

Date of Hearing: June 30, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Ash Kalra, Chair
SB 947 (McNerney) – As Amended June 25, 2026

As Proposed to be Amended

SENATE VOTE: 29-9

SUBJECT: EMPLOYMENT: AUTOMATED DECISION SYSTEMS

SYNOPSIS

According to several studies and news reports, employers increasingly use “Automated Decision System” (ADS) tools, including artificial intelligence (AI), to analyze data about applicants and employees. The tools produce “ADS output” that an employer may then use to make any number of employment-related decisions, including hiring or promoting workers, tracking performance, setting schedules, assigning work tasks, and disciplining and firing workers, among others. According to the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center, these tools “typically perform three main tasks: (a) rank workers, (b) predict workers’ future behavior or characteristics, and (c) give workers directions about their job tasks.” While many laud the possibilities of ADS, the author and sponsor point out that, without human oversight, workers could be unfairly “ranked” or subjected to adverse employment actions based on algorithmic predictions, inaccuracies, or inherent biases built into the data that ADS relies upon. If an employee runs the risk of losing their livelihood, the author and sponsor believe there should be human input.

This bill imposes restrictions on, but does not entirely eliminate, an employer’s ability to use ADS in employment-related decisions. The bill prohibits an employer from using ADS to, in any way, avoid compliance with the law and it prohibits the use of prediction analysis to infer an employee’s protected characteristics, predict future behavior, or identify employees likely to exercise legal rights and then take adverse action against workers based on these predictions. The bill also prohibits employers from relying solely on ADS output to discipline, terminate, or deactivate a worker. If the employer relies primarily on ADS output to discipline, terminate, or deactivate a worker, the employer must direct a human reviewer to investigate and compile information to corroborate the ADS decision. If the employer takes the adverse action based primarily on ADS output they must provide the affected worker with notice of the decision and rationale, as specified. Finally, the bill requires the Labor Commissioner (LC) to enforce the provisions of this bill and authorizes both the LC and a public prosecutor to bring a civil action for injunctive relief, punitive damages, a civil penalty, and attorney’s fees and costs.

The bill is supported by a broad coalition of labor and employee rights organizations, among others. It is opposed by the California Chamber of Commerce and a broad coalition of employer and business associations, as well as associations representing local government entities. The triple-referred bill recently passed out of the Assembly Labor Committee on 5-1 vote and out of the Assembly Privacy Committee on a 10-4 vote.

SUMMARY: Restricts an employer’s ability to use an “Automated Decision System” (ADS) in making employment-related decisions. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits an employer from using ADS to do any of the following:
 - a) Prevent compliance with or violate any federal, state, or local labor, occupational health and safety, employment, or civil rights laws or regulations.
 - b) Infer a worker's protected status.
 - c) Conduct predictive behavior analysis on a worker with the intention of using the analysis to make an employment-related decision.
 - d) Predict or take adverse action against a worker for exercising their legal rights, including, but not limited to, rights guaranteed by state and federal employment and labor law.
- 2) Prohibits an employer from relying *solely* on ADS when making a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decision. Requires an employer who *primarily* relies on ADS output to make a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decision to direct a human reviewer to conduct an independent investigation and compile corroborating or supporting information, as defined, for the decision. If an employer cannot corroborate, as specified, the employer shall not use ADS to discipline, terminate, or deactivate a worker.
- 3) Gives the worker the right to request, and requires an employer to provide, a copy of the most recent 12 months of the worker's own data primarily used by an ADS to make a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decisions. Limits a worker to one request every 12 months.
- 4) Requires an employer that primarily relies upon ADS to make a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decision to provide the affected worker with a written post-use notice at the time the employer informs the worker of the decision and prescribes the content of the notice.
- 5) Prohibits an employer from discharging, demoting, suspending, or in any manner discriminating or retaliating against any worker for using or attempting to use their rights under the bill, filing a complaint with the Labor Commissioner, alleging a violation, cooperating in an investigation or prosecution, or asserting any other right.
- 6) Requires the Labor Commissioner to investigate an alleged violation and order appropriate temporary relief to mitigate a violation or maintain the status quo pending the completion of a full investigation or hearing, as specified, including issuing a citation and filing a civil action. Specifies that the provisions of the bill may also be enforced by a public prosecutor, as defined and provided.
- 7) Specifies that provisions of the bill do not preempt a city, county, or county and city ordinance that provides greater protection to workers.
- 8) Specifies that an employer who complies with the requirements related to notice provisions of the bill is not required to comply with any substantially similar notice provisions related to ADS and employment-related decisions under any other state law. However, an employer that is a business subject to the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 is subject to any privacy-related ADS regulation duly adopted by the California Privacy Protection Agency.

