

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

MAY 9, 2022

With the expiration of the deadlines for bills to pass initial key committee votes, the California Legislative Session for 2022 is coming into clearer focus. To the relief of many employers and human resources professionals, some of the more controversial employment bills appear to have stalled, including the proposed four-day workweek (AB 2932), the wide-reaching Workplace Technology Accountability Act (AB 1651), and the mandatory COVID-19 workplace vaccination rules (AB 1993). There were also several employer-sponsored bills that stalled, including proposed further extensions of the employment information exemption to the California Consumer Privacy Act (SB 1454/AB 2871/AB 2891). Without further extraordinary action, this means the employment exemption will expire December 31, 2022 and employers will need to prepare to fully comply with the CCPA in the new year. Additionally, a bill to allow individualized alternative workweek schedules without requiring work-unit approval (AB 1761) is unlikely to move further this year.

However, numerous employment bills continue to progress through the legislative process, including bills that would:

- Amend the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) to preclude discrimination because of “family responsibility” ([AB 2182](#)).
- Preclude discrimination against employees or applicants for cannabis usage away from the workplace and limit drug screening that can be considered by employers ([AB 2188](#)).
- Require employers to address third-party harassment of customers and provide related training to employees ([AB 2448](#)).
- Revive previously time-barred sexual harassment and wrongful termination claims under certain circumstances ([AB 2777](#)).
- Entitle employees to up to five days of bereavement leave ([AB 1949](#)).
- Enable employers to provide state tax-favored student loan repayment assistance ([AB 1729](#)).
- Extend until January 1, 2025, the period under which employers must provide written notices of COVID-19 exposure ([AB 2693](#)).
- Implement new requirements regarding pay scale disclosures and promotion opportunity announcements and amend the recently enacted Pay Data Reporting requirements ([SB 1162](#)).
- Require large private-sector employers to submit annual reports detailing work-related statistics which the Labor and Workforce Development Agency will use to identify “high-road employers,” who may be eligible for state-provided incentives ([AB 2095](#)).
- Require employers to develop and enforce new policies regarding employee biometric information ([SB 1189](#)).
- Require employers to allow the public to access restrooms provided to employees under certain circumstances ([AB 1632](#)).

Looking ahead, these bills must now pass their chamber of origin by May 27th before moving to the second chamber to repeat the process, meaning many key votes and amendments are likely over the next few weeks. The proposed ballot initiative to materially amend California’s Private Attorneys General Act ([PAGA Initiative](#)) also faces a June 6th deadline to gather enough signatures to qualify for the November 2022 General Election Ballot.

In the interim, below is a summary of the key employment bills currently pending, largely organized by subject matter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR PENDING BILLS

Harassment/Discrimination/Retaliation	3
Human Resources/Workplace Policies	7
COVID-19-Related Proposals.....	13
Leaves of Absence/Time Off/Accommodation Requests	14
Wage & Hour.....	15
Public Sector/Labor Relations	18
State-Provided Benefits	18
Miscellaneous	20

Harassment/Discrimination/Retaliation

“Family Responsibility” Protections under the FEHA (AB 2182)

This bill would amend the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) to preclude discrimination or harassment based upon an employee’s “family responsibilities. “Family responsibilities” would be defined to mean “the obligations of an employee to provide care for a minor child or a “care recipient.” In turn, “care recipient” would mean “a family member or household member of an employee or applicant who relies on the employee or applicant for medical care or for assistance with activities of daily living.” “Family member” would be broadly defined to include not only the seven relationships currently identified under the California Family Rights Act (CFRA) (e.g., spouse, child, parent, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, domestic partner) but also “any other individual related by blood or whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship.”

On the one hand, this bill specifies that except under new Government Code section 12940.5 (discussed below), it would not require employers to make reasonable accommodations for family responsibilities generally, if the employer’s policies and practices (including those related to leave, scheduling, absenteeism, work performance and benefits) are applied in a non-discriminatory manner.

On the other hand, new section 12940.5 would impose accommodation obligations upon an employer arising from an employee’s need to care for a minor child or care recipient because of the unforeseen closure or unforeseen unavailability of their school or care provider, except for planned holidays. In those instances, it would be an unlawful practice, unless doing so would be an “undue hardship” for the employer, to fail to provide an effective accommodation for the employee’s caregiving obligation, including any of the following: (a) excusal from mandatory overtime; (b) temporary or part-time work; (c) remote work; (d) the ability to swap shifts with other employees, at the employee’s request; (e) shifting hours or days of work; (f) temporarily restructuring job duties; (g) permission to communicate by telephone with a minor child, care recipient, care provider or other person related to the coordination of care; or (h) time off work, including allowing the employee to use any paid time off. However, an employer could not require the employee to take time off work if another accommodation listed above would be effective and enable the employee to work. Alternatively, if those accommodations are unavailable, and absent it being an undue hardship, the employer would need to excuse the employee from attendance or tardiness policies. Employers would also be required to provide a “timely response” (currently undefined) to any request for accommodation under this new section.

This new section would also prohibit retaliation against an employee for requesting an accommodation or exercising or attempting to exercise rights under this new section.

This bill is similar to AB 1119 which stalled in 2021 after passing two committee votes.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and the Assembly Judiciary Committee on party-line votes and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Protections for Non-Work-Related Marijuana Usage and Limitations on Testing (AB 2188)

This bill addresses concerns that some employer drug testing focuses on the presence of so-called “nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites” that does not indicate actual impairment at work as opposed to simply revealing an employee may have smoked marijuana at some point and away from the workplace. It is also intended to encourage employers to rely more on testing for tetrahydrocannabinol (TCC), which

measures active impairment or psychoactive effects. Accordingly, it would amend the FEHA to preclude discrimination against an employee or applicant based upon (a) the person's use of cannabis off the job and away from the workplace; or (b) an employer-required drug screening test that has found the person to have nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites in their urine, hair, or bodily fluids. Given the bill's purpose, while it limits testing for nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites, it does not limit THC testing.

To address employer concerns raised with prior versions, this bill would not permit employees to be impaired by or to use cannabis at work, nor would it affect an employer's rights or obligations to maintain a drug and alcohol-free workplace, as specified under Health and Safety Code section 11362.45. This bill would also not apply to employees in the building and construction trades, and would not preempt state or federal laws requiring employee testing for controlled substances, including laws requiring employee testing as a condition of receiving federal funding or federal licensing-related benefits.

