



2025

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

GAIL PELLERIN, CHAIR



December 2025

Interested Parties:

This booklet summarizes selected legislation in the jurisdiction of the Assembly Committee on Elections that was approved by the Legislature in 2025. Bills and other measures that made it through the legislative process are included. Those bills that failed to reach the Governor's desk are not.

Among the most noteworthy measures considered and approved by the Committee were bills to ensure that vote by mail ballots are counted as intended and to streamline and standardize the processing of those ballots; to strengthen disclosure requirements for public officials' financial interests; to protect against threats to public officials and to the integrity of elections; to maintain robust enforcement of local campaign finance and ethics laws; and to ensure that all California voters have access to early in-person voting opportunities. These are just a few of the important policy changes approved by the Legislature this year. This booklet provides a complete listing of these and other measures.

Most of the bills signed into law will take effect on January 1, 2026. Bills noted as urgency measures took effect earlier this year, as detailed in the description of those bills. The full text of legislation summarized in this pamphlet, as well as the committee analysis of those measures, may be viewed on the Internet at the California Legislative Information website (<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>).

I hope you will find this publication informative and useful as a reference tool. For additional information concerning Committee activities, please contact Committee staff at (916) 319-2094.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Gail Pellerin". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Gail" being more prominent than the last name "Pellerin".

Gail Pellerin

Table of Contents

- 2025 Committee Membership [Page 1](#)
- Abbreviation Reference List [Page 2](#)
- 2025 Legislative Highlights [Page 3](#)
- 2025 Legislative Summary – Assembly Bills..... [Page 4](#)
- 2025 Legislative Summary – Senate Bills..... [Page 29](#)
- Index of Chaptered Bills..... [Page 39](#)
- Index of Chaptered Constitutional Amendments..... [Page 40](#)
- Index of Vetoed Bills [Page 41](#)

Assembly Committee on Elections 2025 Committee Membership

Chair

Assemblymember Gail Pellerin, 28th District

Members

Assemblymember Alexandra M. Macedo, Vice Chair, 33rd District

Assemblymember Steve Bennett, 38th District

Assemblymember Marc Berman, 23rd District

Assemblymember José Luis Solache, Jr., 62nd District

Assemblymember Catherine Stefani, 19th District

Assemblymember David J. Tangipa, 8th District

Staff

Ethan Jones, Chief Consultant

Nichole Becker, Principal Consultant

Lori Barber, Secretary

Contact Information

Legislative Office Building

1020 N Street, Suite 365

Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 319-2094

<https://aelc.assembly.ca.gov/>

Key to Abbreviations Used

- AR 77.2: Bill referred to policy committee pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2, which provides that a bill that has been substantially amended since approval by a policy committee may be re-referred to a policy committee.
- N/R: Vote is not relevant.
- SR 28.8: Bill reported to Senate Floor pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8, which provides that bills referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee that do not have significant state costs shall be reported to the Senate Floor without a hearing by the Appropriations Committee.
- SR 29.10: Bill referred to policy committee pursuant to Senate Rule 29.10, which provides that a bill that has been substantially amended since approval by a policy committee may be re-referred to a policy committee.

Assembly Committee on Elections

2025 Legislative Highlights

Improving Voter Accessibility and Outreach:

Several new laws focus on making voting more accessible and ensuring all Californians have the information they need to participate fully in the democratic process. One measure requires every county to regularly review and update voter education and outreach plans, with the goal of increasing voter awareness and engagement across diverse communities. Another bill guarantees that early in-person voting opportunities are available in all counties before all statewide elections. Other approved measures seek to improve the accessibility of public buildings used as polling places and streamline the voter registration process for overseas and military voters, ensuring they can participate without unnecessary obstacles.

Strengthening Campaign Finance and Ethics Rules:

The Legislature approved and the Governor signed multiple bills to enhance the financial disclosures that are required of public officials and candidates for elective office. Additional measures tighten restrictions on campaign spending by foreign entities and support the rollout of a new, data-driven campaign finance disclosure system designed to give the public more accessible and timely information about political spending. Another bill places a measure on the November 2026 general election ballot asking voters whether California jurisdictions should be allowed to adopt public campaign financing programs.

Voting Safeguards and Protecting Elections:

Urgency legislation was enacted to reinforce the integrity and reliability of California's election process. These changes ensure that election results are certified promptly, strengthen state laws against voter intimidation, and prohibit the use of misleading unofficial ballot return envelopes that could confuse voters or compromise ballot security. Another newly enacted law bolsters long-standing prohibitions on vote buying by explicitly making it a crime to offer payments for voting or registering to vote.

Protecting Public Officials from Violence and Threats:

Responding to a documented rise in threats, harassment, and violence targeting public officials—including the recent shooting of two state legislators in Minnesota—the Legislature and Governor enacted a law protecting the confidentiality of home addresses for public officials and candidates, reducing the risk of targeted harassment or violence. Another new law temporarily lifts limits on the use of campaign funds for security expenses to help safeguard elected officials and candidates, and their families and staff.

Assembly Committee on Elections 2025 Legislative Summary

Assembly Bills

[AB 5 \(Berman\)](#)

Chapter 250, Statutes of 2025
Elections: official canvass.

[Adds Section 15307 to the Elections Code]

The speed at which California finalizes election results and certifies elections garnered increased attention following the 2024 statewide general election. That attention was due, in part, to the fact that California had the two closest Congressional races in the nation, which meant that the winners in those two races were not apparent until weeks after the election.

The desire to know the outcomes of elections sooner is understandable and is part of the reason why media organizations declare the winners of elections before ballot counting is complete. Government officials who are responsible for running elections, however, do not have the ability to declare a winner before all ballots are counted. Instead, they are tasked with ensuring that all legally-cast ballots are tabulated accurately and in accordance with state laws, using a process that is open to public scrutiny, and that contains safeguards to protect against the release of incorrect results due to errors, fraud, or other factors.

This bill seeks to speed up vote counting by requiring county elections officials to release the vote counts for ballots by the 13th day after the election, except for certain specified types of ballots that require additional processing. Ballots that do not need to be counted by the 13th day include vote by mail (VBM) ballots forwarded from other counties, VBM ballots subject to signature curing, provisional ballots, same-day voter registration ballots, ballots received by the elections official after the fourth day following the election, and ballots that need duplicating.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	14-0	Senate Appropriations	7-0
Assembly Floor	71-0	Senate Floor	38-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	79-0		

[AB 16 \(Alanis\)](#)

Chapter 140, Statutes of 2025
Vote by mail ballots: processing.

[Amends Sections 15101 and 15104 of the Elections Code]

Until recently, state law required county elections officials to begin mailing vote by mail (VBM) ballots to most voters on the 29th day prior to an election. [AB 49 \(Cervantes\), Chapter 553, Statutes of 2019](#), however, required elections officials to begin sending VBM ballots *no later than* the 29th day before the election. As a result, some counties begin mailing VBM ballots earlier than the 29th day before the election. In those counties, some VBM ballots may be returned to the elections official before the 29th day before the election, which is the first day that existing law allows elections officials to begin processing VBM ballot return envelopes and VBM ballots that have been returned by voters.

This bill allows county elections officials to begin processing VBM ballot return envelopes and ballots on the date on which ballots are mailed.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	75-0	Senate Floor	39-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	74-0		

[AB 17 \(Alanis\)](#)

Chapter 80, Statutes of 2025
Elections: precinct maps.

[Adds Section 12263 to the Elections Code]

Current law requires an elections official to divide a jurisdiction into precincts and prepare detailed maps or exterior descriptions of the precincts. A precinct is defined as a geographical area within a county that is made up of voters. Under current law, copies of precinct maps are available to the public upon request. The elections official may charge a person requesting copies for expenses incurred in providing precinct maps. The law, however, does not specify any specific format in which precinct maps must be made available to the public.