- 9) Specifies that the provisions of the bill do not apply to parties covered by a collective bargaining agreement, as specified, and does not prohibit an employer from complying with regulatory or contractual requirements in the provisions of products or services to the federal government.
- 10) Defines the following terms:
- a) “ADS output” means any information, data, assumptions, predictions, scoring, recommendations, decisions, or conclusions generated by an ADS.
 - b) “Artificial intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.
 - c) “Automated decision system” or “ADS” means any computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision making and materially impacts natural persons. An automated decision system does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.
 - d) “Employment-related decision” means any decision by an employer that materially impacts a worker’s wages, benefits, compensation, work hours, work schedule, performance evaluation, hiring, discipline, promotion, termination, job tasks, skill requirements, work responsibilities, assignment of work, access to work and training opportunities, productivity requirements, or workplace health and safety.
 - e) “Predictive behavior analysis” means any system that predicts a worker’s behavior, beliefs, or intentions.
 - f) “Worker” means any natural person who is an employee of, or an independent contractor providing service to, or through, a business or a state or local governmental entity in any workplace.
 - g) “Worker data” means any information that identifies, relates to, or describes a worker, regardless of how the information is collected, inferred, or obtained.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Makes it an unlawful employment practice, unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification, for an employer to refuse to hire or employ the person or to refuse to select the person for a training program leading to employment, or to bar or discharge the person from employment or from a training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment based upon specified characteristics, including race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, reproductive health decision making, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or veteran or military status. (Government Code Section 12940.)

- 2) Requires the California Department of Technology 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. Defines the following terms:
 - a) “Artificial intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.
 - b) “Automated decision system” means a computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision making and materially impacts natural persons. “Automated decision system” does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.
 - c) “High-risk automated decision system” means an ADS that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisions that have a legal or similarly significant effect, including decisions that materially impact access to, or approval for, housing or accommodations, education, employment, credit, health care, and criminal justice. (Government Code Section 11546.45.5.)
- 3) Clarifies, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Civil Rights Department, that unlawful discrimination based on protected characteristics includes unlawful discrimination made through the use of an automated-decisions system, as defined. (Defines “automated-decision system” for purpose of these regulations to mean a computational process that makes a decision, or facilitates human decision making, regarding an employment benefit. Specifies that an automated-decisions making system may be derived from or use artificial intelligence, machine-learning, algorithms, statistics, or other data processing techniques. (Title 2 California Code of Regulations Sections 11008.1 *et seq.*)

FISCAL EFFECT: As currently in print this bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS: According to the author:

Businesses are increasingly using AI to boost efficiency and productivity in the workplace. But there are currently no safeguards to prevent machines from unjustly or illegally impacting workers’ livelihoods and working conditions. SB 947 establishes post-use notifications when ADS is used in the workplace, and ensures employers have a human in the loop when making critical employment decisions.

SB 947 does not prohibit ADS in the workplace, rather it will establish guardrails to ensure that California businesses are not operated by robo bosses, because there will be a human in the loop. AI must remain a tool controlled by humans, not the other way around.

Employer Use of Automated-Decision Systems (ADS). According to a number of studies and reports, employers increasingly use ADS tools to analyze data about applicants and employees. The ADS then produces output that the employer may use to make any number of employment-related decisions, including hiring or promoting workers, tracking performance, setting

schedules, and assigning work tasks, among others. According to the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center, these tools “typically perform three main tasks: (a) rank workers, (b) predict workers’ future behavior or characteristics, and (c) give workers directions about their job tasks.” Some of these programs simply monitor employee performance, including platforms that monitor office workers’ computer activity to generate “distraction” scores or use behavioral and personality assessments to make predictions about an employee’s ability to assume leadership roles. More troubling, other tools may predict the probability that an employee might join a union, become pregnant, or pose a security or safety risk. (U.C. Berkeley Labor Center, *Electronic Monitoring and Automated Decision Systems*, May 2025; see also A. Hertel-Hernández, *Estimating the Prevalence of Automated Management and Surveillance Technologies and Their Impact on Workers Well-Being*, Washington Center for Equitable Growth, 2024.) According to the author and sponsor, these tools present a danger that employers will use AI and ADS to make decisions – including taking disciplinary actions or even terminating workers – based on output generated by these programs without any human oversight.

