

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 1832 (Ransom)

As Amended August 13, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

This bill would establish the 2-1-1 Fund within the State Treasury. Subject to appropriation by the Legislature, requires the funds to be used for the purpose supporting the 2-1-1 system and 211 Providers Network, as specified. Requires the California Offices of Emergency Services (CalOES) to administer the funds, as provided.

Senate Amendments

- 1) Narrow the scope of work for OES by striking requirements related to integrating 2-1-1 into state emergency planning and response.
- 2) Require CalOES to allocate moneys appropriated from the 2-1-1 Fund to the California 211 Providers Network, also known as 211, strictly to carry out specified purposes.
- 3) Authorizes CalOES to administer the 2-1-1 Fund only as provided, and authorizes CalOES to recover up to \$100,000 per fiscal year for its reasonable administrative costs to administer the 2-1-1 Fund.

COMMENTS

- 1) *What is 2-1-1?* 2-1-1 is a free telephone number providing access to local community services. The number connects callers to information and services, including referrals to physical and mental health resources; housing, utility, food, and employment assistance; and suicide and crisis interventions. 2-1-1 also provides disaster preparedness, response, and recovery during declared emergencies. However, unlike the 9-1-1 or 9-8-8 system there is no dedicated state funding support for the system, nor a statutory structure for the system should operate.

2-1-1 was first established in the early 2000's following a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) order, which reserved the 2-1-1 dialing code for providing non-emergency community information and referral (I&R) services. The FCC's order recognized and encouraged the states to implement 2-1-1 dialing for access to I&R services. In response and under its own authority, not legislative direction, the CPUC adopted a decision implementing 2-1-1 in California. To provide 2-1-1 service, providers and entities first apply to the CPUC for authority to provide these services. Under the decision, 2-1-1 services are operated by county-based entities that coordinate with local human services agencies and by providers who connect callers to local community services.

- 2) *The 2-1-1 system currently lacks statewide coordination, support and focus.* The 2-1-1 system in California does not have any specific statutes governing its operations, nor any statutorily mandated functions or goals. Across the state the 2-1-1 is not well coordinated with state agencies or funding sources and instead manages its operations through local funding from counties and grants. The lack of a centralized state administration structure for the 2-1-1 system means its availability throughout the state is unequal, with 15 counties currently being unserved by 2-1-1 service.

In the counties where 2-1-1 does operate, the system does make millions of contacts per year and serves a variety of informational functions related to social services, public safety, healthcare, utility assistance, and other support services. In other words, the 2-1-1 system operates as a catch-all system for public resources, but this also means the system's operations across the state lacks focus. Therefore, it has had limited usefulness to statewide initiatives. For example, in some counties the 2-1-1 system has worked on public information campaigns related to public-safety power shutoffs. In Los Angeles County, the system was used to report hate crimes under funding received from the California Department of Civil Rights. The system was also widely utilized as an emergency response tool during the Los Angeles area wildfires in 2025. In the same year, the 2-1-1 system 14.2% of 2-1-1 calls were abandoned or dropped.

This bill attempts to address those challenges by establishing a structured arrangement between CalOES and 211 California by directing CalOES to administer moneys in a newly created 211 Fund to 211 California for the purposes described in this bill. However, the operation of the 211 Fund and its related purposes would be contingent on an appropriation by the Legislature.

According to the Author

"211 is a reliable alternative to 911 for Californians facing a crisis, a disaster, or needing access to basic needs. For families across California, 211 is a lifeline, and with the increase in large-scale natural disasters and emergency events, the need for a reliable 211 continues to grow. AB 1832 would ensure 211 has the support and visibility it needs to strengthen this statewide network and enable more people to get help quickly, especially after emergencies. In doing so, 211 service providers can relieve pressure on 911 and emergency response teams, creating a more coordinated and efficient disaster response system."

Arguments in Support

The co-sponsors, 211 California, Family Resource Center San Joaquin and United Ways of California write that, "Simply put, our service organizations, counties, 9-1-1, and 9-8-8 need 2-1-1 to function so they can do their jobs and people can get the right kind of live help they need at the right time. This bill would support critical emergency management integration and ensure core operational capacity and infrastructure for the 2-1-1 system in California."

Arguments in Opposition

None on file.

FISCAL COMMENTS

This bill could result in an unknown, ongoing General Fund cost pressures, likely in the tens of millions of dollars, to provide additional funding for 211 system enhancements. Notably, the author has submitted a budget request for \$20 million dollars.

While this bill specifies OES administer the 2-1-1 Fund solely for the purpose of allocating moneys to 211 California, OES may require additional resources to do so. The bill authorizes OES to recover only up to \$100,000 per fiscal year to cover its administrative costs. To the extent that administrative costs rise above this threshold, there may be additional workload and cost pressures for OES.

Even if OES does not assume a significant administrative role, the office would still likely incur additional workload, with associated costs potentially in the hundreds of thousands to low millions of dollars, to create funding allocation criteria and evaluate reports for future fund distributions.

VOTES:**ASM COMMUNICATIONS AND CONVEYANCE: 9-0-0**

YES: Boerner, Hoover, Bonta, Caloza, Castillo, Krell, Lowenthal, Rogers, Blanca Rubio

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0

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

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0-8

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

ABS, ABST OR NV: Arambula, Chen, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Wilson

UPDATED

VERSION: August 13, 2026

CONSULTANT: Emilio Perez / C. & C. / (916) 319-2637

FN: 0004239