This bill is similar to AB 1256 which stalled in 2021.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and the Assembly Judiciary Committee on party-line votes and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Revival of Sexual Assault and Other Claims (Including Wrongful Termination and Sexual Harassment) (AB 2777)

Entitled the Sexual Abuse and Cover Up Accountability Act, this bill would address concerns that victims of sexual assault may need additional time to pursue legal claims by modifying the statute of limitations for two types of sexual assault claims.

The first change would involve claims of adult sexual assault and addresses concerns that a recent extension of the relevant statute of limitations to 10 years was arguably insufficient to revive otherwise stale claims. For background, in 2019, California enacted AB 1619 extending the statute of limitations for sexual assault from two to ten years. However, AB 1619 did not expressly state that it was intending to revive otherwise time-barred claims. Thus, AB 2777 would provide that any sexual assault claim (as defined) based upon conduct that occurred after January 1, 2009 (ten years preceding AB 1619) and commenced after January 1, 2019, which would have been barred solely because of the statute of limitations, is timely if filed by December 31, 2026.

The second change has greater potential applicability to employers and involves damages suffered as a result of a cover up of sexual assault "or other inappropriate conduct, communication, or activity of a sexual nature," which could include "related claims" including wrongful termination and sexual harassment. For such claims that would otherwise be barred because the statute of limitations expired before January 1, 2023, it would allow such claims to be revived if filed between January 1, 2023 and December 31, 2023. This provision could theoretically apply to *any* time-barred covered claim, and does not have a limit on the age of the claims that may be revived.

To qualify for this claim revival, a plaintiff would be required to allege all of the following: (a) they were sexually assaulted or subjected to other inappropriate conduct, communication, or activity of a sexual nature; (b) one or more entities are legally responsible for damages arising out of this alleged conduct; and (c) the entity or entities (including their agents, officers or employees) engaged in or attempted to engage in a "cover up" of a *previous instance* of sexual assault or other inappropriate conduct by an alleged perpetrator of such abuse.

For purposes of this new law, “cover up” would mean a concerted effort to hide evidence relating to a sexual assault or other inappropriate conduct, communication or activity of a sexual nature that incentivizes individuals to remain silent or prevents information relating to this behavior from being public or disclosed to the plaintiff, including the use of non-disclosure or confidentiality agreements.

As noted, if revival occurs, it will apply to any “related claims” arising out of the misconduct, including for wrongful termination and sexual harassment, except for claims (a) litigated to finality in a court of competent jurisdiction before January 1, 2023, or (b) that have been compromised by a written settlement agreement between the parties entered into before January 1, 2023.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Judiciary Committee and is pending on the Assembly Floor.

Retaliation Protections Related to Natural Disasters (SB 1044)

This bill responds to media reports of employees killed or injured during recent natural disasters (e.g., warehouse employees affected the December 2021 tornado outbreak, or domestic workers forced to work during California’s fire outbreaks). Accordingly, it would preclude employers from taking or threatening adverse action against employees who refuse to report to or who leave a workplace within the affected area because the employee felt unsafe due to a “state of emergency” (as defined) or an “emergency condition.” It would also preclude employers from preventing employees from accessing their mobile devices or other communications device for seeking emergency assistance, assessing the safety of the situation, or communicating with a person to verify their safety.

For purposes of this bill, “state of emergency” would be defined as any of the following that is declared in the county where a worker lives or works, and poses an imminent and ongoing risk of harm to the worker, the worker’s home or the worker’s workplace: (1) a Presidential declaration of a major disaster or emergency caused by natural forces, (2) a declared state of emergency under the Government Code; or (3) a federal, state, regional or county alert of imminent threat to life or property due to a natural disaster or emergency. “Emergency condition” would mean the existence of either (1) an event that poses serious danger to the structure or a workplace or to a worker’s immediate health and safety; or (2) an order to evacuate a workplace, a worker’s home or the school of a worker’s child. However, the bill also provides that it is intended to apply only to emergency conditions posing an imminent risk of harm and not simply to an official state of emergency that remains in place (i.e. COVID-type restrictions).

As in other time-off contexts, an employee will be required, when feasible, to notify the employer of the state of emergency or emergency condition requiring the employee to miss or leave work. If such notice is not feasible, the employee shall notify the employer of these conditions afterwards.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Preventing Harassment of Customers (AB 2448)

California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civil Code section 51 *et seq.*) prohibits business establishments from discriminating (i.e., withholding services or denying accommodations) based on specified characteristics, including sex, race, religion, sexual orientation, medical condition, national origin or immigration status. Citing concerns about increased bias-based harassment of the public (particularly against Asians following the pandemic), this bill would require certain businesses to address the harassment of their customers on their premises and to provide training to their employees regarding how to identify discrimination and harassment.

Specifically, private businesses with a physical presence in California that are open to the public and have 100 or more employees in California, would be required to address the harassment (as defined) of customers on their “premises,” whether by the businesses’ employee or a third-party not affiliated with the business. A business’s premises would include areas inside the building that are under the business’s possession, management or control, as well as areas outside of the building if under the business’s possession, management or control, such as parking lots and outdoor eating areas.

“Harassment” would be defined as “words, gesture, or actions directed at a specific person without the consent of the person on account of any characteristic listed or defined in [the Unruh Civil Rights Act], or because the person is perceived to have one or more of those characteristics or because the person is associated with a person who has or is perceived to have one or more of these characteristics.” As presently drafted, this definition of “harassment” appears to differ from the physically violent behavior needed for temporary restraining order purposes, and from the “severe or pervasive” standard used for FEHA harassment purposes.

Covered businesses will be required to do all of the following: (1) post in a visible and conspicuous space a DFEH-created sign notifying customers of their rights and how to report harassment, (2) ensure employees receive training regarding such third-party bias-based harassment, and (3) develop a policy regarding how the business collects and maintains data related to such third-party harassment, collect and maintain data in accordance with this policy, notify employees of the policy, and provide this data to the DFEH upon request. Businesses would not be required to affirmatively intervene in harassment upon their premises but would be precluded from retaliating against any employee for actions taken or not take pursuant to these new requirements.

Similar to current FEHA harassment training requirements, the DFEH will be required by June 30, 2024, to develop and make available online training courses for both supervisory and nonsupervisory employees regarding discrimination and harassment at businesses (two hours for supervisor employees and one hour for nonsupervisory employees). The DFEH will also be required to provide certificates of training that would be portable across employers. By January 1, 2025, covered businesses will be required to provide such training to all employees in the state who interact with the public. Thereafter, businesses must provide refresher training every two years to employees who interact with the public and provide this training to new employees within six months of being hired or promoted, unless the employee has received the training from a prior employer within the two years preceding their hire. Such training would need to take place during regularly scheduled work hours, on paid time and at a time dedicated solely to the training.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Judiciary Committee and the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in Assembly Appropriations Committee.

