here are some major policy wins brought to you by CalChamber’s policy advocates for 2024:

Privacy

- **Vetoed: SB 1047 (Wiener; D-San Francisco) AI Models.** Requires frontier AI developers to comply with certain requirements before beginning to initially train specified “covered models” to

See CalChamber and Strategic: Page 4

Inside

- **Vote Record: Pages 5–10**

*Labor Law Corner***How to Figure Family Leave Eligibility for Remote Employees**

Ashley Huynh
Employment Law
Expert

Our corporate office in California has 49 employees, while we also have remote employees in other states — one in Nevada, two in New Mexico, and one in Arizona. The Arizona employee is requesting Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) leave. Can the Arizona employee be eligible for FMLA under the worksite requirement of 50 or more employees in a 75-mile radius?

Under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), covered employers are required to provide unpaid job-protected leaves of absence for qualifying reasons such as an employee's own serious health condition, to care for a qualified family member's serious health condition, baby bonding, pregnancy-related disability, or other qualified reasons.

For employees in California, the employer also will need to complete an analysis of whether California Family Rights Act (CFRA) leave or any other leave is applicable.

For employees outside of California, employers also will need to analyze if there are any applicable state/local leave of absence laws.

FMLA Eligibility

For an employee to be eligible for FMLA, the employee must meet the following key requirements:

- Employed at a worksite with 50 or more employees within a 75-mile radius; and
- Have worked for the employer for 12 months **and** 1,250 hours in the 12 months prior to the need for leave.

In this example, the Arizona employee satisfies the second requirement above, and we now need to determine the worksite.

Defining a Worksite

In most cases, the laws are applicable based upon where the employee is performing the work. For example, an Arizona employee who works from home is considered to be working from their Arizona home. However, FMLA eligibility revolves around the employee's worksite and how it is defined for the FMLA.

To determine FMLA eligibility, the employee's personal residence is not a worksite. (Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 825.111(a)(2)).

When an employee works remotely, their worksite is the office to which they report or from which their assignments are made. In other words, this would typically be where the employee's manager is located. Here, the employee's manager, and where the employee reports to and receives assignments from is the corporate office in California. Therefore, for FMLA purposes, the Arizona employee's

See How to Figure: Page 3

California Chamber Officers

Janet A. Liang
Chair

Maryam S. Brown
First Vice Chair

John A. Stowell
Second Vice Chair

Frank Washington
Third Vice Chair

Gregory S. Bielli
Immediate Past Chair

Jennifer Barrera
President and Chief Executive Officer

Alert (ISSN 0882-0929) is published weekly during legislative session with exceptions by California Chamber of Commerce, 1215 K Street, Suite 1400, Sacramento, CA 95814-3918. Subscription price is \$50 paid through membership dues.

Send email address changes to alert@calchamber.com. Publisher: Jennifer Barrera. Executive Editor: Ann Amioka. Art Director: Neil Ishikawa. Capitol Correspondent: Sara Proffitt.

Permission granted to reprint articles if credit is given to the California Chamber of Commerce Alert, citing original publication date of article, and reprint is emailed to Alert at address above.

Email: alert@calchamber.com. Home page: www.calchamber.com.

CalChamber-Sponsored Seminars/Trade Shows

More information at www.calchamber.com.
International Trade

Africa Health. GO-Biz awarding export vouchers. October 22–24, Cape Town, South Africa. patricia.utterback@gobiz.ca.gov.

Cosmoprof Asia Hong Kong. GO-Biz. **Registration of interest required.**

November 12–14, Hong Kong, China.
Rebuild Ukraine 2024: Business in Ukraine and Poland. GO-Biz. November 12–15, Warsaw, Poland. patricia.utterback@gobiz.ca.gov.
Exim 2025 Annual Conference.

Export-Import Bank of the United States. April 29, 2025–April 30, 2025, Washington, D.C. In-person only.

Registration will open later in 2024.
14th World Chambers Congress. World Chambers Congress. September 2, 2025–September 4, 2025, Melbourne, Australia.

Annual Meeting

In compliance with Article III of the bylaws, notice is hereby given that the annual meeting of the members of the California Chamber of Commerce, a mutual benefit corporation operating under the laws of the State of California, will be held on Friday, December 13, 2024 at 9 a.m. in the Cypress Ballroom at the Monterey Plaza Hotel & Spa, 400 Cannery Row, Monterey, California, for the transaction of whatever business may be necessary.

Next Alert: November 1

Minimum Fuel Inventories Bill Signed into Law



Legislation authorizing the California Energy Commission (CEC) to require refineries to maintain minimum transportation fuel inventories was signed into law this week.

The California Chamber of Commerce **opposed** the bill, **ABX2-1 (Hart; D-Santa Barbara)**, because it could create fuel shortages and increase average fuel prices for consumers and businesses.

Joining the CalChamber in opposing ABX2-1 were a coalition of labor groups, petroleum industry association groups, convenience store representatives, local chambers of commerce and economic partnerships, and some city and county governments.

Supporters of the bill besides Governor Gavin Newsom and Attorney General Rob Bonta included environmental and

environmental justice organizations, consumer groups, boards of supervisors, and labor groups.

Asked at the signing ceremony on October 14 whether the bill would lower gas prices, Governor Newsom said the bill will “provide a tool that has not existed in the past” that will actively address price spikes. “I don’t want to overpromise, but we now have the tools.”

