

Date of Hearing: July 1, 2026

Fiscal: Yes

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Chair

SB 951 (Reyes) – As Amended June 22, 2026

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

SENATE VOTE: 28-9

SUBJECT: Employment: technological displacement: notice

SYNOPSIS

Artificial intelligence (AI) and other automated technologies are rapidly changing California's labor market, but policymakers lack reliable data about when, where, and how those technologies are contributing to layoffs, hiring freezes, or the permanent elimination of occupations and positions. Recent reports suggest that employers are increasingly citing AI as a reason for workforce reductions, while state leaders have begun examining how California should prepare workers, businesses, and communities for AI-related economic disruption. Existing law, including the Cal/WARN Act, provides advance notice for certain mass layoffs, relocations, and terminations, but does not specifically require employers to identify when those actions are driven by AI or automation.

SB 951 would establish the California Worker Technological Displacement Act and require employers to provide advance notice when artificial intelligence or other automated technology causes significant workforce disruption. Specifically, the bill would require at least 60 days' written notice before a "technological displacement," defined as a layoff of 50 or more workers in a 30-day period caused by AI or other automation replacing or automating employment positions. The bill would also require employers to notify the Employment Development Department (EDD) when they permanently stop hiring or contracting for a particular occupation or position because of AI or automation. EDD would be required to post summaries of these notices and compile quarterly statewide summaries of worker displacement due to AI and automation. Proposed Committee amendments, detailed in comments # 3 and 4, recast SB 951's AI-related layoff notice requirements into the existing Cal/WARN framework, broaden the causation standard to include workforce actions caused "in whole or in substantial part" by AI or automation, clarify when a technological cessation in hiring occurs, and make minor technical and conforming changes.

This bill is sponsored by the California Federation of Labor Unions and supported by a broad coalition of labor advocacy groups. It is opposed by a broad coalition of business advocacy groups, including the California Chamber of Commerce. A variety of public employers strike an "oppose unless amended" position. The bill was previously heard in the Labor and Employment Committee, where it passed on a 5-0 vote.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Defines "artificial intelligence" to mean 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. (Gov. Code § 11546.45.5.)

- 2) Establishes the California Worker Adjustment and Retraining Act (Cal/WARN), which prohibits an employer with 75 or more full and part-time employees from ordering a layoff of 50 or more employees within a 30-day period, relocation, or termination at a covered establishment, as defined, unless the employer gives written notice to all of the following 60 days before the order takes effect:
 - a) The employees of the covered establishment affected by the order.
 - b) The Employment Development Department (EDD), the local workforce investment board, and the chief elected official of each city and county government within which the termination, relocation, or mass layoff occurs. (Lab. Code § 1400-1413.)
- 3) Defines, for purposes of the Cal/WARN Act, an “employer” to mean any person, association, organization, partnership, business trust, limited liability company, or corporation who directly or indirectly owns and operates a covered establishment. A parent corporation is an employer as to any covered establishment directly owned and operated by its corporate subsidiary. (Lab. Code § 1400.5)
- 4) Exempts from the provisions of Cal/WARN seasonal employees and employees that are laid off due to the completion of a project in specified industries, where the employers are subject to specified wage orders, and the employees were hired with the understanding that their employment was seasonal and temporary. (Lab. Code § 1400.5.)
- 5) Requires employers that are mandated to give notice of a mass layoff, relocation, or termination pursuant to Cal/WARN to include in the notice the elements required by the federal WARN Act. (Lab. Code §1401.)
- 6) Provides that an employer that fails to give the required Cal/WARN notice before ordering a mass layoff, relocation, or termination is liable to each employee that was entitled to notice, for specified back pay and medical expenses incurred that would have been covered under an employee benefit plan, calculated for the period of the employer’s violation, up to a maximum of 60 days, or half the number of days that the employee was employed by the employer, whichever period is shorter. (Lab. Code § 1402.)
- 7) Provides that an employer who fails to give the required Cal/WARN notice is subject to a civil penalty of not more than five hundred dollars (\$500) for each day of the employer’s violation. Exempts an employer from this civil penalty if the employer pays all applicable employees within three weeks from the date the employer ordered the mass layoff, relocation, or termination. (Lab. Code § 1403.)
- 8) Permits a person, including a local government, or an employee representative, seeking to establish liability against an employer for violation of Cal/WARN to bring a civil action on behalf of the person, other persons similarly situated, or both, in any court of competent jurisdiction. Additionally, permits a court to award reasonable attorney’s fees as part of the costs to any plaintiff who prevails in a civil action. (Lab. Code § 1404.)

- 9) Establishes the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) in the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and vests it with various powers and duties to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of California, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment. (Lab. Code § 50.5.)
- 10) Establishes various entities within DIR, including the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement under the direction of the Labor Commissioner (LC), and empowers the LC with ensuring a just day's pay in every workplace and promotes economic justice through robust enforcement of labor laws. (Lab. Code § 79-107.)
- 11) Establishes EDD in LWDA, and vests it with various duties and responsibilities including job creation activities, administration of the Unemployment, Disability, and Paid Family Leave programs, collection of payroll taxes, keeping track of employment records, managing federal job training programs, and collecting and sharing information about the job market. (Unemp. Ins. Code § 301.)

THIS BILL:

- 1) Defines the following terms:
 - a) "Employer" means any person, as defined by Section 18, who directly or indirectly owns and operates a covered establishment. A parent corporation is an employer as to any covered establishment directly owned and operated by its corporate subsidiary. An "employer" includes, but is not limited to, any of the following:
 1. The state, including its legislative, judicial, and executive branches.
 2. Any city, county, or city and county, including any charter city, charter county, charter city and county, and other political subdivisions of the state.
 3. Special districts.
 4. Local educational agencies and community college districts that do not provide layoff notices pursuant to specified statutes of the Education Code for academic, classified, or certificated staff.
 5. Any authority, commission, board, agency, or instrumentality of any entity specified in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive.
 6. The University of California, the California State University, and community college districts.
 - b) "Technological displacement" means a layoff during any 30-day period of 50 or more workers caused in whole by an AI system or other automated technology replacing or automating employment positions.
 - c) "Technological cessation in hiring" means the end of hiring permanently for an occupation or position that is caused in whole by the use of AI or other automation.