DFEH Acting in Public Interest (AB 2662)

This bill would declare that in enforcing the FEHA, the DFEH represents the state and effectuates the declared public policy of California to protect the rights of all persons to be free from unlawful discrimination and other violations of the FEHA. The bill states that it is intended to be declarative of existing law and to codify the holding in *Department of Fair Employment and Housing v. Cathy’s Creations, Inc.* (2020) 54 Cal.App.5th 404, 410.

Status: Passed the Assembly and is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Human Resources/Workplace Policies

Expansion of Limits on Settlement Agreement Confidentiality (SB 1149)

Existing law prohibits settlement agreements from containing confidentiality agreements that prevent disclosure of factual information related to specified claims or causes of action, including harassment. This bill would prohibit confidentiality provisions in settlement agreements that limit disclosure of factual information related to actions for damages regarding a defective product or environmental condition that poses a danger to public health or safety – that is, a product or condition that has caused, or is likely to cause, significant or substantial bodily injury or illness or death. This bill does not preclude a confidentiality provision regarding medical information or personal identifying information regarding an injured person, the amount of the settlement, or trade secrets (but disclosure of trade secrets may only be restricted based on a court order). Although not obviously applicable to most common disputes between employers and employees, practitioners should take note as public safety could be implicated by certain settlements of employment disputes, and this bill would provide that an attorney's failure to comply with these provisions is a ground for professional discipline. Notably, any person, including a representative of the media, can challenge any provision that restricts disclosure of covered information.

Status: Passed the Senate Judiciary Committee and is pending on Senate Floor.

Changes Regarding Pay Scale Postings, Promotion Opportunity Postings, and Annual Pay Data Reporting (SB 1162)

Pay equity concerns have been a primary legislative focus recently, and this law would update several recently enacted laws regarding pay scales and pay data reporting.

- Pay Scale Posting

Labor Code section 432.3 presently requires an employer, upon reasonable request, to provide the pay scale for a position to an applicant after the applicant has completed an initial interview with the employer. This bill would require employers to post the pay scale within any job posting. Employers would also be required to provide the pay scale to a third party engaged to announce/post/publish a job posting, and the third party must include the pay scale in the job posting. While section 432.3 presently only requires employers provide such pay scales to “applicants,” this bill would also require employers, upon request, to provide pay scale information to current employees in connection with the employee’s current position. For purposes of this new requirement, “pay scale” means a salary or hourly wage range.

Employers would also be required to maintain records of a job title and wage rate history for each employee for the duration of employment plus three years after the end of employment. The Labor Commissioner would be entitled to inspect these records.

The bill would allow aggrieved individuals to file a civil action or a written complaint with the Labor Commissioner, establish a civil penalty of \$100 to \$10,000 per violation, and create a rebuttable presumption in favor of an employee’s claim if an employer fails to keep required records.

Responding to employer concerns these Labor Code requirements potentially subject them to representative actions under the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA), this bill would allow employers the opportunity to “cure” any PAGA claim after receiving notice, and outline the specific methods for cure, depending on the violations alleged.

- Promotion Opportunity Posting

Citing concerns about unfair promotion processes, proposed new Labor Code section 432.4 would require employers to notify all current employees of any internal job opening and the pay scale for the position at least five business days before filling the position. The employer would satisfy this requirement via a notice posted at the workplace in both English and the language understood by the majority of the employees, or by an electronic dissemination of the notice to employees. This requirement to publicize internal job openings would not preclude an employer from filling an internal position on a temporary or interim basis for up to 30 days without providing the advance notice if the employer did not anticipate having to fill the position.

Employees would be entitled to the same rights and remedies for violations of these promotion-related postings as they would be for violations of the new pay scale requirements. For PAGA purposes, employers would also have the opportunity to “cure” any alleged violations, although the cure methods would differ slightly from those for pay scale violations given the notices required.

- Annual Pay Data Reporting

In 2020, California enacted SB 973 requiring private employers with 100 or more employees to file an annual Employer Information Report (EEO-1) pursuant to federal law and to submit a pay data report to the DFEH, including the number of employees by race, ethnicity, and sex in specified job categories. SB 973 allowed employers to comply with this new reporting requirement by submitting an EEO-1 to DFEH containing the same or substantially similar pay data information.

As often happens in California, SB 1162 would amend these new reporting requirements in several respects. First, while private employers with 100 or more employees must annually submit a pay data report to DFEH, this bill would also require employers with 100 or more employees to submit a separate pay data report for employees hired through labor contractors, and to disclose on the pay data report the ownership names of all labor contractors used to supply employees. The bill’s author states this expansion to include labor contractor-related hiring is to combat employers trying to circumvent the current pay data reporting limited to employees, and to expand the information collected when assessing pay equity issues. For purposes of this new law, a “labor contractor” means an individual or entity that supplies, either with or without contract a client employer with workers to perform labor within the client employer’s usual course of business.

Second, the pay data report would also now be required to include median and mean hourly rates for each combination of race, ethnicity, and sex within each job category. Third, employers would no longer be permitted to submit an EEO-1 in lieu of a pay data report.

Fourth, while the authors of SB 973 had previously stated these pay data reports would not be published, this bill would require the DFEH to publish private employer pay data report on a public internet website, with the publication start date depending on the employer size (i.e., employers would 1000 or more employees would start in 2024, those with 500 or more in 2025, and those with 250 or more employees in 2026 and each year thereafter). However, the DFEH would not publish any individually identifiable information associated with a specific person. Responding to employer concerns this publication may lack necessary context, the DFEH would be required to provide a mechanism on its website for visitors to view additional information the employer wishes to provide regarding its pay data.

Fifth, this bill would impose new civil penalties of \$100 per employee on an employer who fails to file the required report for a first offense, and \$200 per employee for subsequent violations. Sixth, it would require these reports be due by the second Wednesday of May of each year (beginning in May 2023) rather than the current March 31st deadline.

Lastly, responding to employer concerns these published reports will subject them to suit but without sufficient context, SB 1162 would specifically provide that civil actions based solely upon these pay data reports will be subject to a pleading challenges.