Several counties post precinct maps in portable document format (also known as a pdf) on their website and some of these maps may be downloaded and printed for free. Other counties have online interactive mapping tools that allow a voter to look up district and precinct maps and download and print the digital maps for free.

This bill requires the registrar of voters in each county to make available, upon request by any member of the public, a map in digital form that is free of charge showing the boundaries of each precinct within the county.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	14-0	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	75-0	Senate Floor	35-0

[AB 94 \(Bennett\)](#)

Chapter 251, Statutes of 2025

Recall elections: successors.

[Amends Sections 11382 and 11385 of the Elections Code]

Until 2023, local recall elections held in California generally were conducted in a similar manner to how state recall elections are conducted: namely, as a two-part election where voters were asked (1) whether the targeted official should be recalled, and (2) if the recall is successful, who should replace the recalled officer. In 2022, however, the Legislature passed and Governor Newsom signed [AB 2582 \(Bennett\), Chapter 790, Statutes of 2022](#). For local jurisdictions that do not have a charter provision that provides for recall, AB 2582 removed the successor candidate question from the recall election, so that the election for a local officer only includes the question of whether the officer sought to be recalled shall be removed from office. Any vacancy created as the result of a successful recall election under AB 2582 is filled in the same manner as a vacancy in that office otherwise would be filled.

Last session, the Legislature considered and approved [SCA 1 \(Newman\), Resolution Chapter 204, Statutes of 2024](#). SCA 1 proposes an amendment to the California Constitution that would provide for a state recall election to include only the question of whether the elected officer sought to be recalled should be removed from office, like the process that was established for local recall elections by AB 2582. SCA 1 will be submitted to the voters for their consideration at the November 2026 statewide general election and will only take effect if approved by the voters.

If SCA 1 is approved by voters and a state officer is recalled, the resulting vacancy generally would be filled in the same manner as any other vacancy in that office. For instance, if a member of the Board of Equalization is recalled, the Governor would have the ability to nominate someone to fill the resulting vacancy, with the nominee taking office upon confirmation by the Assembly and the Senate. However, SCA 1 also includes a constraint on who the Governor may nominate in that situation; specifically, SCA 1 prohibits the recalled officer from being appointed to fill the vacancy that resulted from the recall. This bill establishes a similar limitation on appointments to fill a vacancy that result from a local recall election, thereby more closely aligning the state and local recall processes should SCA 1 be approved by voters.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	76-0	Senate Floor	39-0

[AB 287 \(Lackey\)](#)

Chapter 253, Statutes of 2025 Elections: polling places and vote centers.

[Amends Section 12283 of the Elections Code]

Voting outside of the polling location (also known as "curbside" voting) enables a voter to have a voting experience outside the voting area when a polling place is not accessible. Under existing law, any voter who cannot reach the voting area at the polling place because of architectural barriers or physical limitations may be allowed to vote "curbside." In practice, voters may use curbside voting from their vehicle or along the path of travel to the voting area. An elections official will qualify the voter, and bring a ballot and any other voting materials the voter may need to cast their ballot privately and independently.

In 2018, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed [AB 2540 \(Mullin\), Chapter 343, Statutes of 2018](#), which authorizes the governing body with jurisdiction over school buildings or other public buildings to allow its buildings to be used as vote centers, in addition to polling places. Additionally, AB 2540 requires the governing body having jurisdiction over a school building or public building, if an elections official specifically requests the use of the building, to allow for the school or building to be used as a vote center beginning up to 10 days before the election and continuing through election day, as well as during key dates necessary for drop-off, set-up, and pick-up of election materials, as determined by the elections official.

In June 2023, a lawsuit was filed following a lengthy investigation that found that Los Angeles County excluded individuals with disabilities from participating in the county's in-person voting program. Last year, Los Angeles County reached a settlement agreement with the United States Department of Justice to resolve that lawsuit under the Americans with Disabilities Act to increase accessibility for voters with disabilities. Under the agreement, Los Angeles County will work on site selection policies and procedures to ensure that the County selects vote center locations that are accessible or can be made more accessible during the voting period by employing temporary remedial measures.

This bill helps improve accessibility to the electoral process by clarifying that a public building or a school building that serves as a polling place or vote center is required to provide adequate storage space that includes storage space for voting operations and associated voting supplies. Additionally, this bill requires a public facility building administrator to make available accessible parking spaces and parking for curbside voting.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	72-0	Senate Floor	40-0

[AB 359 \(Ramos\)](#)

Chapter 257, Statutes of 2025 Fair Political Practices Commission.

[Amends Section 83123.6 of, and repeals Section 83123.5 of, the Government Code]

Under existing law, local government agencies generally have a significant amount of latitude to develop local campaign finance ordinances that apply to elections in those agencies' jurisdictions. Any jurisdiction that adopts or amends a local campaign finance ordinance is required to file a copy of that ordinance with the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), and the FPPC posts those ordinances on its website.

In 2012, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed [AB 2146 \(Cook\), Chapter 169, Statutes of 2012](#), which permitted San Bernardino County and the FPPC to enter into an agreement that provides for the FPPC to enforce the County's local campaign finance ordinance. Similarly, other local jurisdictions (the City of Stockton, the City of Sacramento, and the City of San Bernardino) have pursued special legislation to partner with the FPPC and allow the FPPC to enforce their local campaign finance ordinance.

Subsequently, [AB 2880 \(Harper\), Chapter 394, Statutes of 2018](#), allowed the governing body of *any* local government agency to contract with the FPPC for the administration, implementation, and enforcement of a local campaign finance or government ethics law, as specified. Prior to AB 2880 becoming law, the FPPC did not have the authority to enforce local campaign finance ordinances without special authorization legislation. AB 2880, however, included a January 1, 2026, sunset date. Absent legislation that either extends or removes the sunset date, certain local jurisdictions will be unable to continue contracting with the FPPC.

This bill removes the January 1, 2026, sunset date, thereby making the law permanent, and makes other technical changes.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	14-0	Senate Appropriations	<u>(SR 28.8)</u>
Assembly Floor	79-0	Senate Floor	35-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	76-0		

[AB 604 \(Aguiar-Curry and Gonzalez\)](#)

Chapter 96, Statutes of 2025

Redistricting: congressional districts. Urgency.

[Adds and repeals Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 21400) of Division 21 of the Elections Code]

[ACA 8 \(Rivas and McGuire\), Resolution Chapter 156, Statutes of 2025](#), proposes an amendment to the California Constitution to provide for the temporary use of new congressional district maps for elections held through 2030 if voters approved that measure. ACA 8 appeared on the ballot at the November 4, 2025, statewide special election as Proposition 50. Voters approved Proposition 50 by a margin of 64% - 36%.

This bill specifies the boundaries for California's congressional districts that will be used for elections held through 2030 due to the voters' approval of ACA 8.

This bill contains an urgency clause. It took effect on August 21, 2025, and became operative with the voters' approval of ACA 8.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	<u>(N/R)</u>	Senate Elections & CA	4-1
Assembly Floor	<u>(N/R)</u>	Senate Appropriations	5-2
Assembly Concurrence.....	56-20	Senate Floor	30-9

[AB 699 \(Stefani\)](#)

Vetoed

Elections: local tax measures.

