

Date of Hearing: June 17, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE
Lisa Calderon, Chair
SB 1054 (Cabaldon) – As Amended June 8, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 38-0

SUBJECT: Unemployment insurance: reporting requirements

SUMMARY: Expands the breadth and frequency of required employment and earning data reporting to Employment Development Department (EDD), and requires EDD to share relevant employment data with the Department of Social Services (DSS), the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), and the Office of the California Education Interagency Council (OCEIC). Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires EDD to work with employers to enhance the reporting of employment and earning data by employers required under existing law, and, where feasible, to align and streamline definitions and requirements for the report of wages, deploy user-friendly application program interfaces, and otherwise streamline reporting processes.
- 2) Beginning July 1, 2027, requires every employer with 10 or more employees, and every individual or organization that, as an agent, reports wages on behalf of one or more employers with 10 or more employees, to include information on total monthly wage, industry, occupation, worker type, and hours worked for each employee, in the report of wages required under existing law; and requires the report to be filed electronically at least monthly, unless the employer receives a waiver as specified..
- 3) On or before January 1, 2028, requires EDD to permit the use of any information in their possession to the extent necessary for the following purposes:
 - To enable DSS and DHCS to access hours worked and other necessary employment data to support employment-related verifications for initial eligibility for, and ongoing receipt of, public benefits, including, but not limited to, benefits pursuant to the Medi-Cal program and the CalFresh program.
 - To enable the OCEIC to access any relevant wage data necessary for the purposes of supporting the California Education Interagency Council’s [“Council’s”] agendas, reports, work products, and resources.
- 4) Requires EDD to adopt and develop procedures for the sharing of hours worked and other necessary employment data pursuant to 3), above.
- 5) Requires EDD to use existing federal and state grant funds to the extent available, and to implement the provisions of the bill on or before July 1, 2027, except with respect to data sharing pursuant to 3), above, which is required to commence on January 1, 2028, or when EDD notifies the Legislature the CalSAWS can perform the necessary automation to implement the data sharing process, whichever is later.

- 6) Requires EDD to work with the California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS) to develop and implement the necessary system changes to implement the data sharing process pursuant to 3), above.
- 7) Requires EDD to work with the OCEIC related to the collection of employment data pursuant to 3), above, for the purposes of supporting the council's agendas, reports, work products, and resources; and requires EDD to work with the California Workforce Development Board (CWDB) and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) to implement existing workforce program reporting requirements and to provide any relevant necessary wage data, including as collected pursuant to 2), above.
- 8) Requires EDD to consult with DSS, DHCS, and stakeholders, including, but not limited to the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data, the County Welfare Directors Association of California, and CalSAWS, with respect to 3) above.
- 9) Requires EDD to work with the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data to support existing state data systems, dashboards, and reports related to the collection of employment data pursuant to existing law.
- 10) Defines "hours worked" to mean the total hours worked by each worker each month; specifies that the employer may report 40 hours worked for each week any duties were performed by a full-time employee, and to report hours paid or a reasonable estimate of the hours worked for each week duties were performed by a part-time employee.
- 11) Defines "occupation" to mean an occupation listed in the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics' Standard Occupational Classification system or the job title of each worker.
- 12) Defines "worker type" to mean the salaried or hourly, and full-time, part-time, intern, or apprentice status of each worker.
- 13) Makes several findings and declarations pertaining to the need for high-quality labor market data to evaluate and improve workforce development and educational programs, and to facilitate verification of eligibility for public benefits.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes EDD in the LWDA, and vests it with various duties and responsibilities including the administration of the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program, the State Disability Insurance (SDI) program, and the Paid Family Leave (PFL) program. (Unemployment Insurance (UI) Code Secs. 301, *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the UI program as a joint state/federal program, administered by EDD, that provides weekly payments for workers who lose their job through no fault of their own. (UI Code Secs. 100, *et seq.*, and 301, *et seq.*)
- 3) Requires each employer to file a report with EDD of employer contributions to the UI fund and worker contributions to the Disability Fund, a quarterly return, and a report of wages paid to the employer's workers in the form and containing any information prescribed by the director of EDD; requires that the report be filed electronically; and authorizes employers to request a waiver from electronic filing requirements, as specified. (UI Code Sec. 1088)