Please note, while the pay data reporting requirements apply only to employers with 100 or more employees, the changes regarding pay scale posting and promotion opportunity announcements would apply to all employers.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Requirement for Large Employers to Report Extensive Employee Statistics (AB 2095)

This bill would require larger private-sector employers (i.e., with more than 1,000 employees in California), beginning by March 31, 2024, to annually submit reports to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) detailing various work-related statistics, which the LWDA will then score and rank to help identify “high-road employers.” These work-related statistics include the following categories (each of which are further detailed in the bill): (1) worker-related statistics for the employer’s workforce throughout the United States (e.g., number of full vs. part-time workers, number of hourly vs. salaried employees, number of employees [limited to California]), (2) pay information (e.g., median pay for all employees, number of employees earning above living wage), (3) hours worked information, (4) worker scheduling, (5) benefits, (6) ratio of nonsupervisory employees to independent contractors and temporary employees, (6) safety statistics, (7) annual turnover rate, and (8) equity information.

This report will need to be signed by the chief executive officer under penalty of perjury. The LWDA will also annually publish on its website the worker-related statistics submitted by all employers. To aid with compliance, the Employment Development Department must annually provide the LWDA the names and addresses of all employers subject to this annual reporting requirement.

As mentioned, the LWDA will annually score the submitted information under a to-be-determined methodology to identify and certify so-called “high road employers” potentially eligible for state-provided incentives, including procurement contracts, tax benefits, and workforce development funding.

Presently, the term “employer” is defined in this bill to include solely larger private sector employers that hire and remunerate persons for their labor or services, but does not include public agencies, non-profit corporations or temporary staffing companies.

A similar but narrower bill seeking to identify “high road employers” in the restaurant industry (AB 572) stalled in 2021.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee on a party-line vote and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Student Loan Repayment Assistance under California Tax Code (AB 1729)

While California and federal law presently allow employers to annually provide up to \$5,250 of payments for an employee's ongoing educational assistance that is exempted from state and federal income taxes, this bill would similarly allow employers to annually provide up to this same amount on a tax-favored basis under California law to help repay existing student loan debt. In this regard, it is like the recent provisions in the federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act that enable employers to provide tax-favored repayment assistance for existing student loan debt that would not be considered income for federal income tax purposes.

Similar bills have been introduced on several occasions, including AB 2478 (2017) and AB 152 (2019), which passed the Tax and Revenue Committee before stalling.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Tax and Revenue Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Biometric Information Protection Act (SB 1189)

Beginning with the Constitutional codification of an individual right of privacy and continuing up through the 2018 enactment of the California Consumer Privacy Act (Civil Code section 1798.100 *et seq.*), California has been very protective of an individual's personal information. Drawing heavily upon Illinois' groundbreaking Biometric Information Privacy Act (2008), this bill would enact California's version of the Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA) to enact "guardrails" around the collection, use, disclosure, and retention of biometric information by private entities in California.

For purposes of this proposed new law, "biometric information" would be defined as "the data of an individual generated by automatic measurements of an individual's biological or behavior characteristics," including a faceprint, fingerprint, voiceprint, retina or iris image or any other biological characteristic that can be used to authenticate the individual's identity. (For employment purposes, this could include fingerprint activated time clocks, facial/voice recognition software, etc.). SB 1189 also specifically enumerates various items that are not included within "biometric information," including a writing sample or written signature, a photograph or video and a physical description

By September 1, 2023, private entities in possession of "biometric information" would need to develop and make available to the public a written policy establishing a retention schedule and guidelines for permanently destroying the biometric information, and would need to comply with this policy. Except for information subject to a warrant or court-issued subpoena, the information would need to be destroyed on or before the earliest of: (a) the date on which the initial purpose for collecting or obtaining the biometric information is satisfied; (b) one year after the individual's last intentional interaction with the private entity; or (c) within 30 days after the private entity receives a verified request to delete the biometric information submitted by the individual or the individual's representative.

While "private entity" would be broadly defined to include most business entities "however organized," it would specifically not include a federal, state, or local government agency or an academic institution.

Private entities would also be prohibited from collecting, capturing, purchasing, receiving or otherwise obtaining a person's biometric information unless certain conditions are met. First, the private entity would need this information to provide a service requested/authorized by the subject of the information, or for another valid business purposes specified in its written policy. Second, the private entity would also

need to inform the person or their representative of the biometric information being collected/used and the specific purpose and length of time for which the biometric information is being collected/used. Third, the private entity would need to obtain a written release executed by the subject or their legal representative, and the release would need to be separate from other releases or employment contracts.

It would also preclude private entities from selling, using or profiting from the disclosure of biometric information, and would prohibit the disclosure of biometric information unless certain conditions are met (including a written release, a subpoena/warrant). It would also prohibit conditioning the provision of services on the collection, use, sale, etc. of biometric information unless biometric information is strictly necessary to provide this service. Lastly, it would require private entities to store, transmit and protect from disclosure biometric information using a reasonable standard of care within the private entity's industry and in a manner that is the same as, if not more protective than, storing other confidential and sensitive information.

This bill would also authorize civil actions against a private entity for violating these provisions and allow the greater of any actual damages or statutory damages ranging from \$100 to \$1,000 per day, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees.

Opponents have expressed concern about potential class action lawsuits against employers, citing the litigation trends in Illinois since its BIPA's enactment.

Status: Passed the Senate Judiciary Committee on a party-line vote and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Expansion of Businesses Required to Post Human Trafficking Notice (AB 1661)

Existing law requires specified businesses and other establishments, including, among others, airports, rail stations, certain medical facilities, and hotels, to post a notice, as developed by the Department of Justice, which contains information relating to slavery and human trafficking, and imposes penalties for failing to comply. This bill would additionally require businesses providing hair, nail, and skin care (as defined) to post the notice.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly and is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Background Checks Involving Date of Birth and Driver's License Information in Court Records (SB 1262)

Background check companies typically use an individual's date of birth or driver's license information to effectively locate information related to an applicant or employee when performing a background check through court records, and to avoid the risk of returning information about another person with the same name. However, a recent California appellate court decision in *All of Us or None of Us v. Hamrick* (2021) 64 Cal.App.5th 751, held that California Rule of Court 2.507 precluded electronic access to such information in court records. Responding to concerns that this interpretation would complicate background checks and potentially lead to unverifiable "false hits" based on common names, this bill would specifically authorize searches and filtering of publicly accessible court records based on a criminal defendant's driver's license number or date of birth, or both.