Opposition Arguments

An industry economic analysis concludes that ABX2-1 could restrict wholesale fuel supplies, causing price increases and an equivalent supply reduction in the retail market that could increase retail prices as well.

California already imports the majority of its oil from out of state. A requirement to maintain minimum gasoline inventories would give out-of-state and foreign fuel providers a competitive advantage as they would not be subject to these burdensome and unnecessary regulations.

In addition, the minimum inventory level requirements could have a negative impact on refineries’ ability to make seasonal transitions from summer to winter blends.

ABX2-1 also gives the CEC undue authority to decide when a refinery could perform necessary maintenance.

Despite amendments to ABX2-1 that require the CEC to give worker and community safety “primary consideration,” substituting the judgment of a state agency for refinery operators on critical maintenance decisions could put refinery employees and the surrounding community at an unacceptable risk.

Moreover, the civil penalties imposed by ABX2-1 — allowing up to \$1 million per day — are overly punitive. A penalty structure like this would make it economically unfeasible to operate a refinery in California, leading to more detrimental downstream impacts on consumers, including an increase in prices.

Staff Contact: Ben Golombek

How to Figure Family Leave Eligibility for Remote Employees

From Page 2
worksite is considered to be the California corporate office.

Employee Count for FMLA Eligibility

To determine whether the 50-employee threshold within a 75-mile radius is met, count all employees whose worksite is considered the California corporate office or located within a 75-mile radius of the worksite, including remote workers who report to this office.

The one employee in Nevada, and two employees in New Mexico also report to and receive assignments from the California corporate office, so their worksite

also would be the California corporate office.

The count would be as follows:

- 49 employees (corporate office in California);
- 1 employee in Nevada (counted in corporate office in California);
- 2 employees in New Mexico (counted in corporate office in California);
- 1 employee in Arizona (counted in corporate office in California)

The total of 53 employees meets the requirement of 50 or more employees employed at a worksite within a 75-mile radius. Therefore, the Arizona employee requesting the leave of absence is eligible

for FMLA, even though the employee is physically located in Arizona.

Based on the worksite definition and employee count, the Arizona employee requesting FMLA is eligible for FMLA. (U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division, Field Assistance Bulletin 2023-1, *Telework Under the Fair Labor Standards Act and Family and Medical Leave Act*, February 9, 2023.)

Column based on questions asked by callers on the Labor Law Helpline, a service to California Chamber of Commerce preferred members and above. For expert explanations of labor laws and Cal/OSHA regulations, not legal counsel for specific situations, call (800) 348-2262 or submit your question at www.hrcalifornia.com.



CalChamber and Strategic Partners Secure Big Wins for Business

From Page 1

promote the safe and secure innovation of AI. CalChamber Opposed.

• **Stopped/Sent to Senate Inactive File: AB 2930 (Bauer-Kahan; D-Orinda) Automated Decision Tools (ADT) Impact Assessments.** Requires developers and deployers of ADTs to perform specified impact assessments prior to first using an ADT and annually thereafter, impacting every industry and businesses of all sizes, in addition to public entities. CalChamber Opposed.

Water

• **Vetoed: AB 828 (Connolly; D-San Rafael) Unfair Exemption.** Exempts certain water users from fees and regulations under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), increasing the burdens borne by agricultural and business water users. CalChamber Opposed.

• **Killed: AB 2079 (Bennett; D-Ventura) Groundwater Restriction.**

Prevents installation of new or replacement groundwater wells throughout much of the state. Circumvents the local control component of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) by creating statewide stringent requirements on wells rather than empowering locally informed solutions to groundwater sustainability. CalChamber Opposed Unless Amended.

• **Killed: AB 1337 (Wicks; D-Oakland) Water Rights.** Gives broad authority to State Water Board to curtail water rights of any seniority or claim of right. Allows curtailments to issue without a hearing, depriving water rights holders of due process. CalChamber Opposed.

Labor

• **Killed: SB 1446 (Smallwood-Cuevas; D-Los Angeles) Use of Technology in Grocery and Retail Stores.** Overly prescriptive mandate regarding the use of self-checkout stations that will frustrate customers and increase costs to retailers and requires stores to notify all workers and the public any time they choose to utilize new technology. CalChamber Opposed.

• **Killed: SB 1345 (Smallwood-Cuevas; D-Los Angeles) Prohibits Consid-**

eration of Conviction History in Employment. Effectively prohibits most employers from considering conviction history of an applicant, existing employee, or contractor in employment or contracting decisions. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Tax

• **Killed: AB 2829 (Papan; D-San Mateo) Tax on Digital Advertising Revenue.** Implements a new tax on digital ads of 5%. In addition to increasing taxes on businesses, it is likely unconstitutional. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

• **Killed: SB 1327 (Glazer; D-Contra Costa) Tax on Digital Advertising Revenue.** Implements a discriminatory 7.25% tax on the revenue generated from the sale of digital advertising. The bill is likely unconstitutional and will lead to costly litigation for the state. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Unemployment Insurance Expansion

• **Killed: SB 1434 (Durazo; D-Los Angeles) Huge Increases to Unemployment Insurance Taxes.** Increases UI taxes to fund UI benefit hikes of up to 55%, as well as providing for subsequent increases based on inflation. Also creates entirely new UI program to provide benefits to workers who do not qualify for traditional UI, to be funded by a new tax on California employers. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

