

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 2524 (Gipson)

As Amended August 13, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Authorizes county probation departments and county child welfare agencies to issue work permits to certain youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. The bill establishes requirements governing the issuance, recognition, notification, and revocation of those work permits and authorizes educational rights holders and attorneys representing eligible youth to request work permits on behalf of those youth.

Senate Amendments

- 1) Replaces references to juvenile courts with county probation departments and county child welfare agency as the bodies authorized to issue work permits to minors under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.
- 2) Adds findings and declarations.

COMMENTS

Purpose of current work permit system. According to the CDE, minors employed in the state of California must have a Permit to Employ and Work (commonly referred to as a "work permit"). Work permits are typically issued by the school where the student is enrolled. Work permits indicate the duties and location where the work will be done as well as the number of hours a minor may work. In most cases it is a two-step process, the minor along with the parent/guardian and employer fill out the form and submit to the school local to the minor's address. The school district reviews the B1-1 form and issues the work permit.

The current system has protective laws in place that regulate the times at which the minor may work (not too early and not late at night nor overnight) and the duration of the employment (not too many hours). All of these laws are in place to prevent exploitation of minors and ensure the minor is able to attend school and graduate.

The minor's work assignment is subject to monitoring by the school attendance, probation, and labor/safety officials to protect the health and safety of the minor and to ensure the employer is complying with all relevant labor laws. Inspectors visit a given address and match each minor on the property to a work permit that is to be made available for inspection at that physical location.

According to the Author

"AB 2524 confronts a harsh reality: foster youth and justice-involved youth are often denied work permits due to school requirements they cannot meet because of instability, trauma, and lack of support. This leaves them vulnerable to exploitation and crime simply to survive. By allowing judicial officers to issue work permits in a youth's best interest; while tying them to educational progress or job training participation, this bill creates a pathway to lawful employment, stability, and accountability. AB 2524 empowers youth with opportunity, reduces recidivism, and helps break cycles of poverty and exploitation."

Arguments in Support

The Alameda County Office of Education writes, "Currently, students under the age of 18 must obtain work permits through school officials, who typically require consistent enrollment, regular attendance, and a minimum 2.0 GPA. For justice-involved and foster youth navigating housing instability and a lack of adult support, these prerequisites can create barriers to obtaining a work permit. As a result, many vulnerable youth are barred from lawful employment.

Justice-involved and foster youth face a significantly higher risk of negative outcomes when they lack access to legitimate income. When local and state decisionmakers block pathways to lawful work, they inadvertently create the conditions that lead to delinquency. These barriers contradict reentry best practices, child welfare permanency planning, and youth violence prevention strategies.

By authorizing judges and judicial officers to issue work permits for minors under the court's jurisdiction, including delinquent and dependency youth, AB 2524 would provide an alternative pathway for these vulnerable youth to obtain work permits and access lawful employment."

Arguments in Opposition

The Chief Probation Officers of California write, " The specific approach in the bill to establish wholly new administrative and procedural processes for county probation departments and child welfare agencies to issue work permits, represents both operational and policy concerns, as well as fiscal implications. The issuance of work permits cannot be viewed as a simple, singular administrative action.

We respectfully suggest a more suitable approach, and one which mitigates these operational and fiscal impacts, would be to first identify what, if any, deficiencies exist within the existing process and whether these deficiencies can be addressed through the already existing work permit process at the school district level. In particular, if probation or child welfare involved youth are being denied work permits by school districts, we believe a process could be put into place for an appeal of the decision that allows probation officers or social workers to weigh in on the child's behalf. Developing an entirely new and concurrent process does not streamline the work permit process, instead it introduces new variations into the existing mechanism creates further complications, not clarity."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee: The bill's authorization for county probation departments and county child welfare agencies to issue work permits is permissive. However, the entities that elect to do so will likely incur additional administrative costs. For example, they would need to develop new procedures to issue the work permits, train staff, and track and monitor the youth that have been issued permits. The extent of these costs would largely depend on the number of participating county probation departments and county welfare agencies, as well as the number of permits issued each year. This could lead to additional General Fund cost pressures, potentially in the hundreds of thousands of dollars each year.

VOTES:

ASM EDUCATION: 9-0-0

YES: Patel, Hoover, Alvarez, Bonta, Castillo, Garcia, Lowenthal, Pellerin, Zbur

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0

YES: Wicks, Hoover, Bauer-Kahan, Calderon, Caloza, Ellis, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 68-0-12

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, Gallagher, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Zbur, Rivas

ABS, ABST OR NV: Arambula, Chen, Gabriel, Garcia, Hoover, Lackey, Lowenthal, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Wicks, Wilson

UPDATED

VERSION: August 13, 2026

CONSULTANT: Debbie Look / ED. / (916) 319-2087

FN: 0004243