Status: Unanimously passed the Senate Public Safety Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Creation of Ultrahigh Heat Standard and Revision of Wildfire Smoke Standard (AB 2243)

Existing law, the California Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1973 (OSHA), requires employers to comply with certain safety and health standards, including a heat illness standard to prevent heat-related illness in outdoor places of employment and a standard for workplace protection from wildfire smoke. This bill would require the Division of Occupational Safety and Health to submit a rulemaking standard to revise the heat illness standard to include an “ultrahigh” heat standard for employees in outdoor places of employment for heat in excess of 105 degrees Fahrenheit, which will include mandatory work breaks every hour, accessible cool water, shade structures that include cooling features such as misters, and increased employer monitoring of employees for symptoms of heat-related illnesses, and to require employers to provide a copy of the Heat Illness Prevention Plan to all new employees when temperatures exceed 80 degrees and to all employees on an annual basis. The bill would also require a rulemaking proposal to revise the wildfire smoke standard to reduce the existing air quality index threshold at which respiratory protective equipment becomes mandatory and to remove the requirement that the employer reasonably anticipates the employees may be exposed to wildfire smoke. Finally, the bill would require the division to consider developing regulations related to additional protections related to acclimatization to higher temperatures, training programs for outdoor employees in administering first aid related to extreme heat-related illnesses, and additional protections for piece-rate workers. The bill would require the division to submit these rulemaking proposals before January 1, 2024, and require the standards board to review and adopt revised standards before July 1, 2024.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee on a party-line vote and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Creation of Advisory Committees Re: Extreme Heat and Humidity (AB 1643)

This bill would require the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to establish an advisory committee to study the effects of extreme heat and humidity on California’s workers and to recommend regulatory changes to improve the state’s understanding of the effects of extreme heat and humidity on California’s workers and economy and report its findings no later than January 1, 2025.

Status: Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Employee and Subcontractor Compliance with Workplace Safety Requirements at Live Events (AB 1775)

This bill applies to “contracting entities,” defined as bodies that contract with an entertainment events vendor to set up, produce, and tear down a live event at a public events venue – including state or county fairgrounds, state parks, the University of California or California State University. The bill requires the contracting entities to require an entertainment events vendor to certify for their employees and subcontractors that those individuals have complied with specified training, certification, and workforce requirements, including that employees involved in setting up, tearing down, or the production of a live event at the venue have completed proscribed OSHA training. The bill imposes civil penalties for violation of the requirement.

Status: Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Establish Juneteenth as a State Holiday (AB 1655)

This bill would add June 19, known as “Juneteenth,” as a state holiday. Community colleges, the California State University, and public schools would be required to close. The University of California would be requested to close. State employees, with specified exemptions, would be given time off with pay.

Status: Passed Assembly Governmental Organization Committee, unanimously passed the Assembly Higher Education Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Establish Election Day as a State Holiday (AB 1872)

This bill would add Election Day (the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of any even-numbered year) as a state holiday. Community colleges, the California State University, and public schools would be required to close. The University of California would be requested to close. State employees, with specified exemptions, would be given time off with pay. The bill also provides that Washington Day (the third Monday in February) would only be observed in odd-numbered years.

Status: Passed Assembly Elections and Governmental Organization Committees and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

COVID-19-Related Proposals

Extended Employer Notice Requirements Regarding COVID-19 Exposure and Expanded Cal-OSHA Powers (AB 2693)

In 2020, California enacted new mandatory employer notification requirements related to potential COVID-19 exposures in the workplace. (AB 685, codified at Labor Code section 6409.6 and 6325.) Specifically, if an employer or a representative of the employer receives a “notice of potential exposure to COVID-19,” the employer must provide statutorily enumerated notices within one business day of the notice of potential exposure, and potentially may also have to provide separate notice to local public health agencies within 48 hours. Cal-OSHA also can prohibit employer access to and usage of portions of the worksite that may constitute an imminent hazard to employees due to potential COVID-19 exposure. These requirements are set to expire on January 1, 2023. The new bill would extend these requirements through January 1, 2025.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and the Assembly Appropriations Committee on party-line votes and is pending on the Assembly Floor.

Extension of Presumption of Workers’ Compensation Coverage for COVID-19 (AB 1751)

On September 17, 2020, California created a rebuttable presumption of workers’ compensation coverage for employees who contracted a COVID-19-related illness under certain circumstances, with slightly different rules depending on whether the workplace exposure occurred before or after July 6, 2020. (SB 1159, codified at Labor Code sections 3212.86, 3212.87, and 3212.88.) The original law is set to expire January 1, 2023. This new bill would extend the rules regarding the rebuttable presumption of coverage through January 1, 2025.

Status: Passed the Assembly Insurance Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Leaves of Absence/Time Off/Accommodation Requests

Bereavement Leave Proposed Again (AB 1949)

An emerging criticism of the California Family Rights Act (CFRA) and the Family Medical Leave Act is that they provide time off to care for a seriously sick family member but provide no time off to the employee in the event the family member passes away.

Accordingly, this bill would require employers to provide up to five days of bereavement leave following the death of an employee's "family member" (e.g., spouse, child, parent, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, domestic partner, or parent-in-law). This bill would apply to private employers with five or more employees and to any state or civil subdivision of the state (e.g., counties and cities), and employees would need to have been employed at least 30 days prior to the commencement of the leave to be eligible. However, it would not apply to employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement that contains specially enumerated provisions, including bereavement leave.

The days of bereavement leave would not need to be consecutive but would need to be completed within three months of the date of the person's death. For most employers, this bereavement leave would be unpaid (unless the employer has an existing bereavement leave policy requiring paid time off), but an employee may use otherwise accrued or available vacation, personal leave, or compensatory time off. If an employer has an existing leave policy providing less than five paid days of bereavement leave, the employee would still be entitled to five days of bereavement leave, consisting of the number of days of paid leave under the policy and the remaining days of unpaid bereavement leave under this new law.

For permanent state employees, the first three days of bereavement leave would be paid, and those employees would be entitled to request an additional two days without pay, but without the current requirement that these two additional days only apply for out-of-state deaths.

Notably, although this new law would be codified in a new section (Government Code section 12945.7) immediately after the statute creating CFRA, bereavement leave would be considered separate and distinct from time off under the CFRA.

If requested by the employer, an employee would need to provide within 30 days of the first day of the leave documentation of the person's death, including a death certificate or a published obituary or written verification of death, burial, or memorial service from a mortuary, funeral home, burial society, crematorium, religious institution, or government agency. Employers would need to maintain the confidentiality of employees requesting this leave and to treat any documentation obtained as confidential and not disclosed except where required by law.