“Technological cessation in hiring” does not mean an overall reduction in employment positions.

- d) “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, for at least 6 months of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required under this article. “Worker” includes, but is not limited to, full-time and part-time workers but does not include a seasonally employed individual who was hired with the understanding that their employment is seasonal and temporary, a volunteer, or an intern.
- 2) Requires an employer to provide at least a 60-day advanced written notice before any technological displacement.
- a) Requires the notice to be provided to all of the following:
 - 1. The workers of the employer affected by the technological disruption.
 - 2. The Employment Development Department.
 - 3. The local workforce investment board, city council members, and county board of supervisors of each city and county in the state within which the technological displacement occurs.
 - b) Requires the notice to contain all of the following information:
 - 1. The name and address of the employment site and the name, email, and telephone number of a company official or public agency contact person.
 - 2. A statement indicating whether the planned action is permanent or temporary.
 - 3. The expected date of the first separation and the anticipated schedule for subsequent separations.
 - 4. The number, classification or occupation, and work location of layoffs that are substantially due to the replacement or automation by AI.
 - 5. The job functions performed by those workers that will be automated by AI.
 - 6. The specific category or type of AI system or other automating technology that substantially resulted in technological displacement, including the entity or entities that developed, sold, or leased the product.
 - 7. If retraining is available to current workers to transition from eliminated occupations to new ones at the company.
 - 8. Whether the employer plans to coordinate services, such as a rapid response orientation, through the local workforce development board, a different entity, or the employer does not plan to coordinate services with any entity.

9. A functioning email and telephone number of the board and a description of the rapid response activities offered by the local workforce development board.
- 3) Requires the employer to arrange services within 30 days from the date of the notice if the employer chooses to coordinate services with the local workforce development board or another entity.
- 4) For employers with more than 100 workers, provides that each worker affected by a technological displacement is entitled to the right of first bid on other positions with the employer, except to the extent that right would conflict with the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement.
- 5) Prohibits an employer from discharging a worker affected by a technological displacement without reasonable and substantiated cause during the 60-day period from when the notice is provided to the worker.
- 6) Requires an employer to provide a written technology hiring disruption notice when it executes a technological cessation in hiring caused in whole by the adoption of AI or other automating technology.
 - a) Requires the notice to be given to the Employment Development Department.
 - b) Requires the notice to include all of the following information:
 1. The name and address of the employment site and the name, email, and telephone number of a company official or public agency contact person.
 2. A statement indicating whether the planned action is permanent or temporary.
 3. The number of positions of the employer that were occupied at any point during the prior quarter for which the employer has decided not to fill because of a technological cessation in hiring.
 4. The classification or occupation, and work location of positions that will no longer be filled by humans due to the replacement or automation by AI.
 5. The job functions performed in these positions.
 6. The specific category or type of AI system or other automating technology that resulted in the technological cessation of hiring, including the entity or entities that developed, sold, or leased the product.
 7. A statement if the cessation resulted in hiring or creation of other employment positions in the company and the number and occupation of those positions.
- 7) Provides that if a workforce action triggers notice obligations under both this bill and the Cal/WARN Act, a covered employer may include the notice required under this bill as part of the notice requirements under Cal/WARN, and provides that a covered employer shall not be required to separately comply with this bill.

- 8) Requires a local education agency that provides layoff notices for classified and certificated staff under applicable law, or a community college district that provides layoff notices for academic and classified employees under applicable law, to provide the Employment Development Department with a written technology displacement or cessation in hiring notice on an annual basis when it executes a relevant workforce action.
- 9) Requires the Employment Development Department to post summaries of notices received pursuant to this bill on their internet website as part of the existing notice requirements of the Cal/WARN Act, and to compile a quarterly summary using those notices to present a statewide summary of worker displacement due to AI and automation. Requires the report to include a link to the Cal/WARN Act notice report internet website.
- 10) Requires the Employment Development Department to submit the report to the Labor and Budget Committees of the Assembly and Senate.
- 11) Provides that an employer that fails to give notice under this bill before ordering a technological displacement is subject to enforcement under the existing Cal/WARN Act.
- 12) Establishes the Technological Displacement Act Fund within the State Treasury, and requires all civil penalties recovered by the Labor Commissioner pursuant to this article to be deposited into the fund. Makes all moneys in the fund available to the commissioner, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for purposes of enforcing this article.
- 13) Provides that this act does not supercede greater protections provided by a collective bargaining agreement.
- 14) Permits the Labor Commissioner and Employment Development Department to adopt rules and regulations as necessary and proper to effectuate the purposes of this article

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's statement.** According to the author:

Artificial Intelligence is transforming our economy at an unprecedented pace. Unlike past technological advances, AI has the ability to automate entire occupations almost overnight, leaving workers vulnerable to sudden economic disruption. Employers are already citing AI as a reason for layoffs and hiring freezes, yet policymakers lack reliable data to understand the full impact. Without this information, government is forced to respond only after workers have already lost their livelihoods.

SB 951 modernizes California's existing Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act by requiring employers to provide a 60-day advance notice when mass layoffs are driven by artificial intelligence or technological automation. This ensures workers and the state have time to prepare and respond, while also allowing the state to collect critical data on AI-related job loss and workforce disruption. This information will help policymakers better understand how AI is reshaping our labor market and craft informed, proactive solutions.

Innovation should not come at the expense of working families. SB 951 ensures transparency, preparedness, and accountability as artificial intelligence becomes a permanent part of California's economy.

2) **Background. *AI and GenAI.*** In brief, AI is the mimicking of human intelligence by artificial systems such as computers. AI uses algorithms – sets of rules – to transform inputs into outputs. Inputs and outputs can be anything a computer can process: numbers, text, audio, video, or movement. AI is not fundamentally different from other computer functions; its novelty lies in its application. Unlike traditional computer functions, AI can accomplish tasks that are normally performed by humans. AI that is trained on small, specific datasets to make recommendations and predictions is sometimes referred to as “predictive AI.” This differentiates it from GenAI, which is trained on massive datasets in order to produce detailed text and images. When Netflix suggests a TV show to a viewer, that recommendation is produced by predictive AI that has been trained on the viewing habits of Netflix users. When ChatGPT generates text in clear, concise paragraphs, it uses GenAI that has been trained on the written contents of the internet.