- 4) Requires each employer to file a report with EDD reporting the hiring of any employee to whom the employer anticipates paying wages, and the hiring of any employee who previously worked for the employer but had been separated from that prior employment for at least 60 consecutive days; and specifies that the report shall include the name, address, and social security number of the employees, the employer's name, address, state employer identification number, and identifying number assigned to the employer under Section 61095 of the Internal Revenue Code, and the first date the employee worked for the employer. (UI Code Sec. 1088.5)
- 5) Establishes that, except as otherwise specifically provided in the UI Code, information obtained in the administration of the UI Code is confidential, not open to the public, and for the exclusive use and information of the director of EDD in discharge of their duties. (UI Code Sec. 1094(a))
- 6) Specifies that information released to authorized entities pursuant to other provisions of the UI Code shall not be admissible in evidence in any action or special proceeding, other than one arising out of the provisions of the UI Code or as specified. (UI Code Sec. 1094(b))
- 7) Provides that the information obtained in the administration of the UI Code may be tabulated and published in statistical form for use by federal, state, and local governmental departments and agencies, and the public, except that the name of the employing unit or of any worker shall never be divulged in the course of the tabulation or publication. (UI Code Sec. 1094(c))
- 8) Provides that any person who knowingly accesses, uses, or discloses any confidential information without authorization is guilty of a misdemeanor. (UI Code Sec. 1094(f))
- 9) Authorizes EDD to share wage and employment data, under specified conditions, for a variety of purposes, including the evaluation of workforce and education programs, and the administration of public benefit programs, as respectively specified. (UI Code Sec. 1095)
- 10) Pursuant to federal regulations, specifies that in order to receive federal grant funds intended for conducting a state UI program, the methods of administration of the program must include provision for maintaining the confidentiality of any information which reveals the name or any identifying particular about any individual or any past or present employer or employing unit, or which could foreseeably be combined with other publicly available information to reveal any such particulars, and must include provision for barring the disclosure of any such information, except as provided. (20 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §603.4)
- 11) Pursuant to federal regulations, specifies circumstances under which disclosure of confidential UI program information is permissible, provided it is authorized by state law and does not interfere with the efficient administration of the state UI program. (20 CFR §603.5)
- 12) Authorizes disclosure of confidential UI program information to a public official for use in the performance of their official duties; defines "performance of official duties" to mean administration or enforcement of law or the execution of the official responsibilities of a Federal, State, or local elected official; specifies that administration of law includes research related to the law administered by the public official; and further specifies that "performance

of official duties” includes use of confidential UI program information for education or workforce training program performance accountability and reporting under Federal or State law. (20 CFR §603.5(e))

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

1) *Purpose.* According to the author:

The current wage file collected by EDD only includes quarterly earnings and employer ID numbers. As H.R. 1 threatens to reduce Californians’ benefit access, the need to collect employees’ hours worked is critical to ensure that California residents do not lose access to their Medicaid and SNAP benefits. As of now, the State relies on a shared-services access contract with Equifax where they provide employment and income data to the Department of General Services at an exorbitant cost to verify eligibility.

Additionally, California will soon require more precise data on labor market outcomes to administer the new Workforce Pell program and enable the California Education Interagency Council to conduct analyses that support planning efforts to better align education pathways with workforce outcomes in sectors critical to California’s economy. A lack of data on employees’ occupation will inhibit these efforts.

This bill is co-sponsored by California Competes, California EDGE Coalition, and UNITE-LA, non-profit organizations focused on education and workforce development.

2) *EDD and the base wage file.* EDD is responsible for administering the state’s unemployment insurance (UI), disability insurance, and paid family leave programs, among others, including collecting the employer and employee payroll taxes that underlie them. In addition to providing funds necessary to administer the programs, these transactions serve as a rich source of administrative data relating to employment in California. This data source is known as the “base wage file.”

As a 2024 report from EDD, CWDB, and LWDA, discussed in detail in Comment #3, explains:

As part of the UI, DI, and PFL benefit program administration, the EDD is responsible for gathering and maintaining information in the base wage file, which assists in determining benefit program eligibility, distributing benefits, and minimizing fraud in the distribution of benefits. In California, the base wage file includes **employee first and last name, social security number, total subject wages, wage plan code, total PIT wages, and total PIT withheld of each employee in California recorded separately for each employer on a quarterly basis**. Base wage file data is reported from employers to EDD’s Tax Branch on a quarterly basis and stored securely by EDD to protect confidentiality. In California, there are approximately 1.6 million employers reporting 22.5 million wage lines per quarter on behalf of approximately 18.5 million California wage earners.