Because this new right would be codified at new Government Code section 12945.7, employees who believe they have been discriminated or retaliated against (or denied available time off) would presumably be entitled to the same remedies available for violations of the CFRA and/or the FEHA. However, alleged violations of this new section against smaller employers (i.e., with between five and nineteen employees) would also be subject to the recently created mediation pilot program for CFRA claims against such smaller employers.

Similar bills (including AB 2999 in 2020 and AB 95 in 2021) have stalled. However, several other states (e.g., Oregon and Maryland) and the City of Pittsburgh have recently enacted bereavement leave laws, suggesting this may be an emerging trend.

Status: Passed the Assembly Judiciary and Labor and Employment Committees with bi-partisan support and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Paid Parental Leave for California State University Employees (AB 2464)

New Education Code section 89519.3 would entitle California State University “employees” (as defined in Government Code section 3562) to a leave of absence with pay for one semester of an academic year, or an equivalent duration, in a one-year period following the birth of a child or placement of a child with an employee for adoption or foster care. The leave would need to be taken in consecutive periods unless otherwise agreed to by mutual consent between the employee and an appropriate administrator, and only working days would be charged against the leave of absence.

Status: Passed the Assembly Higher Education Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Pay and Benefits for State Employees for National Guard Drills (SB 984)

Presently, state employees who are members of reserve military units and the National Guard are entitled to an unpaid leave of absence to attend scheduled reserve drill periods or to perform other inactive duty reserve obligations. This bill would repeal these provisions regarding unpaid time off. Instead, state employees, who are already entitled to up to 30 days of compensation for short-term military leave for active-duty military duty, would be able to use this 30 days of paid military leave for periods of inactive duty training or “drills.”

Status: Unanimously passed the Senate Labor Committee and the Senate Military and Veterans Affairs Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Changes to Active-Duty Compensation and Benefits for State Employees (AB 1768)

Existing law references specific provisions of federal law for purposes of identifying events that establish how long state employees may receive compensation and benefits while serving as members of the California National Guard or a United States military reserve organization. This bill would delete the references to federal law but would leave in place the maximum period of compensation, which is 180 days. The apparent purpose is to remove the possibility for future confusion by state agencies when processing claims.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Military Affairs, Public Employment, and Appropriations Committees and is pending on the Assembly Floor.

Wage & Hour

PAGA Ballot Initiative Being Considered

Efforts are presently underway to gather signatures to qualify for the November 2022 general election ballot an initiative that would materially amend California’s Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). Entitled the California Fair Pay and Accountability Act, this initiative would reinstate the California Labor Commissioner as the primary vehicle for enforcing alleged Labor Code violations rather than employees (or their legal representatives) as so-called “private attorneys general.” ([Link to proposed amendment.](#))

Simply summarized, the initiative would require the state agencies be fully funded (thus removing the stated rationale for PAGA) and would require the state agencies to handle any complaints received. The

initiative would also provide that 100% of the award recovery would go to the employees, rather than the current 75% allocation to the LWDA. It would create a consultation unit to enable employers to resolve potential violations without penalty, but it would also enable the Labor Commissioner to obtain double penalties for willful Labor Code violations.

In short, the initiative is intended to remove the potential “in terrorem” threat of class action violations for technical Labor Code violations, in exchange for increased state agency funding, increased recovery directly to the employees and increased penalties against bad actor employers.

If it obtains sufficient signatures by the June 6, 2022 deadline, the initiative will appear on the November 2022 general election ballot.

Fast Food Industry Regulations (AB 257)

This bill would establish the Fast-Food Sector Council within the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), whose purpose would be to establish minimum standards on wages, working hours, and other working conditions related to the health, safety, and welfare of fast-food restaurant workers. It would define a fast-food restaurant, including that it is a part of a set of restaurants consisting of 30 or more establishments nationally that share a common brand or standards, and that it primarily provides food or beverages in disposable containers for immediate consumption either on or off the premises with limited to no table service.

The bill would also require that fast food restaurant franchisors be responsible for ensuring that franchisees comply with a variety of employment, worker, and public health and safety laws and orders, including those related to unfair business practices, employment discrimination, the California Retail Food Code, a range of labor regulations, emergency orders, and standards issued by the council. Franchisors would also be jointly and severally liable for violations of these same laws by their franchisees and the specified laws could be enforced against a franchisor to the same extent that they may be enforced against a franchisee. The bill would prohibit a fast-food franchisee from waiving this provision or from agreeing to indemnify its franchisor for liability.

The bill would give fast food franchisees a cause of action against franchisors for monetary or injunctive relief if the terms of a franchise prevent or create a substantial barrier to a fast food restaurant franchisee’s compliance with the specified laws, orders, and regulations, and would establish a rebuttable presumption that any changes in the terms of a franchise that increase the costs of the franchise to the franchisee create a substantial barrier to compliance with these laws and orders.

It would also be unlawful for a fast food restaurant operator to discharge or discriminate or retaliate against any employee because the employee made a complaint or disclosed information regarding employee or public health and safety; the employee instituted, testified in, or participated in a proceeding relating to employee or public health or safety; or the employee refused to perform work in a fast food restaurant because the employee had reasonable cause to believe the practices or premises of the fast food restaurant would violate any specified worker and public health and safety laws, regulations or orders, or would pose a substantial risk to the health and safety of the employee, other employees, or the public. The bill would create a private right of action for violation of this provision and allow treble damages for lost wages and work benefits, along with attorney’s fees and costs. There would be a rebuttable presumption of unlawful discrimination or retaliation if a fast-food restaurant operator

discharges or takes any other adverse action against one of its employees within 90 days following the date the operator had knowledge of the employee's protected action.

Status: Passed the Assembly and is pending in the Senate Labor Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Further Garment Manufacturing Changes (SB 1260)

In 2021, California enacted SB 62 to address wage and hour violations in the garment manufacturing industry by, amongst other things, requiring that various entities in the garment manufacturing process (e.g., manufacturers, contractors, brand guarantors, etc.) be jointly and severally liable for damages and penalties flowing from such violations. This bill would specify that such damages for joint and several liability purposes include liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully withheld and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid overtime compensation due.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and Senate Judiciary Committee and is pending on the Senate Floor.