Automated decision systems. Automated decision systems (ADS) typically use predictive AI to produce simplified outputs – such as scores, classifications, or recommendations – to assist or replace human discretionary decisionmaking.¹ ADS can process enormous datasets, identify hidden patterns, and make decisions with efficiency and scale that vastly exceeds human capabilities. This has led to profoundly beneficial applications and breakthroughs.²

But relying on ADS can be hazardous if the systems are not trained carefully or tested thoroughly: the datasets they are trained on are often unrepresentative or contaminated with bias, the inferences ADS draw from those datasets are often inscrutable, and these systems can fail to accurately account for the complexity of human behavior. When deployed without proper oversight in consequential contexts such as employment, housing, healthcare, and criminal justice, the impacts of flawed ADS can be devastating.

AI's effect on labor markets. According to a recent report from executive outplacement firm Challenger, Gray & Christmas, AI was responsible for 54,836 announced layoffs in the United States in 2025.³ Earlier this year, a Resume.org survey of 1000 United States hiring managers revealed that 55% of companies expected further layoffs in 2026, and that 44% of these companies cited AI as a top driver – though 59% admitted they intentionally emphasized AI when explaining hiring freezes or layoffs because it “plays better with stakeholders.”⁴ It is difficult to separate the signal from the noise when assessing the effect that advanced AI is

¹ Government Code section 11546.45.5(a)(1) defines an ADS as “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 decisionmaking and materially impacts natural persons.”

² See e.g. Santariano & Metz, “Using A.I. to Detect Breast Cancer That Doctors Miss,” *New York Times* (Mar. 5, 2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/05/technology/artificial-intelligence-breast-cancer-detection.html>.

³ Challenger, Gray & Christmas, “Challenger Report December 2025,” (Jan. 8, 2026), <https://www.challengergray.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/Challenger-Report-December-2025.pdf>.

⁴ Resume.org, “The Great Turnover: 9 in 10 Companies Plan To Hire in 2026, Yet 6 in 10 Will Have Layoffs,” <https://www.resume.org/the-great-turnover-9-in-10-companies-plan-to-hire-in-2026-yet-6-in-10-will-have-layoffs-2>.

having on the labor market, as emphasized in a recent review published in *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*:

The use of Generative AI has significant effects on businesses and the labor market. One of the key contributions of this technology is the ability to generate content. However, the generation of inaccurate and incomplete content by AI may lead to a decrease in trust in the technology. In some industries and occupations, Generative AI may replace employees in content creation activities and related tasks, reducing job opportunities in these sectors. On the other hand, GenAI may create new specializations in content creation, leading to new job opportunities for people with AI-related knowledge.⁵

Ford CEO Jim Farley recently expressed his belief that “artificial intelligence is going to replace literally half of all white collar workers,”⁶ a belief shared by Anthropic CEO Darius Amodei.⁷ On the other hand, Nvidia CEO Jensen Huang recently predicted that AI will primarily augment, rather than replace, American workers.⁸ Anthropic’s “Economic Index” tool, which tracks AI usage trends across the workforce, reveals that California currently ranks fifth among states in terms of AI usage, behind Washington DC, Massachusetts, Washington state, and New York.⁹

California’s creative economy. The creative economy is both hugely important to California and particularly sensitive to AI. The Otis College 2025 Report on the Creative Economy estimates that California’s creative economy employs more than 760,000 workers with an average salary of \$191,000 per year, accounting for roughly 5% of the state’s workforce.¹⁰ The 2023 version of this report estimated that California’s creative economy was responsible for 14.9% of the state’s \$3.4 trillion economy in 2021, generating over \$194.1 billion in federal, state, and municipal taxes.¹¹

While the adoption of GenAI is opening up new possibilities in music, film, publishing and other creative fields, the technology’s impact on California’s creative economy and individual creators remains uncertain and unevenly distributed. To date, few studies have assessed how AI will affect jobs and incomes for writers, actors, musicians, designers and other creators. A global report published by the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers (CISAC and PMP Strategy) in December of 2024 projected the emergence of a massive market for AI-generated content. The study estimated that AI-generated audiovisual

⁵ Salari, Beiromvand, Hosseinian-Far, Habibi, Babajani, and Mohammadi, “Impacts of generative artificial intelligence on the future of labor market: A systematic review,” *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, (Mar. 15, 2025), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2451958825000673>.

⁶ Jeannine Mancini, “Ford CEO Says AI Will Replace ‘Literally Half’ of White-Collar Workers — But Blue-Collar Trades Are Still The Essential Backbone Of The Economy,” *yahoo!finance*, (Oct. 6, 2025), <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/ford-ceo-says-ai-replace-203114506.html>.

⁷ Jim VandeHei and Mike Allen, “Behind the Curtain: A white-collar bloodbath,” *Axios*, (May 28, 2025), <https://www.axios.com/2025/05/28/ai-jobs-white-collar-unemployment-anthropic>.

⁸ Ashton Jackson, “Nvidia CEO: You won’t lose your job to AI—you’ll ‘lose your job to somebody who uses AI’,” *CNBC*, (May 28, 2025), <https://www.cnn.com/2025/05/28/nvidia-ceo-jensen-huang-youll-lose-your-job-to-somebody-who-uses-ai.html>.

⁹ Anthropic, “Anthropic Economic Index,” <https://www.anthropic.com/economic-index#state-usage>.

¹⁰ Otis College of Art and Design, Otis College Update on the Creative Economy, (Mar. 27, 2025), available at https://www.otis.edu/about/initiatives/documents/25-063-CreativeEconomy_Report4_250325.pdf.