For employers with more than 10 employees, and for entities reporting payroll for such employers, this bill would expand the information that must be reported to EDD for the base

wage file to include total monthly wage, industry, occupation, worker type (i.e. salaried or hourly, and full-time, part-time, intern, or apprentice), and hours worked. For these employers, the bill would also increase the frequency of reporting from quarterly to monthly.

Given the value of this dataset for understanding the landscape of the state workforce, several states have already expanded the reporting requirements for the base wage file, consistent with the requirements of this bill. According to the coalition of education and workforce development non-profits who sponsor the bill, “18 states already collect data on work hours or pay rate, or are in the process of developing this reporting, and 15 states currently collect or will be collecting data on employee occupation.”

- 3) *SB 755 report*. In 2022, the Legislature passed SB 755 (Roth, Ch. 815, Stats. 2022), which required the CWDB and EDD to work collaboratively to measure and report on training-related job placement outcomes for individuals receiving job training services provided through the workforce system. SB 755 also required CWDB and EDD to work collaboratively to create a plan to use the existing unemployment insurance tax data collection infrastructure used to secure quarterly wage data from employers (i.e. the base wage file), to match relevant employee occupational data, employee place of employment data, and employee hours worked data, to persons who enroll in job training services, and to report this plan to the Legislature by January 1, 2024. This report, entitled “SB 755 (2022): Expanding Workforce Performance Analysis and Employer Quarterly Wage Reports,” was timely produced and reported to the Legislature. As part of the required plan, the report identified specific limitations on the scope of workforce training outcome evaluation due to the available data, as follows:

Many discussions at federal and state levels have identified the limitations within existing base wage files if the data is to be used for program evaluation and research. For example, only ‘quarterly earnings’ are available on employees. Without understanding **hours paid** and total compensation to arrive at an hourly wage, it can be challenging to understand variation in earnings across employees. When earnings are particularly low, it is not clear if this is driven by low wages, low hours worked, or both. [...] In addition, it is not possible to determine if job training participants are placed in a ‘training-related job’ when there is no data related to **occupation** in the base wage file and limited information regarding the **training services delivered** in the participant data system. These limitations affect the type of performance analysis and evaluation, as well as broader research, that is feasible when relying on the base wage file [...].

The sponsors of this bill raise similar points, arguing:

Current data collection captures quarterly earnings and employer identifiers, but not the hours worked or job type metrics that are essential for understanding job quality or the occupation metric needed to assess program-to-employment results. This limits the state’s ability to plan strategically for workforce needs and align education investments with good jobs. Additionally, current data limitations hinder institutions’ ability to assess how effectively program offerings meet workforce needs and support graduates in achieving their career goals. These limitations also constrain efforts to refine programs based on such evaluations.

By collecting data on hours worked and occupation, California will be better positioned to measure job placement and wage progression, evaluate workforce outcomes and

trends, and better align training investments with high-quality job outcomes. This effort builds on the state's interest in more meaningful measurement of workforce outcomes and supports statewide alignment initiatives, including the Cradle-to-Career Data System and the California Education Interagency Council.

That said, the report also recommended that policymakers wishing to expand the base wage file “consider costs and benefits of additional data elements.” Specifically, the report explains:

[P]olicymakers seeking to expand the base wage file may wish to consider three points. First, the collection of new data elements must not affect wage reporting codes or the benefit charge rating process or any other existing data element in the existing base wage system that could affect the timely processing of claims. Second, all employers, both public and private, will incur costs to upgrade their payroll systems to report any data enhancements. Future proposals must attempt to balance costs for both EDD and employers to enhance existing systems while maximizing benefits for improved performance analysis, evaluation, and research to drive learning and accountability. Third, changes to the base wage file result in significant IT project costs for EDD.

Consistent with the second consideration, the City of La Verne argues in opposition to the bill:

SB 1054 is intended to address gaps in the state's existing wage data system by requiring employer to report additional information such as hours worked and occupation, largely to support workforce program evaluation and to comply with new federal work verification requirements tied to Medi-Cal and CalFresh eligibility.