[Amends Sections 9401, 9403, 9405, and 13119 of, amends the heading of Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 9400) of Division 9 of, adds Section 9406 to, and repeals and adds Section 9400 of, the Elections Code]

In 2015, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed [AB 809 \(Obernolte\), Chapter 337, Statutes of 2015](#), which required the ballot, if a proposed local initiative imposed a tax or raised the rate of a tax, to include in the statement of the ordinance on the ballot the amount of money to be raised annually and the rate and duration of the tax to be levied. AB 809 took effect in January 2016. Subsequently [AB 195 \(Obernolte\), Chapter 105, Statutes of 2017](#), clarified that the ballot label requirements of AB 809 applied to all local tax measures placed on the ballot, not only initiative tax measures.

This bill proposed to alter the information voters see on the ballot label for local measures that impose or increase a tax for more than one rate, or authorize the issuance of bonds, and to

change the information included in the measure information statement. Specifically, this bill would have permitted the jurisdiction submitting the measure, or the proponents in the case of a voter-submitted initiative, to choose whether to include the tax rate information required by AB 809 and AB 195 in the ballot label, or to instead include a phrase that directs the voter to the county voter information guide for information about the tax rate, or for information about how the bond debt will be repaid, in lieu of providing the information directly on the ballot label. If a local agency or the proponents elect to tell voters to see the voter guide, this bill would have required the election order for the measure, or the full text of the measure in the case of a voter-submitted initiative, to include a statement of the reasons for selecting the inclusion of the phrase. Additionally, this bill proposed to create new tax rate statement disclosure requirements if ballot measure proponents or a local agency chose to include the phrase on the ballot label.

Governor Newsom [vetoed](#) AB 699 stating in part, “While I appreciate the author's intent to provide local agencies with the flexibility to select an alternative tax rate disclosure option, I am concerned that this bill, as drafted, will reduce transparency for local tax and bond measures.”

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	4-2	Senate Local Government	5-2
Assembly Appropriations	11-3	Senate Elections & CA	4-1
Assembly Floor	54-20	Senate Appropriations	5-2
Assembly Concurrence.....	55-21	Senate Floor	24-13

[AB 789 \(Bonta\)](#)

Chapter 621, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: security expenses.

[Amends Section 89517.5 of the Government Code]

The Political Reform Act strictly regulates the use of campaign funds by candidates, elected officials, and others who control the expenditure of those funds and generally requires expenditures of campaign funds to be directly or reasonably related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.

Unfortunately, there has been an increase in threats and harassment against public officials, their families, and their staff. In an effort to address these concerns, last year [AB 2041 \(Bonta\), Chapter 372, Statutes of 2024](#), an urgency measure, was signed into law. AB 2041 broadened the types of security expenses that can be paid for with campaign funds and authorizes campaign funds to be used for costs related to security expenses, as defined, to protect not only a candidate and an elected officer, but also the immediate family or staff of a candidate or elected officer. Additionally, AB 2041 increased the maximum amount of campaign funds that a candidate or elected officer can use for security expenses to \$10,000. AB 2041 took effect in September 2024.

In response to concerns that the \$10,000 lifetime limit is inadequate in today's climate, where threats to public officials and their families are more frequent, more serious, and more costly to address, this bill deletes that lifetime monetary cap until 2029, thereby permitting a candidate or elected official to spend an unlimited amount of campaign funds for security expenses. This bill reestablishes a limit on the use of campaign funds for security expenses of \$10,000 per calendar year beginning January 1, 2029.

Legislative History:

Assembly Health.....	(N/R)	Senate Elections & CA	4-0
Assembly Floor	(N/R)	Senate Floor	31-4
Assembly Concurrence.....	65-6		

[AB 808 \(Addis\)](#)

Chapter 278, Statutes of 2025

Campaign statements and registrations: filing online or electronically.

[Amends Sections 81007, 81007.5, 81009, 81010, 82006, 82015, 82018, 82022.5, 82025, 82046, 83113, 84100, 84101, 84101.5, 84102, 84103, 84104, 84106, 84108, 84200, 84200.5, 84200.8, 84200.9, 84202.3, 84202.7, 84203, 84204, 84204.5, 84205, 84207, 84209, 84211, 84212, 84213, 84214, 84215, 84218, 84219, 84222, 84223, 84224, 84226, 84252, 84300, 84302, 84303, 84306, 84502, 84504.6, 84602, 84605, 84612, 84615, 84616, 85200, 85201, 85307, 85400, 85505, 85704, 86116, 89502, 89503, 89511.5, 89517.5, 89517.6, 90001, 90002, 90004, 91010, 91011, and 91013 of, and repeals Sections 84206 and 84603 of, the Government Code]

In 1997, the Legislature passed and Governor Pete Wilson signed [SB 49 \(Karnette\), Chapter 866, Statutes of 1997](#), which required the Secretary of State (SOS), in consultation with the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), to develop and implement, by the year 2000, an online filing and disclosure system for specified reports and statements required to be filed under the Political Reform Act (PRA). As a result, the SOS created and deployed a system called the California Automated Lobby Activity and Campaign Contribution and Expenditure Search System, commonly referred to as Cal-Access.

Cal-Access is now 26 years old, and the SOS reports that components of the system are no longer supported by their vendor. As a result the system has periodically crashed and denied public access. Additionally, the SOS has indicated that the ability to make modifications to the existing Cal-Access system is very limited. While the Legislature has taken steps to replace the Cal-Access system with a new disclosure system commonly referred to as the Cal-Access Replacement System (CARS), the SOS does not expect to fully deploy CARS until late 2026 at the earliest.

Unlike the current Cal-Access disclosure system, which is structured around campaign disclosure statements being filed on reporting forms that are developed by the FPPC, the new CARS system is required to be developed as a "data-driven" means for filers to submit required information

that must be disclosed under state law. To reflect that data-driven approach, this bill updates terminology to transition away from terms (like statements being prepared on "a form") that generally are used to describe paper-based (rather than electronic) reports and documents. This bill also eliminates the option for certain campaign disclosure reports to be filed by fax and makes other changes to facilitate the implementation of the CARS system.

Existing provisions of the PRA prohibit a candidate from lending more than \$100,000 to their own campaign committee. Federal law also included restrictions on candidate loans. In 2018, US Senator Ted Cruz made a loan of \$260,000 to his re-election campaign, which exceeded the federal limit of \$250,000. In 2019, Senator Cruz then challenged the federal law in order to be fully repaid and won the lawsuit. In 2022, the US Supreme Court ultimately ruled for Senator Cruz, declaring limits on candidate loans to their own campaigns as unconstitutional under the First Amendment. To conform to that Supreme Court decision, this bill deletes California's candidate loan limits.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	14-0	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	69-0	Senate Floor	38-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	79-0		

[AB 827 \(Berman\)](#)

Chapter 279, Statutes of 2025

Voting: signature verification.

[Amends Sections 2194, 3019, 3019.7, and 15301 of the Elections Code]

Under California law, a vote by mail (VBM) ballot must be verified by the elections official before it can be counted. That verification includes a comparison of the signature on the ballot identification envelope with signatures that are part of the voter's registration record to confirm that the voter who was issued the VBM ballot is the voter who completed and returned the ballot.

It is not uncommon for a VBM ballot to be returned in an envelope that is missing the voter's signature or with a signature that doesn't compare to signatures in the voter's record. Existing law includes a process for a voter to cure these issues with their VBM ballot by verifying that the voter cast the ballot. A voter must be allowed to complete this cure process until 5 p.m. two days prior to the certification of the election. Since elections officials are not required to certify election results on a specific day, the deadline for a voter to complete these cure processes varies from county to county, and a voter may not know when the county will certify results.

This bill requires that voters be given until the 22nd day after each regularly scheduled statewide election to complete this VBM ballot cure process. This bill also makes other changes related to

the VBM ballot curing process, including requiring that counties allow voters to return signature cure forms in ballot drop boxes at county elections offices, and requiring the state's VBM ballot tracking system to include a website link to the voter's county's signature cure forms when the system notifies a voter that the voter's ballot cannot be counted because the signature needs curing.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	4-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	11-0	Senate Appropriations	5-0
Assembly Floor	62-3	Senate Floor	30-5
Assembly Concurrence.....	60-5		

[AB 930 \(Ward\)](#)

Chapter 282, Statutes of 2025 Elections and voting procedures.