Existing regulations of employer use of ADS. Last year the California Civil Rights Department’s Civil Rights Council (CRC) approved new regulations to address employers’ use of artificial intelligence (AI) and automated-decision systems (ADSs) under California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). Taking effect on October 1, 2025, these regulations clarify that employers cannot use ADS to make employment decisions that discriminate against applicants or employees in violation of FEHA, the California state law prohibiting discrimination in employment and housing. The regulations define ADS as a “computational process that makes a decision or facilitates human decision making regarding an employment benefit” that “may be derived from and/or use artificial intelligence, machine-learning, algorithms, statistics, and/or other data processing techniques.” The regulations also provide a non-exhaustive, illustrative list of the tasks ADSs perform, including assessing applicants or employees with “questions, puzzles, games, and other challenges”; directing job advertisements to targeted groups; screening resumes for terms and patterns; evaluating facial expressions and speech and voice patterns in online interviews; and analyzing applicant or employee information from third parties. ADSs exclude certain types of processors, such as word processors, spreadsheet software, information technology software, map navigation systems, spellchecking and calculators — “provided that these technologies do not make a decision regarding an employment benefit.” (2 CCR Section 11008.1 *et seq.*)

The new regulations make clear that it is unlawful to use an ADS in connection with an employment decision to discriminate against persons based on their national origin, sex, pregnancy, marital status, disability, age, or other protected characteristics by incorporating references to ADS into several existing prohibitions or requirements. (2 CCR Sections 11016-11079.) In short, discriminating against a worker on the basis of a protected characteristic is an unlawful employment practice, whether based on old-fashioned human bigotry or newfangled technology. As many studies have suggested, AI and ADS, despite their ability to analyze data at speeds and in volumes that are almost unimaginable, still reproduce the biases of the human beings who created that data.

This bill seeks to protect workers by preventing “robo bosses” from making automated decisions “to fire, discipline, or deactivate works by requiring human oversight and independent corroboration before those decisions are made.” The bill defines ADS to mean “any computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or

recommendation that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decision making and material impacts natural persons.” It prohibits an employer from using ADS to (1) prevent compliance with any health, labor, or civil rights law or regulation; (2) infer a worker’s protected status; (3) conduct predictive behavior analysis on a worker with the intention of using the analysis to make an employment-related decision; and (4) predict and take adverse action against for worker for exercising the legal rights.

The bill also prohibits the employer from relying “solely” on ADS to make “disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decisions.” (“Deactivation” seems to refer to terminating a relationship with a contractor, which is included in the definition of “worker.”) As implied by the word “solely,” employers may still use ADS as one factor in a decision to discipline, terminate, or deactivate a worker. However, if the employer “primarily” relies upon ADS to make the decision, the employer must direct a human reviewer to conduct an independent investigation and compile corroborating or supporting information for a decision. The bill specifies that supporting information could include supervisory evaluations, personnel files, work product, peer reviews, witness interviews, and online customer reviews.

Beyond those things that an employer can never do – use ADS to avoid compliance with a law, infer a worker’s protected status, or conduct predictive analysis and use it to make employment-related decisions – there is some ambiguity as to what is required to prove that an adverse decision was based “solely” or “primarily” on ADS, or if it was just one factor among many. Unless the ADS has the power to automatically fire or take an adverse action against an employee, the ADS output will necessarily be interpreted and evaluated by a human actor before an adverse action is taken. It is difficult to imagine that an employer or supervisor will act on that output alone without any consideration of their real life experience with that employee that might confirm or question the ADS output.

If the adverse action relies “primarily” (though not “solely”) on ADS output, the employer may use the ADS output but must direct a human reviewer to “conduct an investigation and compile corroborating and supporting information for the decision.” Although the bill does not say how extensive this investigation must be or how much corroborating information is sufficient, a plausible reading of the bill would suggest that it must be a “reasonable” investigation, and the supporting information would be sufficient to convince a reasonable person that there are reasons beyond the ADS output that justify the adverse action. At a minimum, the employer will need to point to some other piece of evidence that supports the conclusion in the ADS output and not act on the ADS output alone. This does not seem like a great burden on the employer given that the employee’s livelihood is potentially at stake.