• **Killed: SB 1116 (Portantino; D-Burbank) Increased Unemployment Insurance Taxes to Subsidize Striking Workers.** Allows striking workers to claim UI benefits when they choose to strike. Because the UI Fund is paid for entirely by employers, SB 1116 will effectively add more debt onto California employers. Moreover, SB 1116 will effectively force employers to subsidize strikes at completely unrelated businesses because the UI Fund's debt adds taxes for all employers, regardless of whether they've had a strike. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Environmental Policy

• **Killed: ACA 16 (Bryan; D-Los**

Angeles) Environmental Rights. Has far-reaching negative consequences that would impair government operations, stunt development for new housing, infrastructure and clean energy project development and has strong potential to destabilize California's economy. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Housing

• **Killed: AB 2230 (Bennett; D-Ventura) Worsens Housing Crisis.** Substantially shuts down the production of housing in California by blocking the inflow of crucial capital that nearly all housing production relies on. The Cartwright Act already protects against price fixing so expanding it as contemplated by this bill is unnecessary and will have the unintended consequence of making any return on investment a crime. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Health Care

• **Killed: AB 2200 (Kalra; D-San Jose) Government-Run Health Care.** Forces all Californians into a new untested state government health plan, with no ability to opt out while eliminating Medicare for California seniors and increasing taxes at least \$250 billion a year on workers, income, jobs, goods and services. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

• **Vetoed: SB 966 (Wiener; D-San Francisco) Pharmacy Network Disruption.** Limits the use of preferred pharmacy networks and financial incentives which will lead to increased drug costs for patients. CalChamber Opposed Unless Amended.

• **Vetoed: AB 3129 (Wood; D-Healdsburg) Stifles Free Market Transactions for Health Entities.** Requires private investors to obtain the consent of the California Attorney General before acquiring or effecting a change of control with respect to certain health care entities. CalChamber Opposed.

Jennifer Barrera is president and CEO of the California Chamber of Commerce.

CalChamber Vote Record: Major Bills 2024



This report for the second year of the 2023–2024 legislative session focuses on California legislators' votes on California Chamber of Commerce priority bills.

This is the 50th vote record the CalChamber has compiled in response to numerous requests from member firms and local chambers of commerce that would like a gauge by which to measure the performance of their legislators.

Partial Picture

No vote record can tell the entire story of a legislator's attitude and actions on issues of importance to business. To fully evaluate your legislative representative, consult the legislative journals and examine your legislator's votes in committee and on floor issues.

You can view these via links at www.calchambervotes.com.

Many anti-business bills were rejected by legislators in policy or fiscal committees, thus stopping proposals before they reached the floor for a vote.

Most bills in this report cover major business issues that are of concern to both small and large companies.

The CalChamber recognizes that there are many bills supported or opposed by business that are not included in this vote record and analysis.

Factors Considered

The CalChamber considers the following factors in selecting vote record bills:

- The bills and votes reflect legislators' attitudes toward private enterprise, fiscal responsibility and the business climate.
- Each bill was a CalChamber priority in a particular field. Priority bills generally have appeared in the "Status Report" sections of *Alert*.
- This year's vote record charts show selected key committee votes where a committee's actions stopped an onerous proposal before it could be voted on by the entire house.

• The vote record also covers 11 bills voted on by the full Senate and 9 bills voted on by the full Assembly.

• Unless otherwise noted, final floor votes are shown. Concurrence votes are considered final votes.

When 'Not Voting' Helps

Sometimes a legislator is unwilling to vote against a colleague but is willing to support the CalChamber's opposition to a bill. In such cases, a legislator may abstain from voting, which will hinder passage of a bill, just as a "no" vote does.

To recognize that not voting can aid the CalChamber's opposition to a bill, the vote record includes the number of times legislators did not vote "aye" on a CalChamber-opposed bill in the total for the column listing actions "in accord with" the CalChamber's position, if the legislator was not absent for the day.

Priority Bills

Artificial Intelligence/Privacy

• **AB 2481 (Lowenthal; D-Long Beach) Youth Social Media Protection Act.** Requires "large social media platforms" to create a process to verify an expansive list of individuals as "verified reporters," including school principals and counselors, among others. Passed Assembly, May 22, 46-0. Passed Senate, August 29, 31-3. Assembly concurred in Senate amendments, August 31, 58-0. Signed—Chapter 832. CalChamber Opposed.

• **AB 2930 (Bauer-Kahan; D-Orinda) Automated Decision Tools (ADT) Impact Assessments.** Requires developers and deployers of ADTs to perform specified impact assessments prior to first using an ADT and annually thereafter, impacting every industry and businesses of all sizes, in addition to public entities. Passed Assembly, May 21, 50-14. Senate Inactive File August 31. CalChamber Opposed.

• **SB 1047 (Wiener; D-San Francisco) AI Models.** Requires frontier AI developers to comply with certain requirements before beginning to initially train specified "covered models" to promote the safe and secure innovation of AI. Passed Senate, May 21, 32-1 (vote shown). Passed Assembly, August 28, 48-16. Senate concurred in Assembly amendments August 29, 30-9. Vetoed. CalChamber Opposed.

Climate Change

• **SB 1497 (Menjivar; D-Los Angeles) Polluters Pay Climate Cost Recovery Act of 2024.** Imposes an ill-defined

tax on a broad set of entities that will increase costs for goods and services in California. Passed Senate Environmental Quality Committee, April 17, 5-2 (vote shown). Passed Senate Judiciary Committee, April 23, 7-2 (vote shown). Senate Inactive File, May 22. Failed deadline. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024**.