¹¹ Otis College of Art and Design, Otis College Report on the Creative Economy, (2023), available at <https://www.televisionacademy.com/files/assets/Downloads/2023-otis-report-on-the-creative-economy-v1.pdf>.

content, including film and TV, could be worth €48 billion (\$55.73 billion) by 2028. However, the report warned that up to 21% of creators' revenue in film and TV could be cannibalized as a result:

In an unchanged regulatory framework, creators will actually suffer losses on two fronts: the loss of revenues due to the unauthorised use of their works by Gen AI models without remuneration; and replacement of their traditional revenue streams due to the substitution effect of AI-generated outputs, competing against human-made works.¹²

Tech industry layoffs. Over the past two years, major California-based tech companies have laid off hundreds of thousands of workers around the globe. These companies have increasingly linked these layoffs to AI: in March, Reuters reported that Meta's layoff plans, which could affect 20% or more of the company, were intended to offset AI infrastructure investments and prepare for greater efficiency brought about by AI-assisted workers.¹³ Oracle similarly laid off 30,000 employees in late March – representing roughly 18% of its global workforce – in order to fund its commitment to aggressively build out AI infrastructure.¹⁴ Amazon announced plans to lay off 16,000 employees in January of this year, its second round of large-scale job reductions in three months. The company announced in a blog post that the layoffs were necessary to increase its decision-making speed.¹⁵ Jack Dorsey, founder and CEO of startup “Block, Inc” tied cutting 40% of his company to advances in efficiency due to AI in a recent X post:

we're not making this decision because we're in trouble. our business is strong. gross profit continues to grow, we continue to serve more and more customers, and profitability is improving. but something has changed. we're already seeing that the intelligence tools we're creating and using, paired with smaller and flatter teams, are enabling a new way of working which fundamentally changes what it means to build and run a company. and that's accelerating rapidly.¹⁶

Blueprint for an AI bill of rights. In 2022, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy released the *Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights*, which identifies five principles that should “guide the design, use, and deployment of automated systems to protect the American public in the age of artificial intelligence.”¹⁷ As summarized in the *Blueprint*, the principles are as follows:

¹² PMP Strategy/CISAC, Study on the economic impact of Generative AI in the Music and Audiovisual industries, (Nov. 2024), available at <https://www.cisac.org/services/reports-and-research/cisacpmp-strategy-ai-study>.

¹³ Katie Paul, Jeff Horwitz, and Deepa Seetharaman, “Exclusive: Meta planning sweeping layoffs as AI costs mount,” *Reuters*, (Mar. 13, 2026), <https://www.reuters.com/business/world-at-work/meta-planning-sweeping-layoffs-ai-costs-mount-2026-03-14/>.

¹⁴ Jon Markman, “Oracle’s Massive 30,000 Layoff As AI Spending Surges,” *Forbes*, (Apr. 6, 2026), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jonmarkman/2026/04/06/oracles-massive-30000-layoff-as-ai-spending-surges/>.

¹⁵ Jordan Vallnsky, “Amazon is laying off 16,000 employees as AI battle intensifies,” *CNN*, (Jan. 28, 2026), <https://www.cnn.com/2026/01/28/tech/amazon-layoffs-ai>.

¹⁶ Jack Dorsey, X, (Feb. 26, 2026), <https://x.com/jack/status/2027129697092731343>.

¹⁷ The White House, *Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights*, (Oct. 2022), p. 14, <https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/ostp/ai-bill-of-rights/> (*Blueprint*). Despite the use of the term “AI” in its title, the *Blueprint* focuses on ADS.

- Safe and Effective Systems:* You should be protected from unsafe or ineffective systems. Automated systems should be developed with consultation from diverse communities, stakeholders, and domain experts to identify concerns, risks, and potential impacts of the system. Systems should undergo pre-deployment testing, risk identification and mitigation, and ongoing monitoring that demonstrate they are safe and effective based on their intended use, mitigation of unsafe outcomes including those beyond the intended use, and adherence to domain-specific standards. Outcomes of these protective measures should include the possibility of not deploying the system or removing a system from use. Automated systems should not be designed with an intent or reasonably foreseeable possibility of endangering your safety or the safety of your community. They should be designed to proactively protect you from harms stemming from unintended, yet foreseeable, uses or impacts of automated systems. You should be protected from inappropriate or irrelevant data use in the design, development, and deployment of automated systems, and from the compounded harm of its reuse. Independent evaluation and reporting that confirms that the system is safe and effective, including reporting of steps taken to mitigate potential harms, should be performed and the results made public whenever possible.
- Algorithmic Discrimination Protections:* You should not face discrimination by algorithms and systems should be used and designed in an equitable way. . . . Designers, developers, and deployers of automated systems should take proactive and continuous measures to protect individuals and communities from algorithmic discrimination and to use and design systems in an equitable way. This protection should include proactive equity assessments as part of the system design, use of representative data and protection against proxies for demographic features, ensuring accessibility for people with disabilities in design and development, pre-deployment and ongoing disparity testing and mitigation, and clear organizational oversight. Independent evaluation and plain language reporting in the form of an algorithmic impact assessment, including disparity testing results and mitigation information, should be performed and made public whenever possible to confirm these protections.
- Data Privacy:* [. . .] Designers, developers, and deployers of automated systems should seek your permission and respect your decisions regarding collection, use, access, transfer, and deletion of your data in appropriate ways and to the greatest extent possible; where not possible, alternative privacy by design safeguards should be used [. . .] Enhanced protections and restrictions for data and inferences related to sensitive domains, including health, work, education, criminal justice, and finance, and for data pertaining to youth should put you first. In sensitive domains, your data and related inferences should only be used for necessary functions, and you should be protected by ethical review and use prohibitions. [. . .]
- Notice and Explanation:* You should know that an automated system is being used and understand how and why it contributes to outcomes that impact you. Designers, developers, and deployers of automated systems should provide generally accessible plain language documentation including clear descriptions of the overall system functioning and the role automation plays, notice that such systems are in use, the individual or organization responsible for the system, and explanations of outcomes that are clear, timely, and accessible. Such notice should be kept up-to-date and people impacted by the system should be notified of significant use case or key functionality

changes. You should know how and why an outcome impacting you was determined by an automated system, including when the automated system is not the sole input determining the outcome. [. . .]

- *Human Alternatives, Consideration, and Fallback:* You should be able to opt out from automated systems in favor of a human alternative, where appropriate. Appropriateness should be determined based on reasonable expectations in a given context and with a focus on ensuring broad accessibility and protecting the public from especially harmful impacts. [. . .]

