
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1018
Author: Bauer-Kahan (D), et al.
Amended: 7/17/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

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

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

NOES: Niello, Valladares

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

AYES: Caballero, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

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

SUBJECT: Automated decision systems

SOURCE: Service Employees International Union (SEIU) California
TechEquity Action

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

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 1798.100 et seq.)

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

This bill:

- 1) Requires a developer of a covered ADS that was first deployed, or made available to potential deployers, before January 1, 2026, to conduct an initial performance evaluation on the covered ADS before January 1, 2027 and annually thereafter. For covered ADS first deployed or made available on or after January 1, 2026, the developer shall conduct a performance evaluation before initially deploying it or making it available to potential deployers, and annually thereafter.
- 2) Requires a developer, in conducting a performance evaluation, to carry out a number of specified duties.
- 3) Requires a developer to consider and attempt to incorporate any feedback from an auditor into the development of any subsequent version of the covered ADS and to make a high-level summary of the feedback publicly available.

- 4) Requires a developer that sells, licenses, or otherwise transfers a covered ADS to a potential deployer to provide the deployer with specified information.
- 5) Permits a developer to make reasonable redactions from the documentation provided to protect trade secrets, but requires notice of such withholding and the basis for it.
- 6) Requires a developer that receives an impact assessment from an auditor of a deployed covered ADS to provide specified information to any deployer of the covered ADS. Dictates the process and form that any documentation required to be provided to a deployer by a developer must take.
- 7) Makes it unlawful to advertise to consumers in the state that a covered ADS is capable of performing in a manner not substantiated by the results of the most recent performance evaluation conducted on the covered ADS.
- 8) Requires developers to designate at least one employee to oversee the developer's compliance herewith and to conduct a prompt and comprehensive review of any credible compliance issue raised to that employee.
- 9) Provides that the above do not apply to a developer subject to the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act who uses a covered ADS to make or facilitate a consequential decision related to financial services, as described.
- 10) Requires a deployer, before and after it finalizes a consequential decision made or facilitated by a covered ADS, to provide any subject of that decision with specified information. A deployer must also provide the subject with an opportunity to correct any incorrect personal information used and to appeal the decision according to specified processes. Dictates the process and form that documentation required to be provided to a subject by a deployer must take.
- 11) Provides that a deployer's collection, use, retention, and sharing of personal information from a subject of a consequential decision shall be reasonably necessary and proportionate to achieve the purposes for which the personal information was collected and processed, or for another disclosed purpose that is compatible with the context in which the personal information was collected, and not further processed in a manner that is incompatible with those purposes.

- 12) Provides the conditions under which a deployer assumes the responsibilities of a developer.
- 13) Requires a deployer that uses a covered ADS to make or facilitate a consequential decision to designate at least one employee to oversee the deployer's compliance herewith. That employee must conduct a prompt and comprehensive review of any credible compliance issue related to the deployer's use of a covered ADS that is raised to that employee.
- 14) Requires a developer to provide, where applicable, an auditor with any available information that is reasonably necessary for the auditor to conduct a comprehensive audit. Provides that necessary audits not completed by the specified deadlines require the developer to not deploy or make available the ADS.
- 15) Imposes retention requirements on developers and deployers with respect to specified documentation.
- 16) Provides that the provisions governing deployers become operative on January 1, 2027.
- 17) Allows for the redaction of information revealing trade secrets, as provided, but requires disclosure of such withholding and the basis for it.
- 18) Provides that within 30 days of receiving a request from the Attorney General (AG) for a performance evaluation, a developer or auditor of a covered ADS shall provide an unredacted copy of the document to the AG. The AG is authorized to share these materials with other enforcement entities as necessary for enforcement purposes.
- 19) Clarifies that the above disclosure or sharing of a performance evaluation does not constitute a waiver of any attorney-client privilege, work-product protection, or trade secret protection that might otherwise exist with respect to any information contained therein. Such materials are exempt from the California Public Records Act.
- 20) Authorizes enforcement actions against developers, deployers, or auditors to be brought by specified public entities:

- 21) Authorizes a court to award a prevailing plaintiff in such actions specified remedies, including a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per violation.
- 22) Exempts ADS whose sole purpose is to detect, protect against, or respond to cybersecurity incidents or preserve the integrity or security of computer systems or to operate aircraft in the national airspace. The use of a consumer credit score to inform a consequential decision does not itself create an obligation hereunder.
- 23) Clarifies the relevance of compliance, or the failure to comply, with these provisions in actions pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act and the Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 24) Defines AI, ADS, trade secret, and personal information in accordance with existing law and defines other relevant terms.