Environmental Regulation

• **ACA 16 (Bryan; D-Los Angeles) Environmental Rights.** Has far-reaching negative consequences that would impair government operations, stunt development for new housing, infrastructure and clean energy project development and the strong potential to destabilize California's economy. Passed Assembly Natural Resources Committee, April 8, 8-3. Passed Assembly Appropriations Committee, May 16, 11-4. Assembly floor, May 20. Failed deadline. Oppose/**Job Killer 2024**.

Health Care

• **AB 2200 (Kalra; D-San Jose) Government-Run Health Care.** Forces all Californians into a new untested state government health plan, with no ability to opt out while eliminating Medicare for California seniors and increasing taxes at least \$250 billion a year on workers, income, jobs, goods and services. Passed Assembly Health Committee, April 23, 9-4. Held in Assembly Appropriations Suspense File, May 16. Failed deadline. Oppose/**Job Killer 2024**.

• **AB 3129 (Wood; D-Healdsburg) Stifles Free Market Transactions for Health Entities.** Requires private investors to obtain the consent of the California Attorney General before acquiring or effecting a change of control with respect to certain health care entities. Passed Assembly, May 21, 50-16. Passed Senate, August 31, 21-11. Assembly concurred in Senate amendments, August 31, 49-14. Vetoed. Oppose.

Housing and Land Use

• **AB 98 (J. Carrillo; D-Palmdale) Warehouse Compromise.** Provides a reasonable compromise that avoids the negative economic and environmental impacts that would arise from much more stringent and unworkable legislation while still addressing community concerns. Passed Senate, August 31, 22-16. Assembly concurred in Senate amendments, August 31, 46-17. Signed—Chapter 931. CalChamber neutral urging aye vote.

See Next Page

CalChamber Vote Record: Major Bills 2024

From Previous Page

Labor and Employment

• **AB 2288 (Kalra; D-San Jose)**
Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). Creates a long-overdue reform of PAGA. Passed Senate, June 27, 39-0. Assembly concurred in Senate amendments, June 27, 77-0. Signed—Chapter 44. CalChamber Supported.

• **AB 2374 (Haney; D-San Francisco)**
Joint Liability for Businesses of All Sizes. Originally imposed new statutory joint liability on business of any size that contracts for janitorial services if a contractor violates the Displaced Janitor Opportunity Act and placed new mandates on those businesses that should be assigned to the contractor. Job killer status removed due to May 16, 2024 amendments removing joint liability portion of the bill and making other changes. CalChamber remains opposed unless amended due to the requirement that an awarding authority must provide certain notifications to a union representing another entity's employees. Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee, April 3, 5-1 (vote shown). Passed Assembly, May 22, 52-11. In Senate Appropriations Suspense File, August 5. Failed deadline CalChamber Opposed Unless Amended/**Former Job Killer 2024.**

• **AB 2499 (Schiavo; D-Chatsworth)**
Leave Expansion. Significantly expands 12-week leave related to crimes and lowers threshold of applicability to employers with just five employees. Job Killer tag removed due to May 20, 2024 amendments and June 6, 2024 amendments applying leave to employers with 25 or more employees, limiting qualifying reasons for taking leave, and limiting duration of time for specific qualifying reasons. Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee, April 3, 5-0 (vote shown). Passed Assembly Judiciary Committee, April 16, 7-2 (vote shown). Passed Assembly May 23, 56-8. Passed Senate, August 27, 32-7. Assembly concurred in Senate amendments, August 28, 60-11. Signed—Chapter 967. CalChamber Opposed/**Former Job Killer 2024.**

• **AB 2751 (Haney; D-San Francisco)**
Prohibition on Employee Communications During Certain Hours. Prohibits any employee working for an employer of any size from contacting another employee outside of their normal work hours except in very narrow circumstances and would subject employer to costly

litigation for any dispute as to whether the communication was permissible. Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee, April 17, 4-2. In Assembly Appropriations Suspense File, May 8. Failed deadline. Oppose/**Job Killer 2024.**

• **SB 92 (Umberg; D-Santa Ana)**
Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). Creates a long-overdue reform of PAGA. Passed Assembly, June 27, 76-0. Senate concurred in Assembly amendments, June 27, 40-0. Signed—Chapter 45. CalChamber Supported.

• **SB 399 (Wahab; D-Hayward)**
Bans Employer Speech. Chills employer speech regarding religious and political matters, including unionization. Is likely unconstitutional under the First Amendment and preempted by the National Labor Relations Act. Passed Assembly, August 30, 51-17. Senate concurred in Assembly amendments, August 31, 31-9. Signed—Chapter 670. CalChamber Opposed/**Two Year Job Killer.**

• **SB 1446 (Smallwood-Cuevas; D-Los Angeles)**
Use of Technology in Grocery and Retail Stores. Overly prescriptive mandate regarding the use of self-checkout stations that will frustrate customers and increase costs to retailers and requires stores to notify all workers and the public any time they choose to utilize new technology. Passed Senate, May 21, 25-12. In Assembly Rules Committee, August 15. Failed deadline. CalChamber Opposed.