In addition to imposing limits on the employer’s ability to rely solely or primarily on ADS output, including predictive output, the bill also requires an employer who primarily relies on ADS to make a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decision to provide the affected worker with a written notice at the time the employer informs the worker of the decision. The bill requires that the notice, among other things, be written in plain language that explains how the decision was made, how it complies with the provisions of this bill, and the worker’s rights under this bill, including the right to be free from retaliation for exercising those rights.

Enforcement. Finally, the bill requires the Labor Commissioner (LC) to enforce the bill, including by investigating alleged violations and ordering appropriate relief, issuing a citation, or filing a civil action. If a citation is issued, the procedures for issuing, contesting, and enforcing

judgments shall be the same as those provided for under existing provisions of the Labor Code. The bill also authorizes the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney, county counsel, or any other city or county prosecutor to independently investigate, prosecute, and bring actions to enforce the provisions of this bill. In any civil action brought by the Labor Commissioner or public prosecutor, the petitioner may seek appropriate injunctive relief, punitive damages, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs. (A prior version of the bill permitted a private right of action by the person harmed; however, that provision was removed in the Assembly Privacy Committee.)

Opposition concerns. The business and employer groups opposing this bill raise several objections, some more reasonable than others. To begin with, opponents contend that the bill is overly broad and will have a “chilling effect” on the very kinds of technology that help prevent the irrational bias that concern the bill’s proponents. While it is certainly true that technology may be no more biased than human actors, and perhaps even less biased if properly constructed, the bill does not prohibit the use of ADS for all employment related decisions. To be sure, the bill’s definition of “employment related decisions” is quite broad in that it includes anything that “materially impacts a worker’s wages, benefits, compensation, work hours, work schedule, performance evaluation, hiring, discipline, promotion, termination, job tasks, skill requirements, work responsibilities, assignment of work, access to work and training opportunities, productivity requirements, or workplace health and safety.” However, the bill *does not prohibit* the use of ADS to make employment-related decisions. It only prohibits the use of ADS to prevent compliance with the law, infer a worker’s protected status, conduct predictive analysis with the intention of making an employment-related decision, or using predictive analysis to take adverse action against an employer for exercising legal rights. Employers can use ADS for any other reason – including in decisions to discipline, terminate, or deactivate a worker – so long as they do not rely *solely* on ADS. Employers can even use ADS as the primary (but not sole) reason for taking an adverse action against the employee, so long as a human reviewer investigates and compiles supporting information for the decision. In short, if the decision is to discipline, terminate, or deactivate, the employer must be prepared to offer up some additional piece of evidence. This would appear to leave ample opportunity to continue using ADS to assist them in employment-related decisions, even those that result in an adverse action against the employee.

However, the breadth of the bill is not the opposition’s only concern. They also object to defining “worker” to include independent contractors. They point out that many independent contractors are quite different from employees, and the relationship between the employer and contractor may be more akin to a business-to-business relationship than an employer-employee relationship. If an ADS flags inappropriate behavior or fraud, opponents contend that the employer should be free to terminate (or “deactivate” in the words of the bill) that contract without meeting the investigation and corroboration requirements of this bill. Opponents also claim that the requirement to “corroborate” decisions with additional information and to provide this corroborating evidence to the affected employee could compromise the integrity of workplace investigations or reveal confidential communications with other workers. However, there is nothing in the bill that requires undermining investigations or revealing confidential communications; the bill only requires the employer to provide some evidence beyond the ADS output and to ensure that there was some human review of the decision. *The author may wish to consider whether it is necessary to expressly state that the employer is not required to reveal confidential communications or reveal information that could undermine an ongoing*

investigation, but that may not be necessary given that nothing in the bill requires the employer to do that.