However, this approach places a substantial and ongoing administrative burden on employers to solve a state-level data deficiency. Employers would be required to implement new tracking systems, report more frequently, and provide detailed employee level data, all while the State expands data sharing across multiple agencies and programs. This represents an overreach that shifts responsibility away from the State and onto employers without sufficient safeguards or funding.

Still, such enhancements and system updates may ultimately be necessary in order to meet new federal accountability requirements for critical grant funding. As the bill's sponsors explain:

SB 1054 would also help position California for successful Workforce Pell implementation. The U.S. Department of Education's regulations call on states to build out their administrative data collection by 2029 to track program participants' outcomes into an occupation. Critically, to maintain Pell-eligibility, short-term programs will need to see at least 70 percent of their students employed in an occupation “for which the program prepares students” or “a comparable high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand occupation.” California currently does not collect this data as needed. However, SB 1054 will make this information available for the state.

- 4) *H.R. 1 and eligibility verification demands.* On July 4, 2025, President Trump signed into law H.R. 1, also known as the “One Big Beautiful Bill Act.” H.R. 1 was a budget bill, and included provisions spanning a wide variety of policy areas. Relevant to this bill, the federal

funding for state Medicaid expansion pursuant to the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) was made contingent on compliance with specified eligibility and verification requirements. In California, these programs are known as Medi-Cal and CalFresh, respectively.

Specifically, H.R. 1 requires California to impose work or community engagement requirements for Medi-Cal and CalFresh applicants in order to qualify for federal funds. To meet the mandatory eligibility requirements, applicants for these programs must participate in a qualifying activity for up to 20 hours per week, or 80 hours averaged monthly. Qualifying activities include paid employment, volunteer work or community service, job training or work programs, education, workfare, or any combination of these activities. In addition, H.R. 1 requires eligibility to be determined every six months, rather than every year.

Economic Security CA Action, a non-profit dedicated to reducing income inequality, explains in support of this bill:

H.R. 1 imposes two major new compliance burdens on California's benefits administration. First new **work requirements for both Medicaid expansion enrollees and CalFresh recipients** require 80 hours per month of qualifying work or other activities – verified at initial eligibility determination and at every subsequent renewal. Second, beginning January 1, 2027, H.R. 1 requires **eligibility redeterminations to occur no less than every six months** for the ACA expansion population – doubling California's current renewal frequency and creating a corresponding surge in verification events that must be processed accurately and efficiently. Together, these provisions will require counties to verify compliance for an estimated 4.6 million ACA expansion enrollees at twice the current rate.

Without reliable, timely wage data in state systems, counties will be forced to rely on paper documentation submitted by enrollees themselves. California's Department of Health Care Services has already warned that the new federal mandates will increase administrative workload and heighten the rate of procedural discontinuances. SB 1054 directly addresses this risk by making employer-reported data available for automated eligibility checks, enabling counties to verify compliance without burdening working families with duplicative documentation.

In response to the burdens imposed by H.R. 1, this bill seeks to streamline eligibility verification for Medi-Cal and CalFresh, among other public benefit programs, by requiring EDD to allow access to relevant employment data by DSS and DHCS, including hours worked information, which the bill also requires EDD to collect.

- 5) *Confidentiality of base wage file.* Both state and federal law impose strict confidentiality requirements on the use and disclosure of the base wage file. Section 1094(a) of the UI Code provides that, except as otherwise specifically provided in the UI Code, information in the administration of the UI Code is “confidential, not open to the public, and shall be for the exclusive use and information of the director in the discharge of [their] duties.” Violation of this confidentiality is a crime punishable as a misdemeanor.

Similarly, Part 603 of Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations details confidentiality and permissible disclosure of state unemployment compensation (UC) program information. 20

CFR §603.2 defines UC information to mean “information in the records of a State or State UC agency that pertains to the administration of the State UC law.” The same section specifies that this includes state wage reports collected under the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS), that are obtained by the state UC agency for determining UC monetary eligibility.