Product Regulation

• **SB 903 (Skinner; D-Berkeley)**
Bans All Uses of PFAS. Prohibits the use of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in all commercial and consumer products by 2032 unless Department of Toxic Substances Control is petitioned and makes an affirmative determination that the PFAS in a particular product is an unavoidable use. Passed Senate Environmental Quality Committee, April 3, 4-2 (vote shown). In Senate Appropriations Suspense File, April 29. Failed Deadline. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Taxation

• **AB 2829 (Papan; D-San Mateo)**
Tax on Digital Advertising Revenue. Implements a new tax on digital ads of 5%. In addition to increasing taxes on businesses, it is likely unconstitutional. Passed Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee, April 23, 6-3 (vote shown). In Assembly Revenue and Taxation Suspense File, April 29. Failed deadline. Oppose/**Job Killer 2024.**

Key to This Section

Y means voted for bill.

N means voted against bill.

• means not voting.

— means absent.

† means not applicable; no opportunity to vote.

Boldface type indicates votes in accord with CalChamber position.

Red columns are Job Killers.

• **SB 1327 (Glazer; D-Contra Costa)**
Tax on Digital Advertising Revenue. Implements a discriminatory 7.25% tax on the revenue generated from the sale of digital advertising. The bill is likely unconstitutional and will lead to costly litigation for the state. Passed Senate, June 27, 27-7. In Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee, August 8. Failed deadline. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

• **SB 1116 (Portantino; D-Burbank)**
Increased Unemployment Insurance Taxes to Subsidize Striking Workers. Allows striking workers to claim UI benefits when they choose to strike. Because the UI Fund is paid for entirely by employers, SB 1116 will effectively add more debt onto California employers. Moreover, SB 1116 will effectively force employers to subsidize strikes at completely unrelated businesses because the UI Fund's debt adds taxes for all employers, regardless of whether they've had a strike. Passed Senate, May 21, 22-12. Failed passage in Assembly Insurance Committee, June 26, 6-2. CalChamber Opposed/**Job Killer 2024.**

Water Supply

• **AB 2079 (Bennett; D-Ventura)**
Groundwater Restriction. Prevents installation of new or replacement groundwater wells throughout much of the state. Circumvents the local control component of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) by creating statewide stringent requirements on wells rather than empowering locally informed solutions to groundwater sustainability. Passed Assembly, May 20, 41-17. Failed passage in Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee, June 11, 5-6. Failed deadline. CalChamber Opposed Unless Amended.

2024 Senate Vote Record

	AI/Privacy	AB 2481 Youth Social Media	AB 2930 Automated Decision Tools	SB 1047 AI Models	Climate Change	SB 1497 Climate Tax	Environmental Regulation	ACA 16 Environmental Rights	Health Care	AB 2200 Government-Run Health Care	AB 3129 Free Market Transactions	Housing and Land Use	AB 98 Warehouse Compromise	Labor and Employment	AB 2288 PAGA	AB 2374 Joint Liability	AB 2499 Leave Expansion	AB 2751 Employee Communications	SB 92 PAGA	SB 399 Bans Employer Speech	SB 1446 Self-Checkout Stations	Product Regulation	SB 903 Bans PFAS Use	Taxation	AB 2829 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	SB 1327 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	Unemployment Insurance	SB 1116 UI for Strikers	Water	AB 2079 Groundwater Restriction	In Accord with CalChamber	Not in Accord with CalChamber	Absent	
Allen, B. (D)	Y	Y	—	Y ^(x2)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Alvarado-Gil, M. (R)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Archuleta, B. (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ashby, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Atkins, Toni (D)	Y	Senate Inactive File.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Becker, Josh (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Blakespear, C. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Bradford, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Caballero, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Cortese, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Dahle, B. (R)	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•	N	•
Dodd, B. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Durazo, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Eggman, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Glazer, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Gonzalez, L. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y ^(x2)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Grove, S. (R)	•	N	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Hurtado, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Jones, B. (R)	N	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Laird, J. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Limón, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
McGuire, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Menjivar, C. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Min, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Newman, J. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Nguyen, J. (R)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Niello, R. (R)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Ochoa Bogh, R. (R)	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Padilla, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Portantino, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Roth, R. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rubio, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Seyarto, K. (R)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Skinner, N. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Smallwood-Cuevas, L. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Stern, H. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Umberg, T. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wahab, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wiener, S.(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wilk, S. (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Y^(x2): Same vote in both committees.