The Legislature adopted these principles via SCR 17 (Dodd, 2023.)

Executive Order N-6-26. On May 19, 2026, Governor Newsom called publicly for an overhaul of California’s economic and tax policy:

“You cannot save democracy unless we democratize the economy,” the Democratic California governor said at a Center for American Progress event in Washington. “The whole system has to be reimagined.”

. . .

Newsom argued that Democrats needed to advance beyond “tinkering” and pursue ideas, like universal basic capital or wage replacement, to counteract job losses from artificial intelligence. He said rapid advancement in AI would “detonate” the prevailing order and argued technology-fueled economic precarity was already reordering politics.¹⁸

Two days later Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-6-26, directing “California to prepare workers, small businesses, and communities for the economic disruption that artificial intelligence will bring to the workforce.”¹⁹ The Order does all of the following:

- a) Requires the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), GO-Biz, and the Department of Finance, in consultation with academic and relevant industry partners and other state agencies, as appropriate, to provide to the Governor a review of the emerging body of academic research identifying the potential workforce impacts of technological shifts, including AI’s impact on California’s labor market and potential disproportionate impacts on demographic groups.
- b) Requires LWDA to do all of the following:
 1. **Review and provide to the Governor recommendations on revisions and updates to the Cal/WARN Act.**

¹⁸ Jeremy White, “‘The whole system has to be reimagined’ — Newsom calls for rethinking economy amid AI boom”, *Politico*, (May 19, 2026), <https://www.politico.com/news/2026/05/19/gavin-newsom-cap-economy-ai-boom-00927930>

¹⁹ “Governor Newsom signs first-of-its-kind executive order to prepare workers and businesses for potential AI disruption”, (May 21, 2026), <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2026/05/21/governor-newsom-signs-first-of-its-kind-executive-order-to-prepare-workers-and-businesses-for-potential-ai-disruption/>

2. Submit to the Governor a review of policies and practices that provide displaced workers with a safety net, including severance and other forms of compensation such as stock or other forms of equity, and any recommendations for incorporating such policies or strengthening existing programs.
 3. Submit to the Governor a workplan for expanding awareness of and enrollment in employment insurance programs.
 4. Identify, promote and enhance service opportunities, including through California Volunteers, for those experiencing long-term unemployment and other potential employment disruption.
 5. Submit to the Governor recommendations on options for improving efforts to connect unemployed workers to opportunities for training and upskilling.
 6. Review how the collective bargaining process is incorporating and addressing new technologies, such as AI, in ways tailored to the specific needs of workers and employers no later than October 15, 2026.
 7. Review existing workforce training programs to ensure programs are fit for purpose and targeted towards growing industries and professions, and requires the Employment Development Department (EDD) to develop an AI playbook to expand dislocated worker strategies for occupations exposed to AI and provide Local Boards with technical assistance, no later than October 15, 2026.
- c) Requires EDD to do all of the following:
1. Include a summary of feedback from businesses about the role of technological adoption in determining hiring or workforce decisions in the California Labor Market Review.
 2. Launch a dashboard showing AI's impacts on employment across various sectors using Unemployment Insurance data within 90 days.
- d) Requires the Jobs First Council to work with local leadership on opportunities to support regions facing systemically high unemployment.
- e) Requires the Government Operations Agency to provide the Governor with options and recommendations for actions that could alter incentive structures and increase likelihood of AI development and deployments that advance the public good and address critical problems and emerging opportunities facing society.
- f) Requires the Governor's Office for Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) to do both of the following:
1. Evaluate and, where appropriate, support opportunities to expand and enhance worker ownership models to support broad-based capital growth and build wealth from productivity gain among workers.

2. Engage in educational and other initiatives to support business adoption of “opportunity AI.”

- g) Requires the California Health and Human Services Agency to leverage the Office of Data and Innovation’s single online platform to enable Californians to more easily navigate government services.

Ultimately, while Executive Order N-6-26 does not empower California’s workers to contend with the rapid adoption of AI in workplaces across the state, it does commission several studies into the matter.

Cal/WARN. The Senate Committee on Labor, Public Employment, and Retirement’s analysis of this bill describes Federal WARN and Cal/WARN notification requirements:

The federal WARN Act requires employers to provide written notice 60 days prior to a plant closing or mass layoff to employees, or their representative, the State dislocated worker unit (EDD, Workforce Services Division in California), and the chief elected official of local government within which such closing or layoff occurs. The federal WARN Act applies to *employers with 100 or more full-time employees*. Notices are required as follows:

- Plant closings involving 50 or more employees during a 30-day period.
- Layoffs within a 30-day period involving 50 to 499 full-time employees constituting at least 33% of the full-time workforce at a single site of employment.
- Layoffs of 500 or more are covered regardless of percentage of workforce. (29 USC, et seq., 2101 and 20 CFR 639.3)

Similarly, Cal/WARN requires employers to give a 60-day notice to the affected employees and both state and local representatives before a mass layoff, relocation, or termination. The Cal/WARN provisions apply to *employers of 75 or more full-time and part-time employees*. Notices are required as follows:

- For a plant closure affecting any amount of employees.
- Layoff of 50 or more employees within a 30-day period regardless of % of workforce.
- Relocation of at least 100 miles affecting any amount of employees.
- Relocation of a call center to a foreign country regardless of the percentage of workforce affected. [California Labor Code Section 1400.5 (d)-(f) and 1409 (b)]

Advance notification before a termination or layoff provides employees with necessary time to transition and adjust to the potential loss of employment, time to seek alternative employment and, if necessary, time to obtain skills training or retraining to successfully compete in the job market.

3) What this bill would do. This bill would establish the “California Worker Technological Displacement Act,” consisting of two distinct components:

1. A requirement for an employer to notify workers, EDD, and local government representatives 60-days advanced written notice prior to any “technological displacement” – a layoff affecting 50 or more workers caused in whole by an AI system or other automated technology.
2. A requirement for an employer to notify EDD when it executes a “technological cessation in hiring” – the end of hiring permanently for an occupation or position that is caused in whole by the use of AI.