[Amends Sections 4103, 15620, 15621, 15622, 15624, 15625, 15626, 15627, 15628, 15630, 15631, and 15632 of, and repeals and adds Section 15633 of, the Elections Code]

Unlike some other states, California law does not provide for an "automatic" recount in any election contest. Instead, state law allows any voter to request a recount of an election contest once the official canvass of results from the election is complete. Such voter-initiated recounts are rare, in part because the voter who requests the recount must pay for the recount in advance. The voter's money is refunded if the recount changes the outcome of the election in favor of the candidate or position of a ballot measure on which behalf the recount was conducted. State law also allows the elections official, a superior court, or the Governor to order a recount in specified circumstances.

This bill makes various changes to state laws governing voter-requested recounts. Many of those changes are relatively minor or clarifying, codify certain aspects of recount regulations adopted by the Secretary of State, or modernize the law to more closely reflect current election technology and procedures. Additionally, while existing law requires that recount boards be made up of voters (i.e., individuals who are registered to vote in California), this bill gives elections officials the discretion to appoint any individual to a recount board, provided that any recount board member who tallies ballots must be eligible to register to vote in this state.

The Elections Code includes two different code sections that outline rules for the receipt of vote by mail (VBM) ballots: one section which applies generally, and a second section that applies only to certain types of mailed ballot elections. While the policies found in these sections generally have been aligned, recently enacted legislation inadvertently failed to amend one of the relevant sections, thereby creating inconsistencies. This bill once again aligns the policies in those code sections, thereby standardizing the rules that apply to the receipt of VBM ballots in elections.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	5-2	Senate Elections & CA	4-1
Assembly Appropriations	11-4	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	59-16	Senate Floor	29-10
Assembly Concurrence.....	59-19		

[AB 953 \(Pacheco and Alanis\)](#)

Chapter 170, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals.

[Amends Section 85320 of the Government Code]

Federal law prohibits foreign nationals from making campaign contributions or expenditures in connection with federal, state, and local elections, but that law generally does not apply to contributions or expenditures related to ballot initiatives or referenda. Accordingly, in 1997, the Legislature approved and Governor Wilson signed [SB 109 \(Kopp\), Chapter 67, Statutes of 1997](#), to prohibit foreign governments or foreign principals from making campaign contributions or expenditures in connection with state or local ballot measures. While SB 109 was modeled after the federal restrictions on campaign contributions and expenditures, it did not seek to regulate foreign contributions made in connection with elections for *office* because such contributions were already restricted by federal law.

More recently, [AB 319 \(Valladares\), Chapter 313, Statutes of 2021](#), amended state law to prohibit campaign contributions and expenditures by foreign governments and foreign principals in connection with candidate elections. Even though such contributions and expenditures were already prohibited under federal law, AB 319 imposed similar restrictions under state law due to concerns about the willingness and ability of the Federal Election Commission to bring prompt enforcement actions under federal law for violations related to campaign contributions and expenditures by foreign governments and foreign principals.

While state and federal law similarly restrict foreign spending made in connection with candidate elections, those laws differ slightly with respect to the individuals covered. Specifically, while federal law restricts contributions and expenditures by individuals who are not citizens or nationals of the United States (US) and who are not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the US, state law does not restrict contributions or expenditures by individuals who are legally present in the US, even if those individuals are not legal permanent residents. As a result, certain foreign nationals who are legally present in the US—including people in the US temporarily on work and student visas, and certain refugees and asylees—are not prohibited by state law from making campaign contributions or expenditures in connection with candidate elections, even though such contributions and expenditures are prohibited under federal law. Relatedly, state

law does not restrict those individuals from making contributions or expenditures in connection with ballot measure elections.

This bill prohibits foreign nationals, except for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals recipients, from making campaign contributions or expenditures in connection with state and local elections and prohibits the solicitation of contributions from such foreign nationals.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	15-0	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	71-0	Senate Floor	39-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	80-0		

[AB 1029 \(Valencia\)](#)

Chapter 85, Statutes of 2025

Statements of financial interest: digital financial assets.

[Amends, repeals, and adds Section 82034, 87206, 87302, and 87350 of the Government Code]

As part of the Political Reform Act's (PRA) comprehensive scheme to prevent conflicts of interest by state and local public officials, existing law identifies certain elected and other high-level state and local officials who must file statements of economic interests (SEIs, commonly referred to as a Form 700). Similarly, candidates for those positions must file SEIs. Other state and local public officials and employees are required to file SEIs if the position they hold is designated in an agency's conflict of interest code. A position is required to be designated in an agency's conflict of interest code when the position entails the making or participation in the making of governmental decisions that may foreseeably have a material financial effect on the decision maker's financial interests.

The requirement for public officials to file SEIs serves two purposes. First, the SEI provides necessary information to the public about an official's personal financial interests so there is assurance that officials are making decisions that do not enhance their personal finances. Second, the requirement to file an SEI serves as a reminder to the public official of potential conflicts of interests so the official can recuse themselves from making or participating in governmental decisions that are deemed conflicts.

Common reportable interests that are covered by the definition of the term "investments," include stocks, including those held in an IRA or 401K, and business entities, sole proprietorships, partnerships, LLCs, corporations, and trusts. The definition of investments, however, does not include digital financial assets, also known as cryptocurrency. As a result, digital financial assets are not required to be reported as an investment on a SEI.

Without proper disclosure, public officials may be able to influence the value of cryptocurrency holdings without public scrutiny. This bill ensures that digital assets are treated with the same level of transparency as traditional investments like stocks and prevents public officials from secretly holding and influencing the value of cryptocurrency assets for personal financial gain.

Specifically, this bill expands the definition of “investment,” for purposes of the PRA, to include a digital financial asset, and requires specified public officials to disclose their interests in digital financial assets on their SEI, as specified. Additionally, this bill requires an agency’s conflict of interest code to require designated employees to disclose interests in digital financial assets on their SEI, as specified.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	14-0	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	69-0	Senate Floor	35-0

[AB 1072 \(Pellerin\)](#)

Chapter 289, Statutes of 2025

Elections: ballot mistakes.

[Adds Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 13600) to Division 13 of the Elections Code]

It is commonplace for a voter to mismark their ballot. When this occurs, existing law permits a registered voter to request a replacement ballot. A replacement ballot also may be requested if the voter did not receive their vote by mail (VBM) ballot, or lost, destroyed, or made a mistake on the original ballot.

Generally, if an individual is voting in-person at a polling place or vote center, that voter can ask poll workers for advice on how to correct an error or can easily request a replacement ballot. If a person is marking their VBM ballot at home and makes a mistake, a voter has the option to go to a polling location to obtain a replacement ballot or apply for one. However, a voter who is completing a ballot at home may be less likely to request a replacement ballot when they make a mistake, given the amount of time that it may take to get a replacement ballot mailed to them.

When a voter reaches out to their elections official for advice on how to fix a mistake before returning their ballot, elections officials generally do a good job of educating voters about the options for correcting that mistake. However, during the November 2024 general election, media reports pointed out there is no uniform approach to correcting a mistake on a voter’s ballot.