2024 Assembly Vote Record

	AI/Privacy			Climate Change			Environmental Regulation			Health Care			Housing and Land Use			Labor and Employment			Product Regulation			Taxation			Unemployment Insurance			Water			In Accord with CalChamber			Not in Accord with CalChamber			Absent		
	AB 2481 Youth Social Media	AB 2930 Automated Decision Tools	SB 1047 AI Models	SB 1497 Climate Tax	ACA 16 Environmental Rights	AB 2200 Government-Run Health Care	AB 3129 Free Market Transactions	AB 98 Warehouse Compromise	AB 2288 PAGA	AB 2374 Joint Liability	AB 2499 Leave Expansion	AB 2751 Employee Communications	SB 92 PAGA	SB 399 Bans Employer Speech	SB 1446 Self-Checkout Stations	SB 903 Bans PFAS Use	AB 2929 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	SB 1327 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	SB 1116 UI for Strikers	AB 2079 Groundwater Restriction	In Accord with CalChamber	Not in Accord with CalChamber	Absent																
Addis, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y	No Assembly Floor Vote.	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	No Assembly Floor Vote.	+	+	Y	+	3	6	0																
Aguiar-Curry, C. (D)	Y	Y	Y	No Assembly Floor Vote.	+	•	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	No Assembly Floor Vote.	+	+	•	+	5	5	0																
Alanis, J. (R)	Y	N	N		+	+	N	•	Y	•	•	N	Y	N	N		+	+	N	+	11	2	0																
Alvarez, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+		+	+	•	Y	5	5	0																
Arambula, J. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	Y	•	•	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+		+	+	+	—	3	6	1																
Bains, J. (D)	Y	•	N		+	+	N	•	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+		+	+	+	N	6	3	0																
Bauer-Kahan, R. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	•	+	Y	Y*	Y		In Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.	Y	•	Y	6	7	0																
Bennett, S. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+	+	+	Y	3	6	0															
Berman, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+	•	Y	4	6	0																
Boerner, T. (D)	Y	Y	•		+	+	•	•	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+	+	+	Y	4	5	0															
Bonta, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y		+	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+	+	+	Y	3	7	0															
Bryan, I. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	+		+	Y	3	10	0																	
Calderon, L. (D)	—	Y	Y	+	+	—	•	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+	+	In Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.		Y	•	4	4	2																	
Carrillo, J. (D)	Y	•	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+		+	•	5	4	0																	
Carrillo, W. (D)	Y	Y	•	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y*	+	+	+		+	Y	5	8	0																	
Cervantes, S. (D)	Y	—	•	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	—	+	+	+		+	—	4	2	3																	
Chen, P. (R)	•	N	—	+	+	•	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	N	•	8	1	1																		
Connolly, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	8	0																		
Dahle, M. (R)	•	—	•	+	+	N	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	+	—	6	1	2																		
Davies, L. (R)	•	N	N	+	+	N	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	+	N	8	1	0																		
Dixon, D. (R)	•	N	N	+	+	N	N	Y	+	N	+	Y	N	N	N	+	+	N	11	1	0																		
Essayli, B. (R)	•	•	•	+	+	•	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	+	N	8	1	0																		
Flora, H. (R)	•	N	•	N	N	N	N	Y	N	•	N	Y	N	N	+	+	+	N	14	1	0																		
Fong, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	6	0																		
Friedman, L. (D)	Y	—	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	6	1																		
Gabriel, J. (D)	Y	—	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	—	3	4	2																		
Gallagher, J. (R)	Y	N	•	+	+	N	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	+	N	7	2	0																		
Garcia, E. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	6	0																		
Gipson, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	•	4	5	0																		
Grayson, T. (D)	•	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	•	5	4	0																		
Haney, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	8	0																		
Hart, G. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	6	0																		
Holden, C. (D)	Y	—	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	5	1																		
Hoover, J. (R)	Y	N	N	N	+	N	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	N	N	+	+	N	10	2	0																		
Irwin, J. (D)	•	Y	N	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	•	•	•	+	+	Y	8	3	0																		
Jackson, C. (D)	Y	Y	•	+	+	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	4	5	0																		
Jones-Sawyer, R. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	—	+	+	+	—	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	1	7	2																		
Kalra, Ash (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y _(x2)	+	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	3	11	0																		
Lackey, T. (R)	•	N	•	+	+	•	N	Y	+	+	+	Y	N	+	+	+	+	N	8	1	0																		
Lee, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	•	Y	+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	Y	Y	2	10	0																		

*Members who laid off voting before total reached 41 "aye" votes.

Y_(x2): Same vote in both committees.