The technological displacement provisions of SB 951 are drafted in the spirit of the Cal/WARN Act, but differ in several important ways:

- Cal/WARN defines “employer” to mean a person, association, organization, partnership, business trust, limited liability company, or corporation who directly or indirectly owns and operates a covered establishment. This bill expands that definition to include:
 - The state, including its legislative, judicial, and executive branches.
 - Any city, county, or city and county, including any charter city, charter county, charter city and county, and other political subdivisions of the state.
 - Special districts.
 - Local educational agencies and community college districts that do not provide layoff notices pursuant to Sections 45117, 44955, 87740, and 88017 of the Education Code for academic, classified, or certificated staff.
 - Any authority, commission, board, agency, or instrumentality of any entity specified in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive.
 - The University of California, the California State University, and community college districts.
- Cal/WARN defines “employee” to mean a person employed by an employer for at least 6 months of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required. This bill instead defines “worker” to mean 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, for at least 6 months of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required under this article. “Worker” includes, but is not limited to, full-time and part-time workers but does not include a seasonally employed individual who was hired with the understanding that their employment is seasonal and temporary, a volunteer, or an intern.

Due to these two definitional changes, SB 951 applies to a greater number of employees and workers compared to Cal/WARN. This risks creating confusion when layoffs occur: a particular employer might find themselves subject to Cal/WARN, SB 951, or both, depending on where they are situated in California’s economy. Worse, an employer that is subject to both frameworks can have varying obligations with respect to different employees: a community college district that experiences a technological displacement would be required to provide an

SB 951 compliant notice to independent contractors, while providing a Cal/WARN+SB 951 compliant notice to full-time employees.

- Cal/WARN requires notices be provided to each chief elected official of each city and county government within which a termination, relocation, or mass layoff occurs. SB 951 instead requires that notice be provided to city council members and county boards of supervisors.

In the hypothetical scenario outlined above, a community college district would be required to notify city councilors and county supervisors of a layoff of an independent contractor, but would be additionally be required to notify the chief elected official of each city and county for Cal/WARN-eligible employees.

SB 951 would additionally create a “right of first bid” on other positions with the employer for workers affected by technological displacements, and would prohibit an employer from discharging a worker affected by a technological displacement without reasonable and substantiated cause during the 60-day period following the notice. Neither of these rights exist under the Cal/WARN framework, creating further daylight between workers whose displacements are due to AI or automation, and those whose displacements are not.

Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG) summarizes these issues, writing in opposition:

The covered population remains broader than Cal-WARN’s. Although the June 22 amendments raised the numeric trigger to 50 workers, SB 951 counts independent contractors toward that threshold and layers AI-specific notice, disclosure, and liability mandates on top of Cal-WARN obligations that do not exist for economically driven layoffs of the same size. The result remains an asymmetric and disproportionate compliance burden for AI-related workforce decisions.

The bill still covers independent contractors with at least six months of tenure — sweeping in contingent workers who are categorically different from permanent employees and who are not covered under Cal-WARN. This expansion lacks any policy justification rooted in the bill’s stated goals.

...

For employers with more than 100 workers, the bill continues to grant each displaced worker a right of first bid on other positions with the employer. When a workforce restructuring simultaneously triggers both a traditional Cal-WARN notice and an SB 951 AI displacement notice, employers will face overlapping and potentially inconsistent obligations regarding worker prioritization — creating litigation exposure and operational uncertainty that will discourage rather than support responsible workforce transitions.

Separately, a coalition of public employers led by the Rural County Representatives of California takes an “oppose unless amended” position on the bill, writing the following:

Local agencies remain subject to the statutory provisions of the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act (MMBA), which require local agencies to meet and confer with recognized employee organizations regarding changes to employees’ wages, hours, or terms and conditions of

employment. In those cases, existing law provides a robust framework for determining when particular uses of technology may actually have a significant and adverse effect on the employment relationship, in which case notification (and more) is already required.

In addition, for public employers with represented workforces, including cities, counties, and special districts, the use of technology tools is often bargained between employees and public employers based on local conditions, security needs, and the concerns of the public workforce. State law already prohibits local public employers from using workplace technology tools to deter or discourage union membership. Specifically, Government Code Section 3550 provides that a public employer shall not deter or discourage public employees, or applicants to be public employees, from becoming or remaining members of an employee organization. Section 3551.5 imposes significant penalties for violations of Section 3550 and grants employee organizations standing to bring the claims. Because of the existing protections already afforded to public employees, our organizations have concerns regarding the likelihood of overlapping or conflicting requirements introduced by this bill that will create uncertainty and liability for local agencies.

Furthermore, SB 951's requirement that certain employers, including many public agencies, provide displaced workers with a "right of first bid" on other positions would directly conflict with long-established merit-based civil service systems and collectively bargained labor agreements that govern the vast majority of public-sector hiring. These systems prescribe detailed procedures for filling vacancies, including competitive examinations, minimum qualifications, seniority provisions, reemployment lists, promotional opportunities, and negotiated bumping and layoff rights. By creating a new statutory hiring preference that supersedes these established processes, SB 951 would create significant legal uncertainty and expose public employers to competing obligations under state labor laws, civil service rules, and local personnel ordinances.

To address these concerns, the author has agreed to a Committee amendment recasting the “technological displacement” sections of SB 951 into the existing Cal/WARN statute.

SVLG continues, describing the bill’s “caused in whole by an AI system or other automated technology” standard as problematic:

By conditioning every obligation on a layoff being “caused in whole” by AI, the bill builds itself around a fact that is nearly impossible to establish. Recent experience in other jurisdictions illustrates the difficulty of attributing job loss directly to AI. Despite more than 160 mass termination notices filed following enactment of New York’s AI WARN law in 2025, none were attributed solely to AI-related displacement. Business decisions are typically influenced by multiple overlapping factors — economic conditions, budget constraints, organizational restructuring, and market demands — that interact with technology adoption in ways that resist clean attribution.

As SVLG points out, it is unlikely that any layoff will ever be *solely* due to AI or automation — businesses are complicated entities, and every decision a business makes can be attributed to many factors.

To address this concern, the author has agreed to a Committee amendment expanding this standard to displacements or cessations “caused in whole *or in substantial part*” by AI or automation.