Background

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

This bill seeks to regulate the development and deployment, by both public and private actors, of "covered ADS," systems that make consequential decisions, or decisions that materially impact the cost, terms, quality, or accessibility of specified services, opportunities, access, resources, and treatment for natural persons. It requires developers to conduct performance evaluations of their ADS, which, among other things, identify details of the systems, expected performance and uses, and potential disparate impacts. Deployers are required to provide certain notices to subjects of consequential decisions and afford certain rights to them, including the right to correct information and appeal final decisions.

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

Comment

According to the author:

The use of automated decision systems (ADS) has become prevalent among Californian's daily lives and used within various sectors – including, housing, employment, and even in criminal justice sentencing and probation decisions. However, the algorithms that power ADS are often vulnerable to issues such as unrepresentative data, faulty classifications, and flawed design. These shortcomings can result in biased, discriminatory, or unfair outcomes. Rather than solving systemic problems, poorly designed ADS can worsen the very harms they aim to address—ultimately hurting the people they are meant to help. AB 1018 provides the necessary guardrails by regulating the development and deployment of an ADS used to make consequential decisions. Specifically, it requires developers to conduct an initial performance evaluation of an ADS by January 1, 2027. Additionally, the current role that an ADS plays in a consequential decision is hidden from consumers. Fundamentally, consumers should have the right to be well informed of how these ADS are used in life altering decisions. AB 1018 calls for transparency on the usage of ADS by requiring notice to consumers by deployers before and after a consequential decision. It is crucial that we take the necessary steps to ensure the technology is used responsibly and can be trusted. Well-intentioned but flawed technology is a matter of state concern. Guardrails and accountability are needed to ensure that technology does not further marginalize communities or broaden inequities.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- Unknown, potentially significant costs (local funds, General Fund) to local agencies that deploy ADS to make consequential decisions and must comply with the above-described requirements, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually statewide. For example, counties will be required to review all of their systems for compliance—including tools used for online testing, hiring, permitting, case management, risk assessments, and property management. They will also incur costs of audits, training, staffing, disclosures, appeals process, data retention, sending out notices, and

potential legal exposure. If developers raise their cost as a result of this bill, these costs will be passed onto the counties. Counties may claim reimbursement of those costs if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this bill creates a new program or imposes a higher level of service on local agencies.

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

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

- Costs (special fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the Labor Commissioner to enforce Labor Code violations, possibly in the millions of dollars, annually. Actual costs will depend on the number of enforcement actions and the amount of workload associated with each action.
- The Department of Justice (DOJ) estimates a fiscal impact of \$2.5 million or less (General Fund, Unfair Competition Law Fund). The DOJ notes that implementation of this bill will be dependent upon the appropriation of funds. The DOJ will be unable to absorb the costs to comply with or implement the requirements of the bill within existing budgeted resources.

The Consumer Protection Section (CPS), Civil Rights Enforcement Section (CRES) and Healthcare Rights & Access Section (HRA) within the Public Rights Division of the DOJ anticipate increased workloads in enforcing this bill beginning on January 1, 2026, and ongoing. The workload includes investigating and prosecuting violations. The Sections will require the following additional resources:

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

consequential actions under the bill. To meet the bill's provision, the State Water Board estimates significant cost pressures, likely in the millions of dollars per year. Costs would allow the State Water Board to fulfill several requirements regarding each of these covered systems. This would include facilitating and conducting a performance evaluation, contracting with an independent third party to perform audits on any systems the Water Boards develops, notifying those impacted by the consequential decision about the use of the ADS, and providing an appeal process. Taking these steps for each covered system, if feasible at all, would require significant additional staff and contract resources in the millions of dollars annually, impacting all Water Boards' fund sources. Alternatively, State Water Board programs would need to find ways to store, process, and analyze data to make decisions without using any tool which would qualify as an automated decision system. Costs would be incurred from all eligible State Water Board fund sources.