2024 Assembly Vote Record

	AI/Privacy	AB 2481 Youth Social Media	AB 2930 Automated Decision Tools	SB 1047 AI Models	Climate Change	SB 1497 Climate Tax	Environmental Regulation	ACA 16 Environmental Rights	Health Care	AB 2200 Government-Run Health Care	AB 3129 Free Market Transactions	Housing and Land Use	AB 98 Warehouse Compromise	Labor and Employment	AB 2288 PAGA	AB 2374 Joint Liability	AB 2499 Leave Expansion	AB 2751 Employee Communications	SB 92 PAGA	SB 399 Bans Employer Speech	SB 1446 Self-Checkout Stations	Product Regulation	SB 903 Bans PFAS Use	Taxation	AB 2929 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	SB 1327 Tax on Digital Ad Revenue	Unemployment Insurance	SB 1116 UI for Strikers	Water	AB 2079 Groundwater Restriction	In Accord with CalChamber	Not in Accord with CalChamber	Absent
Low, E. (D)	Y	Y	N				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	4	5	0		
Lowenthal, J. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	Y _(x2)			Y			•	Y	4	9	0		
Maienschein, B. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			•	4	7	0			
Mathis, D. (R)	Y	—	Y				+	+	N	N	N	N	N	—	+	+	+	+	—	N	+			+			+	—	2	3	4		
McCarty, K. (D)	Y	Y	N				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	•	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	7	0		
McKinnor, T. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	•	•	•	•	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			Y	Y	4	7	0		
Muratsuchi, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y				Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	7	0		
Nguyen, S. (D)	•	Y	•				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	—	6	2	1		
Ortega, L. (D)	—	Y	—				+	+	—	—	—	—	—	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	—	Y _(x2)			Y			Y	Y	2	9	5		
Pacheco, B. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	•	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	•	6	4	0		
Papan, D. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	6	0		
Patterson, Jim (R)	•	N	N				+	+	N	N	N	N	N	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	N	+			+			+	N	8	1	0		
Patterson, Joe (R)	•	N	N				N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	N	N			N		In Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee.	N	N	13	1	0		
Pellerin, G. (D)	Y	Y	Y				Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	•	5	5	0		
Petrie-Norris, C. (D)	•	Y	N				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			•	•	8	2	0		
Quirk-Silva, S. (D)	Y	Y	•				+	+	Y	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+			+			+	Y	4	5	0		
Ramos, J. (D)	Y	•	Y				+	+	Y	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	•	5	4	0		
Rendon, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	6	0		
Reyes, E. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	7	0		
Rivas, L. (D)	Y	•	N				+	+	Y	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	—	4	4	1		
Rivas, R. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	6	0		
Rodriguez, F. (D)	•	•	•				+	•	Y	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	•	8	2	0		
Rubio, B. (D)	•	•	Y				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			•	•	8	2	0		
Sanchez, K. (R)	•	N	N				+	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	+	N	+	+	Y	N	+			+			+	N	10	1	0		
Santiago, M. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	7	0		
Schiavo, P. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	7	0		
Soria, E. (D)	Y	•	Y				+	+	Y	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+			+			+	N	5	4	0		
Ta, T. (R)	•	N	N				+	+	N	N	N	N	N	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	N	+			+			+	N	8	1	0		
Ting, P. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			+	Y	3	6	0		
Valencia, A. (D)	Y	•	N				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+			+			Y	Y	6	4	0		
Villapudua, C. (D)	Y	Y	•				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	•	+			+			+	•	6	3	0		
Waldron, M. (R)	•	N	Y				+	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	+	•	+	+	Y	N	+			+			+	N	9	2	0		
Wallis, G. (R)	Y	•	N				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	N	+			+			•	N	8	2	0		
Ward, C. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y _(x2)			Y			+	Y	3	12	0		
Weber, A. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	•	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y*	+			+			+	Y	5	5	0		
Wicks, B. (D)	Y	Y	Y				Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	Y			Y			+	Y	3	9	0		
Wilson, L. (D)	•	Y	Y				+	+	•	•	•	•	•	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	Y			•			+	•	7	4	0		
Wood, J. (D)	Y	Y	Y				Y	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+	+	+	+	Y	Y	+			+			Y	Y	3	8	0		
Zbur, R. (D)	Y	Y	Y				+	+	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	•	Y	Y	Y			+			+	Y	4	9	0		

*Members who laid off voting before total reached 41 "aye" votes.

Y_(x2): Same vote in both committees.

CalChamber Best Business Votes 2024

Legislators are listed in descending order according to how often they voted in accord with the California Chamber of Commerce position (first number) versus how often their votes were not in accord with the CalChamber position (second number) in 2024. Total votes may not match the vote record chart because the tally for absences is not included in this list. Votes when a legislator was absent are not included in calculating percentages.

80% or more with CalChamber	60%-79% with CalChamber	30%-59% with CalChamber	Less than 30% with CalChamber
-----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

Senate

Nguyen, Janet (R)	12-1
Niello, Roger (R)	11-1
Dahle, Brian (R)	11-2
Grove, Shannon (R)	10-1
Jones, Brian W. (R)	10-1
Seyarto, Kelly (R)	10-1
Ochoa Bogh, Rosilicic (R)	9-2
Alvarado-Gil, Marie (R)	8-3
Wilk, Scott (R)	7-5
Eggman, Susan Talamantes (D)	6-5
Becker, Josh (D)	6-5
Caballero, Anna (D)	6-6
Min, Dave (D)	6-6
Glazer, Steve (D)	5-6
Newman, Josh (D)	5-6
Portantino, Anthony (D)	5-6
Archuleta, Bob J. (D)	5-7
Blakespear, Catherine (D)	4-7
Bradford, Steven (D)	4-7
Dodd, Bill (D)	4-7
Rubio, Susan (D)	4-7
Stern, Henry (D)	4-7
Umberg, Tom (D)	4-8
Allen, Ben (D)	3-8
Atkins, Toni (D)	3-8
Cortese, Dave (D)	3-8
Limón, Monique (D)	3-8
McGuire, Mike (D)	3-8
Padilla, Steve (D)	3-8
Smallwood-Cuevas, Lola (D)	3-8
Wiener, Scott (D)	3-8
Ashby, Angelique (D)	3-9
Durazo, Maria Elena (D)	3-9
Hurtado, Melissa (D)	3-9
Laird, John. (D)	3-9
Wahab, Aisha (D)	3-9
Menjivar, Caroline (D)	3-10
Skinner, Nancy (D)	3-10
Gonzalez, Lena (D)	3-11
Roth, Richard (D)	2-9