Extension of Meal and Rest Period Requirements to Employees of Public Hospitals (SB 1334)

Existing law requires an employer to provide specified meal and rest periods to employees of private sector hospitals and provides a remedy of one hour of premium pay for missed meal and rest breaks, while excepting employees in the public sector from these requirements. This bill would apply to employees who provide direct patient care or support direct patient care in a general acute care hospital, clinic, or public health setting and who are employed by the state, political subdivisions of the state, municipalities, and the regents of the University of California. Employees would be entitled to one unpaid 30-minute meal period on shifts over 5 hours and a second unpaid 30-minute meal period on shifts over 10 hours, as well as a rest period based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of 10 minutes net rest time per 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof. Employers would be required to pay one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each meal period violation and rest period violation.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Changes to Final Pay Rules for Seasonal Employees (AB 2133)

Labor Code section 201 currently regulates the payment of wages after an employer discharges an employee and provides that if an employer lays off a group of seasonal employees employed in the curing, canning, or drying of fruit, fish, or vegetables, the employer must pay final wages within a reasonable time, not to exceed 96 hours. This bill would reduce the time limit on payment of such wages to 48 hours.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Minimum Wage Citations (AB 2955)

Labor Code section 1197.1 authorizes the Labor Commissioner to issue a citation for payment of less than the minimum wage. The citation must be in writing and describe the nature of the violation. This bill would require each citation to also include the date of the violation.

Status: Passed Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Public Sector/Labor Relations

Penalties and Potential Liability for Discouraging Union Membership (SB 931)

Government Code section 3550 currently prohibits a public employer from deterring or discouraging employees or applicants from becoming members of an employee organization, authorizing representation by an employee organization, or authorizing dues or fees to an employee organization. This bill would authorize an employee organization to bring claim before the Public Employment Relations Board alleging violation of these rules and would establishing a civil penalty up to \$1000 for each affected employee, not to exceed \$100,000 in total, recoverable by the Board. The bill would instruct the Board to award attorney's fees and costs to a prevailing employee organization unless the Board finds the claim was frivolous, unreasonable, or groundless when brought, or the employee organization continued to litigate after it clearly became so.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor and Judiciary Committees and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

New Labor Relations Rules for Agricultural Employers (AB 2183)

This bill make several changes to regulation of labor relations for agricultural employees. First, it would allow a labor organization to obtain an agricultural employer's employee list upon notice of an intention to organize. The employer would have to submit an employee list to the Agricultural Labor Relations Board within five days from the date of filing the notice and, if the employer contends the unit named in the notice is inappropriate, the employer would have to submit written arguments in support of its contention. The bill would also permit agricultural employees, as an alternative to holding a secret ballot election, to select labor representatives through representation ballot card election by submitting cards signed by majority of employees in a bargaining unit. It would create civil penalties for employers who commit unfair labor practices of up to \$10,000. The bill would also require an employer who appeals or petitions for writ of review of any order of the board involving make-whole, backpay or other monetary awards to employees to post an appeal bond in the amount of the entire economic value of the order.

Status: Passed Assembly Labor Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

State-Provided Benefits

Increase Paid Family Leave Benefits (SB 951)

To address concerns the current Paid Family Leave benefits paid by the state Disability Fund are insufficient to enable many lower wage workers to take family leave, this bill would increase the weekly benefits from 60% to up to 90% of an employee's wages (subject to certain caps). These increased benefits would begin January 1, 2023. The bill would also remove a limitation on workers' contributions to the Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund. This is a slightly modified version of AB 123, which passed the Legislature last year but was vetoed by the Governor.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Workers' Compensation Coverage for Hospital Employees (SB 213)

This bill would define "injury" for workers' compensation purposes regarding hospital employees providing direct patient care in acute care hospitals to include infectious diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal

injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, asthma or COVID-19. It would create a rebuttable presumption these injuries arose out of the course and scope of employment, with the presumption extending for specified periods after the employee's termination of employment.

Status: Passed the Senate and is pending in the Assembly Insurance Committee.

Pilot Program Regarding Unemployment Assistance for Undocumented Workers (AB 2847)

Existing law prohibits payment of unemployment compensation benefits to a person who is not a citizen or national of the United States, unless that person is lawfully admitted for permanent residence, was lawfully present for the purposes of performing work, or was permanently residing in the United States under color of law. This bill would establish, until January 1, 2025, the "Excluded Workers Pilot Program" to provide income assistance to excluded workers who are not eligible for state or federal unemployment benefits. The bill would apply to individuals who reside in California and who performed at least 93 hours of work or earned at least \$1,300 in gross wages over the course of three calendar months (which do not need to be consecutive) for work performed in California within the 12 months preceding their application for benefits. The bill would make individuals eligible to receive \$300 per week for each week of unemployment between January 1, 2023 and December 31, 2023, up to a maximum of 20 weeks. The program would be funded by an appropriation of \$690,000,000 from the General Fund.

Status: Passed Assembly Insurance Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Increase Disability Benefits by Disparity in Earning Between Genders (SB 1458)

This bill would increase the payment of disability benefits by the percentage of disparity in earnings between genders as reported by the applicant's employer in its pay data report to the DFEH if the applicant's average weekly wage is less than the average weekly wage of the opposite gender. It would apply prospectively to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2023.

Status: Passed the Senate Labor Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Treatment by Licensed Clinical Social Workers under Workers' Compensation (SB 1002)

Existing workers' compensation law requires employers to provide medical services reasonably required to cure or relieve an injured worker from the effects of covered injuries. This bill would expand the meaning of medical treatment to include the services of a licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) and would authorize an employer to provide an employee with access to an LCSW. The bill would authorize medical provider networks to add LCSWs as providers and would prohibit an LCSW from determining disability, as specified.

Status: Unanimously passed the Senate and is pending in the Assembly Insurance Committee.

Acknowledgement of Penalties for False Statements in Unemployment Insurance Applications (AB 2621)

Existing law prohibits employers or employees from willfully making false statements or representations, or willfully failing to report a material fact in connection with an unemployment insurance application. This bill would require claimants and employers to sign an acknowledgement that they understand they may be subject to penalties under the unemployment insurance law if they violate these provisions.

Status: Unanimously passed Assembly Insurance Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Changes to Workers' Compensation Liability Presumptions, Coverage, and Penalties (SB 1127)

Existing law provides that if an employer does not reject liability within 90 days after receiving an injured employee's claim form, an injury is presumed compensable under the workers' compensation system. This bill would reduce that period to 60 days, except for certain injuries for law enforcement or first responders, in which case the time period would be reduced to 30 days. In addition, the bill would increase the number of compensable weeks for specified firefighters and peace officers for illness or injury related to cancer from 104 weeks to 240 weeks. Finally, the bill would increase the penalty for unreasonably rejecting specified claims for law enforcement or first responders from the current amount (25% of the unreasonably delayed or refused claim or a minimum of \$10,000) to five times the amount of the benefits unreasonably delayed, up to a maximum of \$100,000.