§603.4 lays out the basic confidentiality requirement, specifying that in order to receive federal grant funds intended for conducting a state UC program, the methods of administration of the state UC program “must include provision for maintaining the confidentiality of any UC information which reveals the name or any identifying particular about any individual or any past or present employer or employing unit, or which could foreseeably be combined with other publicly available information to reveal any such particulars, and must include provision for barring the disclosure of any such information, except as provided [].” In other words, violation of the confidentiality requirements prescribed by federal law with respect to the base wage file can result in withholding of federal UI funding, which can have catastrophic consequences for the state UI program.

§603.5 lays out the exceptions to the confidentiality requirement, specifying that “[d]isclosure of confidential UC information is permissible under the exceptions [] only if authorized by State law and if such disclosure does not interfere with the efficient administration of the State UC law.” Relevant to this bill, §603.5(e) authorizes “disclosure of confidential UC information to a public official for use in the performance of [their] official duties”. The regulation defines “performance of official duties” to mean “administration or enforcement of law or the execution of the official responsibilities of a Federal, State, or local elected official” and specifies that administration of law includes “research related to the law administered by the public official.” It also specifies that “performance of official duties” includes use of confidential UC information for “education or workforce training program performance accountability and reporting under Federal or State law.”

Pursuant to the §603.5 requirement that any disclosure of confidential UI information must be authorized by state law, Section 1095 of the UI Code details a wide range of purposes for which the director of EDD shall permit the use of any information in the director’s possession to the extent necessary. This bill would add two provisions to that section, requiring EDD to provide access to information for the following purposes:

- (as) To enable DSS and DHCS to access hours worked and other necessary employment data to support employment-related verifications for initial eligibility for, and ongoing receipt of, public benefits, including, but not limited to, benefits pursuant to the Medi-Cal program and the CalFresh program.
- (at) To enable the OCEIC to access any relevant wage data necessary for the purposes of supporting the council’s agendas, reports, work products, and resources.

These purposes do not appear to conflict with the conditions under which federal regulations authorize confidential UI information disclosure. Both disclosures are made to “public officials” within the meaning of the federal regulations, and the former would be considered in furtherance of the administration or execution of the official duties of DSS and/or DHCS, with respect to the Medi-Cal and CalFresh programs, among others, that they are tasked with administering. Section 11902 of the Government Code, which details the Council’s

purposes, places the mandate of the Council squarely in the realm of education and workforce training program performance accountability and reporting. It is therefore unlikely that the UI information disclosure required by this bill would violate federal confidentiality requirements for UI information, provided the disclosure is properly administered.

- 6) *Potentially redundant authorities.* Under existing law, Section 1095 already provides for information sharing purposes that are similar to, and potentially redundant with, the authority this bill would provide pursuant to subdivision (as), concerning public benefits programs.

Subdivision (f) of existing law requires EDD to provide access to information for purposes related to public benefits, as follows:

To enable federal, state, or local governmental departments or agencies, subject to federal law, to verify or determine the eligibility or entitlement of an applicant for, or a recipient of, public social services pursuant to Division 9 [citation] of the Welfare and Institutions Code, [the federal Social Security Act], and state or federal subsidies offered through the California Health Benefit Exchange [citation], when the verification or determination is directly connected with, and limited to, the administration of public social services.

Public benefits pursuant to Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code include CalFresh, which is specifically enumerated in the new provisions, as well as nearly all other public benefits programs administered by DSS and DHCS.

Subdivision (ad) of existing law also specifically requires EDD to provide access to information for verifying Medi-Cal eligibility, as follows:

To enable [DHCS], the California Health Benefit Exchange, the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board, and county departments and agencies to obtain information regarding employee wages, California employer names and account numbers, employer reports of wages and number of employees, and disability insurance and unemployment insurance claim information, for the purpose of [...] verifying or determining the eligibility of an applicant for, or a recipient of, state health subsidy programs, limited to the Medi-Cal program [citation], and the Medi-Cal Access Program [citation], when the verification or determination is directly connected with, and limited to, the administration of the state health subsidy programs referenced in this [provision].

Accordingly, it is not clear whether the data access authority provided by subdivision (as) of this bill is entirely redundant with existing authorities pursuant to subdivisions (f) and (ad) of existing law. That said, this redundancy is unlikely to cause material practical or legal issues, since either way, the named entities would have the authority to access the information as needed for these purposes.

- 7) *Committee Amendments.*

Committee amendment #1: Explicitly ensuring compliance with federal law.