Providing and promoting best practices for fixing common ballot errors will help minimize ambiguity and increase voters’ confidence that their ballot will be counted correctly. Accordingly, this bill requires the Secretary of State to collaborate with county elections officials to develop

uniform standards and guidelines for a voter to correct mistakes made on the voter’s ballot. These uniform standards will provide more consistent guidance to voters on how to fix and correct common ballot mistakes that are made.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	15-0	Senate Appropriations	7-0
Assembly Floor	76-0	Senate Floor	39-0

[AB 1079 \(Ávila Farías\)](#)
Chapter 178, Statutes of 2025
Civil appeals: stay of enforcement.

[Amends Section 916 of, and adds Section 917.10 to, the Code of Civil Procedure]

[SB 976 \(Polanco\), Chapter 129, Statutes of 2002](#), enacted the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) to address racial block voting in at-large elections for local office in California. In areas where racial block voting occurs, an at-large method of election can dilute the voting rights of minority communities if the majority typically votes to support candidates that differ from the candidates who are preferred by minority communities. In such situations, breaking a jurisdiction up into districts can result in districts in which a minority community can elect the candidate of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election. Accordingly, the CVRA prohibits an at-large method of election from being imposed or applied in a political subdivision in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class of voters to elect the candidate of its choice or to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgement of the rights of voters who are members of the protected class.

Since the enactment of the CVRA, more than 275 jurisdictions have transitioned from at-large to district-based elections. While some jurisdictions did so in response to litigation or threats of litigation, other jurisdictions proactively changed election methods because they believed they could be susceptible to a legal challenge under the CVRA, and they wished to avoid the potential expense of litigation.

[AB 764 \(Bryan\), Chapter 343, Statutes of 2023](#), enacted the Fair and Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities and Political Subdivisions Act of 2023 (FMA), which built upon [AB 849 \(Bonta\), Chapter 557, Statutes of 2019](#), also known as the Fair Maps Act of 2019. These bills revised and standardized the criteria and process to be used by local governments when adjusting the boundaries of the electoral districts that are used to elect members of the jurisdictions' governing bodies and required local jurisdictions to comply with substantial public hearing and outreach requirements as part of the process for adjusting the boundaries of electoral districts. AB 764 was developed in part based on recommendations made in a report that evaluated the effects of AB 849 during the local redistricting process that followed the 2020 federal decennial census.

That report concluded that AB 849 “was broadly successful in promoting a more transparent and more participatory local redistricting process,” and that “[t]o a lesser extent, it was successful in producing maps that better reflect the diverse communities residing in cities and counties across the state.” On the other hand, the report also concluded that improvements to AB 849 were needed “to address ambiguities, loopholes, and deficiencies in the legislation that undermined the law’s important goals, and were often exploited to protect incumbents.” In particular, the report concluded that notwithstanding the ranked, mandatory redistricting criteria that was included in AB 849, “in many jurisdictions incumbency protection proved to be the overriding criterion for how maps were drawn.”

When a trial court order is appealed, the court’s order generally is stayed while the appeal proceeds, except as otherwise specified. As a result, an election method or system found to be discriminatory or otherwise unlawful under CVRA or the FMA by a trial court could continue to be used for elections while appeals proceeded over the trial court’s ruling. The author and sponsor of this bill argue that such delays in replacing unlawful election systems or policies can frustrate the purpose of California’s voting rights and redistricting laws.

This bill provides for a superior court order to be enforced during a pending appeal in cases involving the CVRA or FMA, except as specified.

Legislative History:

Assembly Judiciary	7-3	Senate Judiciary	10-1
Assembly Elections.....	4-2	Senate Elections & CA.....	4-1
Assembly Floor	55-16	Senate Floor	25-13
Assembly Concurrence.....	56-17		

[AB 1249 \(Wilson\)](#)

Chapter 296, Statutes of 2025
Early voting: satellite locations.

[Amends Section 319.5, 3016.5, 18370, 18502, 18540, and 18541 of, adds Section 3016.3 to, and repeals Section 3018 of, the Elections Code, and amends Section 66852 of the Education Code]

[SB 450 \(Allen\), Chapter 832, Statutes of 2016](#), established the Voter's Choice Act (VCA) and provided a new model for counties to administer elections. The VCA requires counties to mail a ballot to all active registered voters and replaces polling places with vote centers and ballot drop-off locations. In general, VCA counties are required to provide early voting locations and have vote centers open starting the 10th day prior and through Election Day, as specified. These early voting opportunities provide accessibility and flexibility for voters to visit any vote center in the voter's county to return their ballot, register to vote, and vote. For the November 5, 2024, statewide presidential general election, 29 counties conducted their elections using the VCA

model. The remaining 29 counties are non-VCA counties, also referred to as traditional polling place counties.

While existing law does not expressly require a non-VCA county to offer early voting opportunities, in practice many provide early voting opportunities at their office or a satellite location. This bill ensures voters in non-VCA counties also have the early voting opportunities and requires a non-VCA county to provide at least one early voting location on the Saturday before a statewide election that is open for at least six hours. Additionally, this bill requires the polling location to permit a voter to return their VBM ballot in person without the identification envelope.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	5-2	Senate Elections & CA	4-1
Assembly Appropriations	11-3	Senate Appropriations	5-2
Assembly Floor	60-19	Senate Floor	30-10
Assembly Concurrence.....	60-18		

[AB 1286 \(Boerner\)](#)

Chapter 186, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: prospective employment.

[Amends Sections 87202, 87203, and 87204 of, and adds Sections 82004.2 and 87207.5 to, the Government Code]

As part of the Political Reform Act's (PRA) comprehensive scheme to prevent conflicts of interest by state and local public officials, existing law identifies certain elected and other high-level state and local officials who must file statements of economic interests (SEIs, commonly referred to as a Form 700). Similarly, candidates for those positions must file SEIs. Other state and local public officials and employees are required to file SEIs if the position they hold is designated in an agency's conflict of interest code.

Additionally, the PRA places several restrictions on the activities of public officials who are leaving governmental employment. For instance, the PRA prohibits public officials from making, participating in making, or influencing a governmental decision that directly relates to a prospective employer. Once a public official is employed and begins receiving income from the employer, they are prohibited from making or participating in a governmental decision that has a material financial effect on the employer as a source of income. Sources of income and business positions held are disclosed on the Form 700. However, an official is not required to publicly disclose whether, or on what date, the official accepts an offer for employment. Thus, it may be difficult for the public or the Fair Political Practices Commission to determine if a public official was making governmental decisions that benefit, or otherwise involve, the future employer after the official has accepted the job offer.

This bill requires all elected, appointed and nominated officials with high-level decision-making authority to disclose an arrangement for prospective employment on the official's Form 700, including the date the official accepted the job offer.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA.....	5-0
Assembly Appropriations.....	14-0	Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)
Assembly Floor	77-0	Senate Floor	35-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	76-0		

[AB 1370 \(Patterson\)](#)

Chapter 191, Statutes of 2025

State Legislature: nondisclosure agreements.

[Adds Section 8923 to the Government Code]

A nondisclosure agreement (NDA) is a provision in a contract that binds the parties to secrecy regarding information specified in the contract. NDAs generally prohibit parties from disclosing the specified information to people who are not parties to the NDA and often provide for the damages that will be imposed if a party shares information in violation of the NDA. NDAs commonly are used to protect sensitive and confidential information, including trade secrets and business negotiations.

Three years ago, the Legislature approved and Governor Newsom signed [AB 257 \(Holden\), Chapter 246, Statutes of 2022](#), which proposed to establish a Fast Food Council within the Department of Industrial Relations. In 2023, certain proponents and opponents of AB 257 entered into negotiations over potential changes to AB 257. Those negotiations led to an agreement which was codified in [AB 1228 \(Holden\), Chapter 262, Statutes of 2023](#).