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

contracting costs due to vendors including costs for conducting the assessment and other requirements.

- The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) reports that it does not currently use platforms it considers to be Automated Decision Systems (ADS). As a result, CDCR does not anticipate immediate costs associated with the requirements in AB 1018. However, should the department choose to implement or develop systems in the future that meet the bill's definition of an ADS, there could be costs associated with compliance. These may include but are not limited to performance evaluations, third-party audits, disclosure and documentation requirements, and staff oversight responsibilities outlined in the bill. It should be noted that CDCR uses several risk assessment tools, including, but not limited to, the Static-99R to assess every eligible sex offender prior to release on parole, the California Static Risk Assessment tool to assess the risk of reoffending, the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) to assess an incarcerated individuals needs and target those needs, and the Automated Reentry Management System (ARMS). If this bill is interpreted to apply to these tools, CDCR, and other correctional agencies, could potentially incur a significant fiscal impact.
- The Department of Finance (DOF) reports potential unknown costs (General Fund) and indicates that that this bill may apply to its ongoing pilot using generative artificial intelligence to assist with bill analyses.
- Unknown, potentially significant costs to the Judicial Council, likely in the hundreds of millions annually. This bill could hamper the ability of trial courts and their justice partners to use several tools, including SARATSO for sex offenders, and many others, such as pretrial risk assessment tools minimize bias in pretrial detention situations. Developers of these tools, including nonprofits, universities, and even the state of Virginia, are unlikely to make any adjustments as would be required under this bill. As such, the entire judicial branch could potentially lose the use of all pretrial risk assessment tools, as their developers do not necessarily have a strong financial incentive to adhere to this bill's stringent requirements. Courts also use tools such as MyCitation, which would also be affected. MyCitation is a tool created by the Judicial Council pursuant to AB 143 (Committee on Budget) Stats. 2021, ch. 79, designed as an easy-to-use option for defendants to provide relevant financial information for the court to consider reductions in infraction fines and fees owed.

- Unknown, potentially significant costs to the state funded trial court system (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund). By authorizing a new civil penalty with statutory damages, this bill will likely lead to additional case filings that otherwise would not have been commenced, with attendant workload and resource costs to the court. This bill may result in additional trial court costs to the extent that cases are brought to litigate its constitutionality. The fiscal impact of this bill to the courts will depend on many unknowns, including the number of cases filed and the factors unique to each case. An eight-hour court day costs approximately \$10,500 in staff in workload. This is a conservative estimate, based on the hourly rate of court personnel including at minimum the judge, clerk, bailiff, court reporter, jury administrator, administrative staff, and jury per-diems. If court days exceed 10, costs to the trial courts could reach hundreds of thousands of dollars. While the courts are not funded on a workload basis, an increase in workload could result in delayed court services and would put pressure on the General Fund to fund additional staff and resources and to increase the amount appropriated to backfill for trial court operations.
- Costs (General Fund, special funds) of an unknown but significant amount to each state agency that deploys ADS to make or contribute to consequential decisions and must comply with this bill's notice, opt-out, correction, appeal, and, if applicable, audit requirements. In the aggregate, for all affected state agencies, costs may be in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually ongoing.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/29/25)

SEIU California (source)

TechEquity Action (source)

ACCE Action (Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment)