Assembly

Flora, Heath (R)	14-1
Patterson, Joe (R)	13-1
Dixon, Diane (R)	11-1
Alanis, Juan (R)	11-2
Sanchez, Kate (R)	10-1
Hoover, Josh (R)	10-2
Waldron, Marie (R)	9-2
Chen, Philip (D)	8-1
Davies, Laurie (R)	8-1
Lackey, Tom (R)	8-1
Patterson, Jim (R)	8-1
Ta, Tri (R)	8-1
Essayli, Bill (R)	8-1
Petrie-Norris, Cottie (D)	8-2
Rodriguez, Freddie (D)	8-2
Rubio, Blanca (D)	8-2
Wallis, Greg (R)	8-2
Dahle, Megan (R)	6-1
Gallagher, James (R)	7-2
Wilson, Lori D. (D)	7-4
Irwin, Jacqui (D)	8-3
Nguyen, Stephanie (D)	6-2
Bains, Jasmeet (D)	6-3
Villapudua, Carlos (D)	6-3
Pacheco, Blanca (D)	6-4
Valencia, Avelino (D)	6-4
Cervantes, Sabrina (D)	4-2
Bauer-Kahan, Rebecca (D)	6-7
Carrillo, Juan (D)	5-4
Grayson, Tim (D)	5-4
Ramos, James C. (D)	5-4
Soria, Esmeralda (D)	5-4
Aguir-Curry, Cecilia (D)	5-5
Alvarez, David (D)	5-5
Pellerin, Gail (D)	5-5
Weber, Akilah (D)	5-5
Carrillo, Wendy (D)	5-8

Calderon, Lisa (D)	4-4
Rivas, Luz (D)	4-4
Boerner, Tasha (D)	4-5
Gipson, Mike (D)	4-5
Jackson, Corey (D)	4-5
Low, Evan (D)	4-5
Quirk-Silva, Sharon (D)	4-5
Berman, Marc (D)	4-6
Maienschein, Brian (D)	4-7
McKinnor, Tina (D)	4-7
Lowenthal, Josh (D)	4-9
Zbur, Rick Chavez (D)	4-9
Gabriel, Jesse (D)	3-4
Holden, Chris (D)	3-5
Addis, Dawn (D)	3-6
Arambula, Joaquin (D)	3-6
Bennett, Steve (D)	3-6
Fong, Mike (D)	3-6
Friedman, Laura (D)	3-6
Garcia, Eduardo (D)	3-6
Hart, Gregg (D)	3-6
Papan, Diane (D)	3-6
Rendon, Anthony (D)	3-6
Rivas, Robert (D)	3-6
Ting, Phil (D)	3-6
Bonta, Mia (D)	3-7
McCarty, Kevin (D)	3-7
Muratsuchi, Al (D)	3-7
Reyes, Eloise (D)	3-7
Santiago, Miguel (D)	3-7
Schiavo, Pilar (D)	3-7
Mathis, Devon (R)	2-3
Connolly, Damon (D)	3-8
Haney, Matt (D)	3-8
Wood, Jim (D)	3-8
Wicks, Buffy (D)	3-9
Bryan, Isaac (D)	3-10
Kalra, Ash (D)	3-11
Ward, Chris (D)	3-12
Lee, Alex (D)	2-10
Ortega, Liz (D)	2-9
Jones-Sawyer, Reggie (D)	1-7

California Motion Picture and TV Industry Dynamic, Competitive



As the California Law Revision Commission (CLRC) met earlier this month for

another deep dive on competition issues, a [newly released report](#) has found that California’s motion picture and television industry (aka the “audiovisual industry”) is robustly competitive.

Prepared by Compass Lexecon at the behest of the Motion Picture Association, the findings repudiate a CLRC Working Group’s conclusion that the audiovisual sector is implicitly uncompetitive because it is “overly concentrated.”

Competitive Industry

In fact, the study found that:

The audiovisual industry is a dynamic and highly competitive industry with numerous participants providing an increasingly diverse array of content across new and innovative delivery platforms, benefitting consumers. Furthermore, the empirical evidence demonstrates that the audiovisual labor market is an important employer in California, is a well-functioning labor market,

and pays wages above the average of other industries.

A competitive industry provides benefits to consumers through low prices, innovation, and improvements or better value of goods and services. Compass Lexecon found that the empirical evidence on outcomes in the audiovisual industry, such as streaming services, short-form video, increasing output and quality, and pricing “is consistent with a competitive industry (and) supports the conclusion that the audiovisual industry is well-functioning, dynamic, and exhibits signs of healthy competition.”

New entrants, like Apple, Netflix and Amazon have been able to significantly impact the marketplace — both critically and commercially. The study also found that the audiovisual industry is a well-functioning labor market, providing benefits to workers within the industry. Nationwide employment in production and distribution has been stable over time (except during the COVID-19 pandemic and Hollywood strikes), and wages are higher than national averages and have increased over time.

The California Law Revision Commission was directed by the Legislature to examine whether California

should make major changes to its antitrust and competition laws, affecting every industry in the state, from large technology companies to media, health care, grocery and small businesses, among many others.

No Need for Radical Change

The California Chamber of Commerce has made the case at several [prior hearings](#) that California’s antitrust and competition laws do not need to be radically changed to target single firms that improve their market position through legal and naturally competitive means, and that California’s antitrust and competition laws should not be radically changed absent compelling evidence of need and rigorous analysis of economic impacts.

The October 10 hearing explored the [competitive implications of artificial intelligence](#), and in particular, (1) algorithmic collusion, (2) unilateral conduct, and (3) consolidation. The report of the Artificial Intelligence Working Group also discusses the merits of a digital sector regulator.

The Commission will consider and debate the direction of its report to the Legislature, and any recommendations, into 2025.

Contact: Loren Kaye

We've Got a Gift With Your Name Written All Over It!

Place your order by November 29, 2024, to ensure delivery in time for the holidays.

Purchase Your Personalized Calendar Today