Status: Passed the Assembly Insurance Committee with bi-partisan support and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Extension of Provisions for Electronic Application for Work Sharing Program Under Unemployment Insurance Law (AB 1854)

Existing unemployment compensation law deems an employee unemployed in any week if the employee works less than their usual weekly hours of work because of the employer's participation in a work sharing plan that meets specified requirements, pursuant to which the employer, in lieu of a layoff, reduces employment and stabilizes the workforce. Existing law creates an alternative process for submitting and approving employer work sharing plan applications, allowing applications to be submitted electronically. This law is in effect until January 1, 2024. This bill would extend these provisions indefinitely.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly and is pending in the Senate.

Miscellaneous

Call Center Job Protections (AB 1601)

This bill would require employers (as defined) of customer service employees working in a call center to provide at least 120 days' notice to the Labor Commissioner before relocating the call center from California to a foreign country. If a violation occurs, the Labor Commissioner would be authorized to award either a civil penalty up to \$10,000 for every day of violation, or to award damages proportionate to the impact on the community as determined by a community impact study, for which the employer shall pay.

The Labor Commissioner will also compile and publish a list of employers providing notice regarding an intent to relocate, and the list will be made available to specified state entities. Employers appearing on the list will be ineligible for state grants, state-guaranteed loans, or tax benefits for five years after the date that the list is published and would be required to remit the unamortized value of any existing grant, guaranteed loan, or tax benefit, as specified.

It would also require that private entities that have contracted with the state of California for call center services as of January 1, 2023 ensure that a certain percentage of services are performed in California.

Similar bills (AB 1677 in 2019 and AB 2317 in 2020) have previously stalled.

Status: Passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee on a party-line vote and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Public Access to Employer Restrooms (AB 1632)

Since 2005, 17 states have passed laws requiring businesses to allow members of the public experiencing a medical emergency to use employee-only restrooms. AB 1632 would enact a similar requirement in California.

Accordingly, places of business open to the public for the sale of goods and that have a toilet facility for their employees would need to permit certain individuals who are lawfully on the business' premises to use that toilet facility during business hours, even if the business does not normally allow public usage of the employee restrooms. Such access would need to be provided if all of the following conditions are met: (1) the individual requesting access has an "eligible medical condition" or uses an ostomy bag; (2) three or more employees are working onsite when the employee requests access; (3) the employee toilet facility is not located in an area where access would create an obvious health/safety risk to the requesting individual or an obvious security risk to the place of business; (4) use of the employee toilet facility would not create an obvious risk or safety risk to the requesting individual; and (5) a public restroom is not otherwise immediately accessible.

"Eligible medical condition" would be defined as Chron's disease, ulcerative colitis, other inflammatory bowel disease, irritable bowel syndrome, or another medication condition that requires immediate access to a toilet facility.

Businesses would be permitted to require the individual to present reasonable evidence of an eligible medical condition or the use of an ostomy device. Such evidence would include a signed statement issued to the requesting individual by a physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant on a form to be developed by California's State Department of Public Health. Businesses also would not be required to make any physical changes to the employee toilet facility to comply with this bill, and these employee toilet facilities would not be considered "places of public accommodation" for purposes of state disability law.

The Public Health Department would be solely responsible for enforcing these provisions (i.e., there would be no private civil action allowed), and violations would result in civil statutory penalties up to \$100 per violation. Places of businesses would only be civilly liable for willful or grossly negligent violations. Employees of a business would not be subject to civilly liable, nor could they be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action by their employer for any violations of these new access requirements.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Business and Professions Committee and the Assembly Health Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

New Lease Disclosure Requirements Regarding Employee Parking (AB 2206)

To combat air pollution and promote alternative transportation, Health and Safety Code section 43845 presently requires that in certain "air basins designated as a nonattainment area," employers with 50 or more employees that provide a parking subsidy to employees must also offer a "parking cash out program" to employees that do not use this parking. However, the fact that many commercial leases simply bundle parking with other services in the lease rather than separately designating the cost of parking spots has made it difficult for employers to calculate and pay out this subsidy. This reality has also

made it difficult for the state agencies to enforce the law’s requirements, including penalizing employers who were not paying this parking cash out programs.

To overcome these problems, this bill would require that for leases entered into or renewed after January 1, 2023, the lessor shall list the market-rate (as defined) parking costs as a separate line item in the lease or provide a list of parking costs to the employer within 30 days after the lease is entered into or renewed. Whereas previously employers were not specifically required to provide a parking cash-out program unless the parking costs were specifically enumerated, employers would now be required to maintain such a program even if the lessor did not comply with the new requirement to separately identify the market rate parking costs. It would also require the employer, upon request by the employee, to provide the parking cost information received from the lessor, but it would not otherwise create a right for an employee to access, review or challenge a lease or a proposed lease.

Status: Passed the Assembly Transportation Committee and is pending on the Assembly Floor.

Tax Credits for Hiring Injured or Recovering Workers (AB 2378)

Along the lines of AB 2035 discussed above, this bill proposes a tax credit of up to 40% of the wages paid or incurred by the employer (up to \$6,000 per employee and not to exceed \$30,000 per employer) for employees hired on or after January 1, 2023 who are a vocational rehabilitation referral, a qualified SSI recipient or a qualified SSDI recipient (as those terms are defined), and who was not an employee of the employer in the previous five taxable years.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Revenue and Tax Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Tax Credits for Hiring Homeless of Foster Youth (SB 1484)

Continuing the theme of tax credits to encourage employer hiring in certain respects, AB 1484 would provide a tax credit of up to 40% of the first-year wages if an employer hires an employee who is a homeless youth, foster youth, or former foster youth (as defined).

Status: Unanimously passed the Senate Governance and Finance Committee and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Remote Work for Finance Lender Employees (AB 2001)

While California’s Financing Law presently precludes finance lenders from transacting business at a location other than that identified in its license, this bill would authorize licensed finance lenders to designate employees who could work at a “remote location” (as defined) provided certain criteria are met (e.g., prohibiting consumer’s personal information from being stored at the remote location unless stored on an encrypted device or encrypted media, as defined). In effect, it would codify the COVID-19 requirements issued by the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation to enable finance lender employees to work remotely during the initial stages of the pandemic.

Status: Unanimously passed the Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee and Assembly Banking and Finance Committee and is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.