American Federation of Musicians, Local 7

Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California

California Center for Movement Legal Services

California Civil Liberties Advocacy

California Community Foundation

California Employment Lawyers Association

California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO

California Immigrant Policy Center

California Initiative on Technology and Democracy

California National Organization for Women

California Professional Firefighters

California School Employees Association
California Women's Law Center
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Child Care Law Center
Citizen's Privacy Coalition
Common Sense Media
Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Federation of America
Consumer Federation of California
Consumer Reports
Courage California
East Bay Community Law Center
Economic Security California Action
Electronic Privacy Information Center
End Child Poverty California Powered by Grace
Equal Rights Advocates
Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California
Felony Murder Elimination Project
Greenlining Institute
Housing Now!
Justice2jobs Coalition
Kapor Center
LA Defensa
LAANE (Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy)
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
Mujeres Unidas Y Activas
Northern California District Council of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union
Oakland Privacy
Parent Voices
Powerswitch Action
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse
Public Citizen
Restoring Hope California
Rubicon Programs
Smart Justice California
Surveillance Resistance Lab
Tech Oversight Project
UDW/AFSCME Local 3930
UFCW - Western States Council

Vision Y Compromiso
Women's Foundation California
Working Partnerships USA
Worksafe

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/29/25)

Advanced Medical Technology Association
Aerospace and Defense Alliance of California
American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists - District IX
American Innovators Network
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
American Staffing Association
America's Physician Groups
Associated General Contractors of California
Association of California Life and Health Insurance Companies
Association of National Advertisers
Business Software Alliance
CalBroadband
Calcom Association
California Association of Health Plans
California Chamber of Commerce
California Credit Union League
California Dental Association
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Hospital Association
California Life Sciences
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Medical Association
California Radiological Society
California Staffing Professionals
Chamber of Progress
Civil Justice Association of California
College Board
Computer and Communications Industry Association
Connected Commerce Council
Consumer Data Industry Association
Consumer Technology Association
CTIA
Delta Dental of California
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce
Financial Technology Association
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Innovative Lending Platform Association
Internet Works
Kaiser Permanente
Lincoln Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Ochin, INC.
Orange County Business Council
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Psinapse Technology
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management
Rancho Cordova Chamber of Commerce
Receivables Management Association International
Rocklin Area Chamber of Commerce
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
Security Industry Association
Shingle Springs/cameron Park Chamber of Commerce
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Society for Human Resource Management
Software Information Industry Association
STAR Staffing
Sutter Health
TechCA
TechNet
United Chamber Advocacy Network UCAN
University of California
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Yuba Sutter Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: A broad coalition, including the sponsors, SEIU California and TechEquity Action, write:

While the advent of generative AI and large language models has been a new piece of the puzzle, ADS have long existed in our communities. ADS have been woven into the daily lives of our community members—increasingly these tools are dictating access to and the quality of housing, healthcare, employment, credit, and

many other critical services Californians need. The potential harms and biases of these systems have been well documented—from banks using lending models that were twice as likely to deny Black applicants compared to White applicants with the same financial profile,¹ to healthcare providers using ADS that significantly underestimated the healthcare needs of Black patients compared to White ones.² Technology should not be a pass to violate our civil and labor rights, this legislation regulates the misuse of automated systems.

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

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: A coalition of financial industry groups, including the California Credit Union League, writes:

While Section 22756.2(b)(1) provides the authority to a financial institution to deny an opt-out request for financial services providers regulated under the Gramm Leach Bliley Act, the nation’s most robust law governing how financial information is used, it is unclear to us why there is not a similar exemption from the entirety of the bill. As written today, financial institutions could choose to categorically deny any consumer’s opt-out request. This will ultimately frustrate and confuse consumers, which is the opposite of the state intention of AB 1018 – which is to bring more transparency.

The Equal Credit Opportunities Act (ECOA) and Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) already require creditors to provide a notice to consumers when they are denied credit detailing the reason for the denial and a method to dispute the accuracy or completeness of any information that led to the denial. Yet, financial services must still provide an opportunity to correct information, which is duplicative of FCRA, and an opportunity to appeal, which can impact the lending process. Establishing a consumer appeal provision would require a type of manual underwriting that has not been regularly used in the mortgage industry for nearly three decades. The current mortgage origination process relies on automated systems such as AUSs and Credit Scoring Models (CSMs) that do not have usable or scalable alternative manual processes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prepared by: Christian Kurpiewski / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
8/30/25 12:36:06

**** END ****