Finally, the opposition argues that the bill increases employers' exposure to litigation and costly civil penalties. This criticism had more weight when the bill permitted a private right of action, but as recently amended the actions may only be brought by the Labor Commissioner and public prosecutors. Because these agencies typically target their limited resources to many other pressing public needs, it seems unlikely that this bill will result in a wave of litigation. Most likely, the Labor Commissioner and public prosecutors will only pursue the most egregious cases. Having said that, *the author may wish to consider modifying the language in the bill that permits a petitioner in a civil action (whether the LC or a public prosecutor) to seek "punitive damages," especially given that the LC and public prosecutor may recover attorney's fees and costs and impose a civil penalty of \$500 per violation.*

Unanswerable questions about AI vs. human bias. One of the promises and selling points of ADS is that it removes the element of human bias. In theory, ADS is programmed to analyze data in an efficient, objective, and scientific manner, free from the subjective feelings and implicit bias of human actors. However, AI and ADS are only as good as the datasets and large-scale language models that they "scrape" and harvest. Earlier this year the consultants in the Committee conducted an admittedly unscientific experiment asking ChatGPT to write letters of application for different job positions and feeding it with different scenarios about both the applicant and the job. When asked to write a job application letter for a Latina seeking a job as an attorney, ChatGPT recommended that the letter writer discuss her pride in being the first person from her family to graduate from college and seek a professional degree, even though we had not given ChatGPT any reason to believe that our hypothetical applicant was the first in her family to attend college. ChatGPT assumed that based on stereotypes. AI is no less biased and subjective than humans, because the data it pulls from originates from and is pre-organized by humans. Of course one could persuasively argue that humans have such a dismal track record in this regard that they will do worse than ADS. Who knows for sure? Yet it cannot but help to have a second set of eyes, as it were, reviewing the ADS output before jeopardizing someone's livelihood.

Relationship to SB 7: Last year's SB 7, by the same author, is quite similar to the bill now before the Committee. SB 7 was vetoed by Governor Newsom because he found it "overly broad" and cited, in particular, a provision that required the employer to provide a "pre-notification" to workers before using ADS. The Governor contended that this provision would impose "unfocused notification requirements on any business using even the most innocuous tools." The author removed the pre-notification requirement in its entirety from this year's bill. Opponents contend, however, that the bill does not address the Governor's more general criticism that the bill was "overly broad." They claim, too, that the bill adds new requirements that were not in SB 7, such as the requirement that a human reviewer "conduct an investigation" and compile evidence that corroborates the ADS output. Whether the differences between this bill and SB 7 are sufficient to assuage the Governor remains to be seen.

Clarifying Technical Amendment. On page 4, line 34, replace "or" with "and." This makes it clearer that the bill prohibits the use of ADS to predict *and* then take adverse action based on that prediction.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Federation of Labor Unions, the bill’s sponsor, writes in support:

Employer use of ADS is increasingly used without oversight to make the decisions that impact workers’ paychecks. A 2025 Resume Builder survey of employers found that 60% of managers use AI systems to make critical decisions about workers, including raises, terminations, and layoffs. Of those, 20% let AI make final decisions without any human input or oversight. Algorithmic management can inflict serious harm to workers. Endlessly increasing efficiency through eliminating routine tasks and increasing work speeds can lead to fatigue, burn-out, excessive injuries, and other harm, as seen in Amazon warehouses that relied on algorithms to implement speed quotas which forced workers to skip bathroom breaks and skirt safety measures.

In addition to swiftly firing a worker, ADS can potentially discriminate based on the pre-set rules that are deemed proprietary to conduct predictive behavior analysis to prevent “undesirable worker outcomes.” For example, Teramind offers employers with advisory service algorithms to detect potential employee fraud by analyzing information such as a worker’s debt history or their spending habits in order to flag a worker as being susceptible to committing fraud and stealing from the company. Ultimately, unregulated employer use of ADS technology leaves workers vulnerable to discrimination, lower pay, dangerous working conditions, and high risk of unjust termination. The wellbeing of a human should not be at the behest of a machine.

To prevent algorithmic firings and discipline, SB 947 ensures human oversight of automated decision-making systems when making decisions that impact workers’ working conditions and livelihoods. SB 947 allows employers to use ADS, but requires human oversight and independent corroboration of firing, disciplinary, and deactivation decisions. Additionally, SB 947 outright prohibits employers from using an ADS to make decisions on workers based on predictive analysis, thus protecting workers from being profiled and disciplined based on actions they have not committed. SB 947 will prevent the outsourcing of decisions that impact workers’ lives to machines. It allows for the use of technology and tools to make workplaces more productive and efficient but ensures human oversight to prevent abuse and mistakes.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Chamber of Commerce, writing on behalf of itself and several other business associations, opposes this bill for the following reasons:

The bill broadly targets businesses of all sizes, across every industry, and regulates even low-risk applications of automated decision systems (ADS). . . SB 947 will drive up costs for consumers and employers because it would impose significant compliance burdens and any misstep would lead to costly litigation for even the smallest of employers . . . Unfortunately, we believe SB 947 will have an undesired chilling effect on technology and make it that much harder to develop the very tools that can help combat bias in decision making.