In SB 951’s “technological cessation in hiring” provisions, it is unclear whether a cessation has occurred if an employer has ceased hiring, but still employs workers in a particular position.

To address this concern, the author has agreed to a Committee amendment clarifying that a technological cessation applies “whether any workers in that occupation or position remain employed or under contract.”

The author has additionally agreed to Committee amendments making minor technical and conforming changes throughout.

4) **Bill as proposed to be amended.** The complete text of SB 951 as proposed to be amended is reproduced below:

1400. This chapter may be cited as the “California Worker Adjustment and Retraining Act” or “Cal/WARN Act.”

1400.5. The definitions set forth in this section shall govern the construction and meaning of the terms used in this chapter:

(x) “Artificial intelligence” or “AI” 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.

(a) “Covered establishment” means any industrial or commercial facility or part thereof that employs, or has employed within the preceding 12 months, 75 or more persons.

(b) “Employer” means any person, as defined by Section 18, who directly or indirectly owns and operates a covered establishment. A parent corporation is an employer as to any covered establishment directly owned and operated by its corporate subsidiary.

(c) “Layoff” means a separation from a position for lack of funds or lack of work.

(d) “Mass layoff” means a layoff during any 30-day period of 50 or more employees at a covered establishment.

(e) “Relocation” means the removal of all or substantially all of the industrial or commercial operations in a covered establishment to a different location 100 miles or more away.

(f) “Termination” means the cessation or substantial cessation of industrial or commercial operations in a covered establishment.

(g) (1) This chapter does not apply where the closing or layoff is the result of the completion of a particular project or undertaking of an employer subject to Wage Order 11, regulating the Broadcasting Industry, Wage Order 12, regulating the Motion Picture Industry, or Wage

Order 16, regulating Certain On-Site Occupations in the Construction, Drilling, Logging and Mining Industries, of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and the employees were hired with the understanding that their employment was limited to the duration of that project or undertaking.

(2) This chapter does not apply to employees who are employed in seasonal employment where the employees were hired with the understanding that their employment was seasonal and temporary.

(h) "Employee" means a person employed by an employer for at least 6 months of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required.

1401. (a) An employer may not order a mass layoff, relocation, or termination at a covered establishment unless, 60 days before the order takes effect, the employer gives written notice of the order to the following:

(1) The employees of the covered establishment affected by the order.

(2) The Employment Development Department, the local workforce development board, and the chief elected official of each city and county government within which the termination, relocation, or mass layoff occurs.

(b) An employer required to give notice of any mass layoff, relocation, or termination under this chapter shall include in its notice the elements required by the federal Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. Sec. 2101 et seq.).

(c) An employer required to give notice of any mass layoff, relocation, or termination under this chapter shall include in the notice whether the employer plans to coordinate services, such as a rapid response orientation, through the local workforce development board, the employer plans to coordinate services through a different entity, or the employer does not plan to coordinate services with any entity.

(1) Regardless of whether the employer chooses to coordinate services with the local workforce development board or another entity, the employer shall include in the notice a functioning email and telephone number of the board and the following description of the rapid response activities offered by the local workforce development board in accordance with Chapter 32 (commencing with Section 3102) of Title 29 of the United States Code:

"Local Workforce Development Boards and their partners help laid off workers find new jobs. Visit an America's Job Center of California location near you. You can get help with your resume, practice interviewing, search for jobs, and more. You can also learn about training programs to help start a new career."

(2) If the employer chooses to coordinate services with the local workforce development board or another entity, the employer shall arrange services within 30 days from the date of the notice.

(3) An employer required to give notice of a mass layoff, relocation, or termination caused in whole or in substantial part by an AI system or other automated technology replacing or automating employment positions shall additionally include in the notice all of the following information:

(A) The number, classification or occupation, and work location of layoffs that are substantially due to the replacement or automation by AI.

(B) The job functions performed by those workers that will be automated by AI.

(C) The specific category or type of AI system or other automating technology that substantially resulted in technological displacement, including the entity or entities that developed, sold, or leased the product.

(d) An employer required to give notice of any mass layoff, relocation, or termination under this chapter shall include in the notice a description of the statewide food assistance program known as CalFresh (Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 18900) of Part 6 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code), the CalFresh benefits helpline, and a link to the CalFresh internet website.

(e) An employer required to give notice of any mass layoff, relocation, or termination under this chapter shall include in the notice a functioning email and telephone number of the employer for contact.

(f) Notwithstanding the requirements of subdivision (a), an employer is not required to provide notice if a mass layoff, relocation, or termination is necessitated by a physical calamity or act of war.

1402.7. (a) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) Notwithstanding Section 1400.5, “employer” means any person, as defined by Section 18, who directly or indirectly owns and operates an establishment. A parent corporation is an employer as to any establishment directly owned and operated by its corporate subsidiary. An “employer” includes, but is not limited to, any of the following:

(A) The state, including its legislative, judicial, and executive branches.

(B) Any city, county, or city and county, including any charter city, charter county, charter city and county, and other political subdivisions of the state.

(C) Special districts.

(D) Local educational agencies and community college districts.

(E) Any authority, commission, board, agency, or instrumentality of any entity specified in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive.

(F) The University of California, the California State University, and community college districts.

(2) “Technological cessation in hiring” means the permanent ending of hiring or contracting for a particular occupation or position, caused in whole or in substantial part by the employer’s use of AI or other automation, regardless of either of the following:

(A) Whether any workers in that occupation or position remain employed or under contract.

(B) Whether the cessation results in an overall reduction in occupations or positions.

(3) “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, for at least 6 months of the 12 months preceding the date on which notice is required under this article. “Worker” includes, but is not limited to, full-time and part-time workers but does not include a seasonally employed individual who was hired with the understanding that their employment is seasonal and temporary, a volunteer, or an intern.

(b) An employer shall provide a written technology hiring disruption notice containing all of the following information to the Employment Development Department when it executes a technological cessation in hiring:

(1) The name and address of the employment site and the name, email, and telephone number of a company official or public agency contact person.

(2) A statement indicating whether the planned action is permanent or temporary.