Subsequently, the press reported that private parties involved in the AB 1228 negotiations were asked to sign an NDA to protect the confidentiality of the negotiations. Assembly Elections Committee staff is not aware of any reporting that suggests that any public officials, including Legislators, legislative staff, the Governor, or staff to the Governor, signed an NDA in connection with negotiations over AB 1228, requested that anybody else sign an NDA in connection with those negotiations, or otherwise were bound by an NDA when involved in legislative negotiations.

This bill prohibits a Member of the Legislature from entering into or requesting an NDA in connection with negotiations over legislation.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Judiciary	13-0
Assembly Judiciary	12-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Appropriations	15-0	Senate Appropriations	7-0
Assembly Floor	71-0	Senate Floor	39-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	79-0		

[AB 1392 \(Sharp-Collins and Flora\)](#)

Chapter 300, Statutes of 2025

Elections: voter registration information: elected officials and candidates.

[Amends Sections 2194, 2227, 8040, 8600, and 10226.3 of, and adds Section 2166.9 to, the Elections Code]

In June 2025, two Minnesota legislators and their spouses were shot in their homes. One state Representative and her husband were killed. According to The New York Times, in response to these shootings, legislators and officials across the country began to reexamine their practices relating to privacy and security. This includes increased security for lawmakers in Ohio, security briefings for legislators in Michigan, increased patrols around lawmakers' homes in Fairfax County, Virginia, and the removal of home addresses from biographies of legislators in North Dakota.

Under current law, all voter registration information is confidential, though certain information from voter registration records may be released for approved election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes. In certain situations, state law provides a higher level of confidentiality for voter registration records, prohibiting the release of a voter's residence address, phone number, and email address even for election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes.

This bill creates a new procedure for public officials and candidates for office to prevent the residence addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses in their voter registration records from being disclosed for election, scholarly, or political purposes. The residence addresses, phone numbers, and emails of public officials and candidates granted confidentiality under this program would still be available for bona fide journalistic or governmental purposes, as specified.

Legislative History:

Assembly Labor & Employment	<u>(N/R)</u>	Senate Labor, PE & R	<u>(N/R)</u>
Assembly Floor	<u>(N/R)</u>	Senate Elections & CA <u>(SR 29.10)</u>	5-0
Assembly Elections <u>(AR 77.2)</u>	7-0	Senate Judiciary <u>(SR 29.10)</u>	13-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	77-0	Senate Appropriations	7-0
		Senate Floor	40-0

[AB 1411 \(Sharp-Collins\)](#)
Chapter 301, Statutes of 2025
Voter education and outreach plans.

[Repeals and adds Section 2105 of the Elections Code]

[SB 450 \(Allen\), Chapter 832, Statutes of 2016](#), established the Voter's Choice Act (VCA) and provided a new model for counties to administer elections. The VCA requires counties to mail a ballot to all active registered voters and replaces polling places with vote centers and ballot drop-off locations, as specified. Voters can visit any vote center in the voter's county to return their ballot, register to vote, and vote. A VCA county is required to implement a voter education and outreach plan targeted to voters who primarily speak a language other than English, as well as voters with disabilities, to educate all communities on the services available, as specified. For the November 5, 2024, statewide presidential general election, 29 counties conducted their elections using the VCA model. The remaining 29 counties are non-VCA counties, also referred to as traditional polling place counties.

Existing law requires the Secretary of State (SOS) to adopt regulations requiring a county to design and implement a voter registration plan. However, following the adoption of related emergency regulations in 1976, few counties have continued to consistently submit updated plans to the SOS, and the regulations are outdated. This bill repeals that outdated voter registration plan requirement for all counties, and instead requires non-VCA counties to submit voter education and outreach plans to the SOS that provides information to the public about online voter registration, preregistration opportunities, vote by mail procedures, ballot tracking services, options for military and overseas voters, options for voters with disabilities, options for in-person voting opportunities, language accessibility, and key election dates and deadlines. Additionally, this bill requires a county elections official to make the most current version of its plan available on its website.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	5-0	Senate Elections & CA	4-1
Assembly Appropriations	11-0	Senate Appropriations	5-2
Assembly Floor	62-2	Senate Floor	30-10
Assembly Concurrence.....	62-9		

[AB 1441 \(Soria\)](#)
Chapter 730, Statutes of 2025
County of Merced Citizens Redistricting Commission.

[Adds Chapter 6.6 (commencing with Section 21554) to Division 21 of the Elections Code]

Prior to 2017, state law generally permitted a county or a city to create an advisory redistricting commission, but did not expressly permit local jurisdictions to create commissions that had the authority to establish district boundaries. Instead, the authority to establish district boundaries for a local jurisdiction generally was held by the governing body of that jurisdiction.

In 2016, however, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed [SB 1108 \(Allen\), Chapter 784, Statutes of 2016](#), which permitted a county or a general law city to establish a redistricting commission, subject to certain conditions. Separately, the Legislature has enacted several bills to require specified counties to establish redistricting commissions. [SB 958 \(Lara\), Chapter 781, Statutes of 2016](#), required the establishment of a Citizens Redistricting Commission in Los Angeles County. Similarly, [AB 801 \(Weber\), Chapter 711, Statutes of 2017](#), required the establishment of a Citizens Redistricting Commission in San Diego County. These commissions were in place for redistricting following the 2020 federal decennial census and drew the district lines for those counties' supervisorial districts.

Since the 2020 redistricting process, the Legislature has enacted bills to create redistricting commissions in the counties of Fresno ([AB 2030 \(Arambula\), Chapter 407, Statutes of 2022](#)), Kern ([AB 2494 \(Salas\), Chapter 411, Statutes of 2022](#)), Orange ([AB 34 \(Valencia\), Chapter 315, Statutes of 2023](#)), Riverside ([AB 1307 \(Cervantes\), Chapter 403, Statutes of 2022](#)), Sacramento ([SB 314 \(Ashby\), Chapter 389, Statutes of 2023](#)), and San Luis Obispo ([SB 977 \(Laird\), Chapter 450, Statutes of 2024](#)). All those commissions will be created for the next redistricting process following the 2030 census.

This bill creates a citizens redistricting commission in Merced County that is similar to the ones created in other counties through prior legislation, but with some differences from those commissions. This bill charges the Merced County citizens redistricting commission with adjusting the boundaries of county supervisorial districts in future redistricting processes.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	5-2	Senate Elections & CA.....	4-1
Assembly Local Government.....	7-2	Senate Local Government.....	5-2
Assembly Appropriations	11-3	Senate Appropriations	5-2
Assembly Floor	60-19	Senate Floor	28-10
Assembly Concurrence.....	59-19		

[AB 1511 \(Committee on Elections\)](#)

Chapter 249, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: refunding and transferring contributions: voter information guide.

[Amends Sections 81001, 81002, 84101, 84217, 85318, 85600, 85601, 88000, 88001, 88002, 88002.5, 88003, 88004, 88005, 88006, and 88007 of the Government Code]

Last year, the Legislature unanimously approved [SB 948 \(Limón & Zbur\), Chapter 125, Statutes of 2024](#). SB 948 sought to codify prior advice that the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) issued in 2010 (*Brown* Advice Letter, No. A-09-276). Under that advice, a candidate who raises money for the primary and general elections for one office, but who decides before the primary election not to run for that office, may transfer those campaign contributions to a committee established by the candidate to run for a different office, subject to specified restrictions. In an effort to codify that advice, the language of SB 948 made it clear that such transfers were allowed if the candidate did not "file a declaration of candidacy to qualify" for the primary election.

After SB 948 was passed and signed into law, the Legislature approved [AB 1784 \(Pellerin\), Chapter 355, Statutes of 2024](#). Among other provisions, AB 1784 allowed candidates for elective state office (other than statewide office), for the first time, to withdraw nomination documents (including declarations of candidacy) after filing them for the primary election. Due to the enactment of AB 1784, it is now possible that a candidate for elective state office could file a declaration of candidacy but subsequently withdraw that declaration of candidacy and, as a result, not be a legally qualified candidate for that office at the primary election.