[Many] employers rely on ADS for productivity tracking or performance monitoring in environments where supervisors cannot directly observe every worker at all times. In those circumstances, SB 947 would effectively bar the use of these tools for personnel purposes because they could never be relied upon unless every single output is

independently corroborated. In practice, this would undermine the very technologies that help employers manage operations, maintain safety, and ensure accountability.

The bill's definition of "worker" includes independent contractors, which should be removed from the bill. Contractors are often limited-term workers who are performing a specific job for a company. . . [The] the inclusion of contractors is especially problematic in several respects. For example, it is not uncommon [for] ADS to flag inappropriate behavior, potential fraud, or other issues and to then have the company need to immediately terminate the relationship or terminate while there is an investigation that occurs. That would be prohibited under SB 947, even if that termination is necessary for employee or consumer safety, to stop a seller from selling counterfeit goods or defrauding customers, and more.

SB 947 will significantly increase litigation exposure and civil penalty liability for businesses by expanding the circumstances under which employers may be subject to enforcement actions. By creating new compliance obligations and record-keeping requirements, SB 947 effectively establishes additional bases for technical violations that could trigger costly lawsuits, civil penalties of \$500 per violation, and enforcement proceedings. Even minor or inadvertent administrative errors could expose employers to substantial statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and prolonged litigation.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION, UNLESS AMENDED: Several organizations oppose the bill unless amended. Their concerns are similar to those raised by the Chamber of Commerce, and they seek various amendments that effectively limit the breadth of the bill's application by focusing more on high-risk uses of ADS.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Federation of Labor Unions (sponsor)
Alameda Labor Council
American Federation of Musicians, Local 7
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees California
Association of California State Employees With Disabilities
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Nurses Association
California Professional Firefighters
California School Employees Association
California State Legislative Board of the Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers -
Transportation Division (SMART-TD)
California State Legislative Board of the Smart - Transportation Division
California Teachers Association
California Working Families Party
Center on Policy Initiatives
Central Coast Labor Council

Central Labor Council, Fresno-Madera-Tulare-Kings Counties
Communications Workers of America, District 9
County Employees Management Association
Electronic Frontier Association
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Inland Empire Labor Council
Kapor Center Advocacy
National Union of Healthcare Workers
North Bay Labor Council
North Valley Labor Federation
Oakland Privacy
Orange County Employees Association
Orange County Labor Federation
San Mateo County Central Labor Council
San Mateo Labor Council
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Tech Oversight California
Techequity Action
Techequity Collaborative
United Auto Workers Region 6
What We Will

Opposition

American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association
American Staffing Association
Associated Equipment Distributors
Associated General Contractors of California
Associated General Contractors San Diego
Association of California Healthcare Districts
Association of California School Administrators
Bay Area Council
California Apartment Association
California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Broadband & Video Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Coalition on Workers Compensation
California County Superintendents
California Farm Bureau
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Grocers Association
California Hospital Association
California Landscape Contractor's Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association

California Special Districts Association
California Staffing and Recruiting Association
California Staffing Professionals
California State Association of Counties
California Trucking Association
California's Credit Unions
Chamber of Progress
Cinema Association of California
Civil Justice Association of California
County of Fresno
County of Kern
Family Business Association of California
Fresno County Board of Supervisors
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Leading Age California
League of California Cities
Los Angeles County Business Federation
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies
Orange County Fire Authority
Personal Insurance Federation of California
Protect App-based Drivers & Services Coalition
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM)
Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce
Rural County Representatives of California
Self Storage Association
SHRM California
Technet
Uber Technologies, INC.
Urban Counties of California
Western Growers Association

Oppose Unless Amended

Business Software Alliance
Gaslamp Quarter Association
Insights Association
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Restaurant Association
Valley Industry and Commerce Association

Analysis Prepared by: Tom Clark / JUD. / (916) 319-2334