(3) The number of positions of the employer that were occupied at any point during the prior quarter for which the employer has decided not to fill because of a technological cessation in hiring.

(4) The classification or occupation, and work location of positions that will no longer be filled by workers due to the replacement or automation by AI.

(5) The job functions performed in these positions.

(6) The specific category or type of AI system or other automating technology that resulted in the technological cessation of hiring, including the entity or entities that developed, sold, or leased the product.

(7) A statement if the cessation resulted in hiring or creating other employment positions in the company and the number and occupation of those positions.

(c) The Employment Development Department shall do all of the following:

(1) Post summaries of the notices received pursuant to this Section on their internet website as part of the existing notice requirements of the Cal/WARN Act pursuant to this Chapter.

(2) Compile a quarterly summary using notices received pursuant to this Section to present a statewide summary of worker displacement due to AI and automation. The report shall include a link to the Cal/WARN Act notice report internet website.

(3) Submit the report to the labor and budget committees of the Assembly and Senate. The report submitted to the Legislature pursuant to this subdivision shall be submitted pursuant to Section 9795 of the Government Code.

1403. An employer who fails to give notice as required by paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 1401 ***or subdivision (b) of Section 1402.7*** is subject to a civil penalty of not more than five hundred dollars (\$500) for each day of the employer's violation. The employer is not subject to a civil penalty under this section, however, if the employer pays to all applicable employees the amounts for which the employer is liable under Section 1402 within three weeks from the date the employer orders the mass layoff, relocation, or termination.

1406. (a) In any investigation or proceeding under this chapter, the Labor Commissioner has, in addition to all other powers granted by law, the authority to examine the books and records of an employer.

(b) The Labor Commissioner may enforce the notice requirements in Section 1401 ~~and~~, ***subdivision (b) of Section 1402.7, and*** subdivision (a) of Section 1410, including investigating an alleged violation and ordering appropriate temporary relief to mitigate the violation pending the completion of a full investigation or hearing, through the procedures set forth in Section 98.3 or 1197.1, including by issuance of a citation against an employer who violates this chapter. If a citation is issued, the procedures for issuing, contesting, and enforcing judgments for citations and civil penalties issued by the commissioner shall be the same as those set forth in Section 1197.1, as appropriate.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

A coalition of labor groups led by the California Federation of Labor Unions writes in support:

According to the Challenger Jobs Report that tracks workforce trends, 2023 was the first year that companies cited artificial intelligence as a reason for layoffs. Since then, AI was cited as the cause of close to 72,000 job cuts, with 55,000 AI-related layoffs in 2025 alone. Amazon, Dow Chemical, Accenture, Dell, Intel, Microsoft, TCS, UPS, and Citigroup all announced tens of thousands of AI-related job cuts in 2025. Salesforce laid off 4,000 customer support staff and froze hiring lawyers or software engineers, stating that AI now does up to 50% of the work of the company. In February 2026, CEO Jack Dorsey of Block and Square payments announced that he was laying off 4,000 workers, about 40% of the entire workforce, stating explicitly that the company would use AI to automate work.

Policy makers cannot ignore the blaring alarm bells warning of massive economic upheaval and worker suffering. AI poses an existential threat to human workers, government revenue, and society. The first step to tackling the growing threat is to collect and use reliable, local data to inform policy responses and to support workers who are the canaries in the coal mine of AI. This bill is a small, but crucial first step to that process.

SB 951 provides policy makers and the public with data on AI-related job loss. It requires employers to give advance notice to workers, local government, and the Employment Development Department (EDD) of AI-related layoffs or cessation in hiring for occupations. The notice is modeled on the WARN Act and updated for technological, rather than industrial, layoffs. Employers are also required to give workers facing layoffs the right to bid on existing positions in the company to mitigate the impact on incumbent workers. EDD will then collect and compile the data to provide legislators, researchers, and the public an overview of the impact of AI on jobs and hiring decisions. This data can be used with other sources from studies and developers for a more complete picture of the impact of AI on workers so the state, unions, and the public can respond.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

A coalition of trade associations led by the California Chamber of Commerce writes in opposition:

While we appreciate amendments the author has taken to more closely align with California's current WARN Act (Cal-WARN), the bill's core structural problems remain unresolved. Furthermore, on May 21, 2026, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-6-26 which establishes a deliberate, evidence-based process for reviewing and updating California's existing workforce protection framework, including the WARN Act, in response to AI and automation. SB 951 would preempt this by imposing sweeping new statutory mandates before the review is complete.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio (Sponsor)
Alameda Labor Council
American Federation of Musicians, Local 7
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Afl-cio
California Alliance for Retired Americans (CARA)
California Employment Lawyers Association
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers Afl-cio
California Nurses Association
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
California State Legislative Board of the Smart - Transportation Division
California Teachers Association
Center on Policy Initiatives
Central Coast Labor Council
Central Labor Council, Fresno-madera-tulare-kings Counties, Afl-cio
Communications Workers of America, District 9
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Inland Empire Labor Council, Afl-cio
Kapor Center Advocacy

North Bay Labor Council
 North Valley Labor Federation
 Orange County Labor Federation, Afl-cio
 San Mateo County Central Labor Council
 Service Employees International Union California
 State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, Afl-cio
 TechEquity Collaborative
 What We Will

Oppose

Acclamation Insurance Management Services
 Allied Managed Care
 Associated General Contractors of California
 Associated General Contractors San Diego
 Calforests
 California Apartment Association
 California Bankers Association
 California Chamber of Commerce
 California Employment Law Council
 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 (CMTA)
 California Restaurant Association
 California Retailers Association
 California's Credit Unions
 Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
 Flasher Barricade Association
 Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
 Official Police Garages of Los Angeles
 Shrm California
 Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG)
 Technet
 Tri County Chamber Alliance
 Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA)
 Western Growers Association

Oppose Unless Amended

Association of California Community College Administrators
 Association of California Healthcare Districts (ACHD)
 California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
 California Special Districts Association
 California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
 Chamber of Progress

League of California Cities
Nevada County Board of Supervisors
Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM)
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)
University of California
Urban Counties of California (UCC)

Analysis Prepared by: Slater Sharp / P. & C.P. / (916) 319-2200