Though the purposes for which UI information would be disclosed under the bill seem consistent with federal regulations (see Comment #5), several other provisions of Section 1095 include explicit clarification that any sharing *must* comply with federal law and

regulations (see, e.g., subdivisions (t), (y), (z), (ae), (af), (aq): “to the extent permitted by federal law and regulations”; (ab), (ac), (ak): “to the extent permitted by federal statutes and regulations”; (ad)(2): “subject to the requirements of, and provided to the extent permitted by, federal law and regulations, including Part 603 of Title 220 of the Code of Federal Regulations”; (ah): “to the extent not prohibited by federal law”; (ai): “subject to federal law, including the confidentiality, disclosure, and other requirements set forth in Part 603 of Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations”; (an): “to the extent permitted by state and federal laws and regulations”; (ap): “to the extent permissible by federal laws and regulations”).

While it seems unlikely that the new provisions added to Section 1095 would be construed to require sharing that is otherwise prohibited by federal law or regulations, the presence of explicit limitations in so many other provisions of the same section (various as they may be) warrants clarification. Considering misinterpretation, and consequent violation of federal law or regulation, could result in withholding of federal UI funds, the stakes are high enough that clarification seems worthwhile.

Accordingly, the author has agreed to the following amendments:

*On page 21, in line 25, strike out “access” and insert: **access, to the extent permitted by federal laws and regulations,***

*On page 21, in line 37, strike out “access” and insert: **access, to the extent permitted by federal laws and regulations,***

Committee amendment #2: Clarifying the purpose of disclosures to OCEIC.

The bill in print requires EDD to enable OCEIC to access “any relevant wage data necessary for the purposes of supporting the council’s agendas, reports, work products, and resources.” [Emphasis added.] While the purposes of the Council are specified by law and are consistent with permissible disclosures under the federal confidentiality regulations, it is not clear that access to wage data pursuant to the bill is limited to only what is necessary to fulfill the purposes the Council is explicitly intended to satisfy.

To clarify this limitation, the author has agreed to the following amendments:

*On page 7, in lines 31 and 32, strike out “purposes of supporting the council’s agendas, reports, work products, and resources.” and insert: **council’s purposes specified in Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 11900) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 22 of the Government Code.***

*On page 21, in line 38, strike out “purposes of supporting the council’s”, strike out line 39 and insert: **council’s purposes specified in Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 11900) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.***

Committee amendment #3: Technical correction.

Section 1088.3(f) of the bill in print provides that “The department shall work with the Office of the California Education Interagency Council related to the collection of employment data pursuant to *subdivisions (as) and (at) of Section 1095* [...]” However, subdivision (as) does not provide any authorities pertinent to the OCEIC, and is therefore irrelevant to this provision.

To correct this technical error, the author has agreed to the following amendment:

*On page 7, in line 30, strike out “subdivisions (as) and” and insert: **subdivision***

Committee amendment #4: Technical clarification.

Section 1095(as)(2) provides that “The department shall consult with the State Department of Social Services, the State Department of Health Care Services, and stakeholders, including, but not limited to, the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data, the County Welfare Directors Association of California, and the California Statewide Automated Welfare System (CalSAWS).” Though the paragraph is within the subdivision requiring EDD to enable DSS and DHCS to access employment data to support employment-related eligibility verifications for public benefits, it does not specify the purpose of the required consultation.

To clarify this requirement, the author has agreed to the following amendment:

*On page 21, in line 30, strike out “The” and insert: **In implementing this subdivision, the***

- 8) *Double referral.* This bill is double-referred to the Assembly Committee on Labor & Employment.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

All Home
 Bay Area Council
 Building Skills Partnership
 California Competes: Higher Education for a Strong Economy
 California Edge Coalition
 California In-home Supportive Services Consumer Alliance
 California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
 Ceo Leadership Alliance Orange County
 Child Care Resource Center
 Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
 Food Bank of Contra Costa and Solano
 Jobtrain
 Jvs Bay Area
 Jvs Social
 National Talent Collaborative
 Orange County United Way

The Institute for College Access & Success
Unite-la
University of California Student Association
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.
Yolo County Commission on Aging and Adult Services
Yolo County In-home Supportive Services Advisory Committee

Opposition

City of LA Verne

Analysis Prepared by: Landon Klein / INS. / (916) 319-2086