This bill clarifies that a candidate who has raised money for a candidacy for one office, but who does not run in the primary election for that office, may transfer the campaign contributions raised for the primary and general election to a committee established by the candidate to run for a different office. Such transfers would be subject to any relevant campaign contribution limits, and contributions that were transferred would have to be attributed to specific donors in accordance with existing law. This bill additionally specifies that the intent of the Legislature in enacting this provision is to ensure that SB 948 is interpreted consistent with the FPPC's advice in its *Brown* advice letter. This bill additionally standardizes the terminology used in the Political Reform Act to refer to official election publications and makes technical changes.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	77-0	Senate Floor	39-0
Assembly Concurrence.....	79-0		

[AB 1512 \(Committee on Elections\)](#)

Chapter 303, Statutes of 2025

Elections: ballot language.

[Amends Sections 1004, 5020, 15122, 18333, 18513, 19608, 19724, 24906, 35762, and 72026 of the Education Code, amends Sections 23271, 23355, 23374.5, 34876.5, 51929, 51930, 51931, and 57137 of, and repeals and adds Section 29903 of, the Government Code, amends Sections 6463 and 6612 of, and repeals and adds Section 20104 of, the Health and Safety Code, repeals and adds Section 5105 of the Public Resources Code, amends Sections 2965, 2973, 22740, and 22743 of the Public Utilities Code, amends Sections 1176, 1182, 26064, and 26163 of the Streets and Highways Code, and amends Sections 12057, 12889.2, 13417, 21929, 21931, 22171, 22173, 23224, 35520.15, 35520.19, 35884, 39931, 45276, 50976, 60385, 60414, 74099, 74101, 74467, 74833, 74850, 75063, 75065, 75444, 75936, and 76042 of, repeals Section 42327 of, and repeals and adds Sections 21930, 22172, 25675, 25703, 45271, 48255, 75168.3, and 75393 of, the Water Code]

Various provisions of law outside the Elections Code that govern local ballot measures require the ballot question or voting options to be presented in a way that is inconsistent with how ballot questions generally appear on the ballot in California. For example, for certain types of local bond measures, Government Code Section 29903 requires that the voting options presented to voters appear as “Bonds—Yes” and “Bonds—No,” rather than simply “Yes” and “No” as questions are generally presented on the ballot. This inconsistency can lead to confusion and has led to errors in ballot printing. This bill standardizes the way that voting options are presented to voters when they are considering local ballot measures, thereby creating greater uniformity in ballot design.

[AB 623 \(Berman\), Chapter 863, Statutes of 2019](#), made numerous changes to the way ballots are formatted to update ballot design requirements and allow county election officials flexibility to create ballots that are accessible and easy to read. AB 623 additionally required the Secretary of State (SOS) to create a Ballot Design Advisory Committee (BDAC), consisting of SOS staff, recognized ballot design experts, and county elections officials. The BDAC was tasked with assisting the SOS in promulgating regulations that prescribe ballot design and format. [AB 1219 \(Berman\), Chapter 676, Statutes of 2023](#), made various changes to ballot layout requirements in the Elections Code to implement BDAC recommendations. Among other changes, AB 1219 standardized provisions of the Elections Code related to voting target locations and eliminated obsolete ballot instructions that directed a voter to stamp a cross (+) in the square next to the voter’s selection.

This bill makes ballot formatting changes to provisions of state law found outside of the Elections Code similar to changes that were made by AB 623 and AB 1219.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	69-0	Senate Floor	37-0

[AB 1513 \(Committee on Elections\)](#)

Chapter 304, Statutes of 2025

Election procedures: certified mail and superior courts.

[Amends Sections 12, 5200, 11000, 11001, 11002, 11003, 11004, 11221, 13113, 15621, 16442, 16462, and 16464 of the Elections Code]

This bill updates the Elections Code to ensure elections-related communications do not need to be transmitted via registered mail and instead can be delivered electronically or via the quicker certified mail option. According to the United States Postal Service, registered mail is “not recommended if speed of delivery is important,” because the security surrounding and manual processing of registered mail “naturally slows the speed at which it travels.” Specifically, AB 1513 deletes all existing situations where the Elections Code requires an elections-related communication to be sent by registered mail and instead requires that it be sent either electronically in the case of communications between different governmental bodies, or via certified mail, in the case of a communication from a governmental body to an individual or non-governmental organization.

Most provisions of the Elections Code related to the election of superior court judges use the term "superior court" when referring to those offices. The provisions of the Elections Code governing the recall of superior court judges, however, use the term "trial court" instead. The term "trial court," however, is not defined in the Elections Code, so the use of that term exclusively in provisions of law related to the recall process can lead to confusion about the specific offices that are covered when the Elections Code refers to the recall of "trial court" judges. This bill addresses this by replacing the term "trial court" with "superior court" in provisions of the Elections Code related to the recall process, and makes related conforming and clarifying changes.

Additionally, this bill makes other minor and technical changes to provisions of the Elections Code.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	7-0	Senate Elections & CA	5-0
Assembly Floor	69-0	Senate Appropriations	<u>(SR 28.8)</u>
Assembly Concurrence.....	79-0	Senate Floor	38-0

[ACA 8 \(Rivas and McGuire\)](#)
Resolution Chapter 156, Statutes of 2025
Congressional redistricting.

[Adds Section 4 to Article XXI of the California Constitution]

“Redistricting” is the process by which the boundaries of districts of a governmental body are adjusted. Redistricting generally occurs at the beginning of each decade following the decennial federal census, when new district lines are adopted based on the census data so that the populations of each district of a governmental body are roughly equal. Over the course of the decade, districts can become significantly unequal in population due to differential growth rates in various locations of a jurisdiction. Redistricting is the way this inequality is corrected.

The California Legislature last redrew the boundary lines of the congressional, State Senatorial, Assembly, and Board of Equalization (BOE) districts in 2001 based on the results of the 2000 census. Those district lines were finalized and approved in September 2001.

In 2008, California voters approved Proposition 11, which created the Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC), and gave it the responsibility for drawing district lines for the state Senate, Assembly, and the BOE. It also changed the criteria used when drawing those lines. In 2010, voters approved Proposition 20, which expanded the CRC’s duties to include drawing California’s congressional districts, and made additional changes to the procedures and criteria to be used by the CRC. The passage of Propositions 11 and 20 meant that the California Legislature did not play a direct role in adopting district boundaries for congressional, legislative, and BOE districts following the 2010 and 2020 federal censuses.

Under current law, the districts drawn by the CRC after the 2020 census are scheduled to remain in place until the CRC adopts new maps following the 2030 census. Those new districts would take effect for regularly-scheduled elections in 2032 and beyond.

In July 2025, Texas Governor Greg Abbott called a special session of the Texas Legislature, including to enact “[l]egislation that provides a revised congressional redistricting plan.” Press reports indicate that this topic was added after aides to President Donald Trump urged Texas to redraw its congressional map, following allegations from the United States Justice Department that the existing map could be illegal. President Trump was later quoted as saying that Republicans were “entitled to five more seats” in Texas. In August, the Texas Legislature approved and Governor Abbott signed legislation to change the congressional districts in Texas for future elections.

This measure provides for the temporary use of new congressional district maps for elections held through 2030. [AB 604 \(Aguiar-Curry\), Chapter 96, Statutes of 2025](#), specifies the boundaries for California’s congressional districts that will be used for elections held through 2030.

This measure appeared on the ballot at the November 4, 2025, statewide special election as Proposition 50. Voters approved Proposition 50 by a margin of 64% - 36%.

