

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 1731 (Wilson)

As Amended August 13, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Would require the Office of Farm to Fork (Office) within the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), upon appropriation by the Legislature, to establish the California Healthy Food Procurement Fund Program (CHFPPF) to cultivate equity, nurture students, build climate resilience, support California Agriculture, and create scalable and sustainable change in the school food system. The bill would require the office to implement initiatives that would provide funding for approved vendors to procure only food products that are whole or are minimally processed and are grown or produced in California using climate-smart agriculture practices and production systems. Finally, the bill would, within one year of the office establishing the program, and every three years thereafter, require the Office to submit a report on the status of the program to the Legislature.

Senate Amendments

Change the bill from a Fund that distributes grants for the purchase of food and instead requires CDFA's Office of Farm to Fork to develop a list of food vendors who meet the criteria to be a Healthy Food Vendor for California Public Institutions. The amendments also expand the scope of the bill to include not just K-12, but all public institutions, as defined.

The criteria for being a Healthy Food Vendor is as follows:

- 1) Source food that is 1) whole or minimally processed 2) grown in California using climate smart agricultural practices and climate smart ag production systems, and 3) 50% of the farms and ranches that the vendor sources from (if more than 1 source) are CA farms that use climate smart ag practices and climate smart ag production systems.
- 2) Vendor is capable of serving public institutions.
- 3) Vendor tracks supply chain information.
- 4) Vendor keeps required records.
- 5) Vendor aligns with the priorities of the office.
- 6) Vendor maintains robust compliance that ensure farms comply with food safety requirements.

COMMENTS

Senate amendments limit the scope of the bill to just publishing a list, rather than implementing a program, but Members may wish to consider whether ambiguity in some of the terminology should be addressed.

First, "Climate Smart Agricultural Practices" and "Climate Smart Agricultural Production Systems" are undefined. What practices qualify – is it only state approved, what about Federal,

what about 3rd party, other countries or international bodies? What is the difference between Climate Smart Agricultural Practices and Climate Smart Agricultural Production Systems? The plain meaning of the language would imply that one can use Climate Smart Agricultural Practices but NOT be in a Climate Smart Agricultural Production System, as both must be satisfied.

Second, what does "Vendor aligns with the priorities of the Office" mean? What are the priorities of the Office of Farm to Fork and how does a vendor align with them in a public Request for Proposal? Will they be published ahead of time, concurrently, or not at all? Will they change with each new Director of the Office? What if they conflict with the priorities of the Secretary?

Lastly, the requirement that at least 50 percent of the vendor-sourced farms and ranches be from California and practice climate smart agriculture in a climate smart agricultural production system does not apply to the food sourced. Thus, even if half of the vendors satisfy this requirement, the other half does not have to. Therefore, in practice, most, if not all, of the food could come from non-compliant farms and ranches and the vendor would still benefit from the moniker bestowed by this program.

According to the Author

"Supporting our farmers as they face stability challenges, while ensuring our state's children have access to nutritious foods, is not just important, it's essential. AB 1731 is a powerful step forward, empowering California's farmers to give back to their communities with healthier food options, and ensuring our children thrive with the nourishment they deserve."

Arguments in Support

Supporters include a large coalition of organic farms, technical assistance providers, and NGOs who state that, "AB 1731 responds to a pivotal moment for California's food system, which faces two urgent and interconnected challenges: the rapid loss of California's small and mid-sized farms and the need for schools to transition away from ultra-processed foods."

Arguments in Opposition

None on File.

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, CDFA's administrative costs associated with this bill have yet to be identified but could reach the low hundreds of thousands of dollars, annually.

VOTES:

ASM AGRICULTURE: 8-0-0

YES: Soria, Hadwick, Aguiar-Curry, Alanis, Connolly, Jeff Gonzalez, Irwin, Ransom

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 11-0-4

YES: Wicks, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache

ABS, ABST OR NV: Hoover, Dixon, Ta, Tangipa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 78-0-2

YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

ABS, ABST OR NV: Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez

UPDATED

VERSION: August 13, 2026

CONSULTANT: Jim Houston / AGRI. / (916) 319-2084

FN: 0003755