Legislative History:

Assembly Elections.....	(N/R)	Senate Floor	30-8
Assembly Elections.....	5-2		
Assembly Appropriations	11-4		
Assembly Floor	57-20		

Senate Bills

[SB 3 \(Cervantes\)](#)

Chapter 307, Statutes of 2025

Elections: signature verification and results.

[Amends Sections 3011, 3019, 15104, and 15306 of the Elections Code]

Under California law, a vote by mail (VBM) ballot must be verified by the elections official before it can be counted. That verification includes a comparison of the signature on the ballot identification envelope with signatures that are part of the voter's registration record to confirm that the voter who was issued the VBM ballot is the voter who completed and returned the ballot.

It is not uncommon for a VBM ballot to be returned in an envelope that is missing the voter's signature or with a signature that doesn't compare to signatures in the voter's record. Existing law includes a process for a voter to cure these issues with their VBM ballot by verifying that the voter cast the ballot.

This bill makes various changes to state law governing the process for verifying signatures on VBM ballot return envelopes. Among other changes, this bill prohibits an elections official from considering a voter's party preference, race, or ethnicity when verifying signatures on those envelopes. This bill additionally increases the frequency at which elections officials are required to post updated election results during the official canvass from a minimum of once per week to twice per week.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	5-0	Assembly Elections.....	7-0
Senate Appropriations	6-0	Assembly Appropriations.....	15-0
Senate Floor	39-0	Assembly Floor	79-0
Senate Concurrence	40-0		

[SB 42 \(Umberg, Allen, and Cervantes\)](#)

Chapter 245, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: public campaign financing: California Fair Elections Act of 2026.

[Amends Sections 85300 and 85320 of the Government Code]

In 1988, voters approved two separate initiatives that sought to regulate campaign financing by amending the PRA: Proposition 68 and Proposition 73. Proposition 68 proposed a system of public funding and expenditure limits for state legislative races, and passed with 53% of the vote.

Proposition 73 prohibited public funding of campaigns and set contribution limits for state and local elections, and passed with 58% of the vote. The California Supreme Court subsequently ruled in *Taxpayers to Limit Campaign Spending v. FPPC* (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 744, that because the two measures contained conflicting comprehensive regulatory schemes they could not be merged and only one could be implemented. As such, since Proposition 73 received more affirmative votes than Proposition 68, the Court ordered the implementation of Proposition 73 and declared all provisions of Proposition 68 invalid.

Because of the public campaign funding ban contained in Proposition 73, the state and most local governments in California do not have the option to offer public financing programs for electoral campaigns. This bill would allow the state and local governments to offer public campaign financing programs. This bill additionally proposes to triple the maximum potential fine for criminal violations of an existing ban on campaign contributions and expenditures by foreign entities. This bill will be submitted to the voters for their consideration at the November 2026 statewide general election, and will take effect only if approved by voters.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	4-1	Assembly Elections.....	5-2
Senate Appropriations	5-1	Assembly Appropriations	11-4
Senate Floor	28-10	Assembly Floor	59-20
Senate Concurrence	29-8		

[SB 280 \(Cervantes and Pellerin\)](#)

Chapter 97, Statutes of 2025 Elections. Urgency.

[Adds and repeals Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 8160) of Part 1 of Division 8 of the Elections Code]

Under existing law, every constitutional amendment, bond measure, or other legislative measure submitted to the people by the Legislature appears on the ballot of the first statewide election occurring at least 131 days after the adoption of the proposal by the Legislature, except as specified. This bill calls a statewide special election to be held on November 4, 2025, notwithstanding that 131 day requirement, requires the Secretary of State (SOS) to submit [ACA 8 \(Rivas and McGuire\)](#) of the current legislative session to the voters at that election, and requires ACA 8 to be designated as Proposition 50 on the ballot.

Because county elections officials had a short timeframe to prepare for the November 2025 special election, this bill made adjustments to accommodate the condensed timeframe to conduct the special election that are similar to previous bills calling statewide special elections. For instance, this bill provided counties with the option to choose to provide reduced in-person voting locations in lieu of the procedures for in-person voting that would otherwise be applicable

in that county under existing law. These are similar to provisions that were included in [SB 152 \(Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review\), Chapter 34, Statutes of 2021](#), which established procedures for the conduct of the 2021 gubernatorial recall election. Additionally, this bill provides certain procedures for the 2025 special election regarding the translation of ballot materials, examination of the condensed ballot title and summary, availability of vote by mail ballot drop-off locations, certification of results, and curing of signatures.

This bill made changes to address potential conflicts between the 2025 special election calendar and the 2026 primary election calendar. For example, existing law requires signature-in-lieu (SIL) petitions to be made available beginning 173 days before the election, or December 11, 2025, in the case of the 2026 primary election. That date fell before the statutory deadline for the SOS to issue final election results for the 2025 special election. To ensure that the results of the 2025 special election were clear when the candidate filing process began for the 2026 primary election, this bill made adjustments to candidate filing timelines, as specified. The changes in this bill are similar to changes that [SB 594 \(Glazer\), Chapter 320, Statutes of 2021](#), made to state law governing candidate filing for the 2022 statewide primary election due to COVID-related delays in the release of census data and the adoption of new district lines by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Additionally, this bill declared the intent of the Legislature to ensure counties have sufficient funding to effectuate the 2025 special election and appropriated an amount from the general fund for the actual and reasonably necessary costs, as determined by the Department of Finance director, for the counties to conduct the 2025 special election, and for the SOS to administer the 2025 special election.

This bill contains an urgency clause and took effect on August 21, 2025.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	(N/R)	Assembly Elections.....	(N/R)
Senate Appropriations	(N/R)	Assembly Appropriations	(N/R)
Senate Floor	(N/R)	Assembly Elections (AR 77.2)	5-2
Senate Concurrence	30-8	Assembly Appropriations (AR 77.2)	11-4
		Assembly Floor	57-20

[SB 398 \(Umberg\)](#)

Chapter 246, Statutes of 2025

Election crimes: payment based on voting or voter registration.

[Adds Section 18107.5 to the Elections Code]

Existing federal law prohibits paying or providing anything of value to any person to register to vote or to vote, or for accepting payment for registering to vote or voting in a federal election.

State law prohibits paying or providing anything of value to any person to vote or refrain from voting for a particular candidate or measure. State law does not expressly prohibit providing someone with a thing of value (e.g., a dozen donuts; a chicken dinner) for voting in a local or state election where no federal offices are on the ballot.

A 2017 United States Department of Justice manual on prosecuting election crimes provides that the federal law prohibition on paying or providing anything of value for a person to register to vote or to vote includes any payment "having monetary value, including cash, liquor, lottery chances, and welfare benefits such as food stamps...However, offering free rides to the polls or providing employees paid leave while they vote are not prohibited...Such things are given to make it easier for people to vote, not to induce them to do so. This distinction is important. For an offer or a payment to violate [federal law] it must have been intended to induce or reward the voter for engaging in one or more acts necessary to cast a ballot. [Federal law] does not prohibit offering or giving things having pecuniary value, such as a ride to the polls or time off from work, to help individuals who have already made up their minds to vote to do so."

Federal law, however, does not expressly prohibit the use of lotteries as a registration incentive and currently no such crime exists at the state level, limiting enforcement only through federal prosecution. Accordingly, this bill expands state law to more broadly prohibit a person paying money or other valuable consideration to another person with the intent to induce the person to vote or to register to vote, or where the payment is contingent upon whether the person voted or the person's voter registration status. Additionally, this bill specifies that the term "other valuable consideration" includes, but is not limited to, a lottery or a similar prize-drawing contest.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	5-0	Assembly Elections.....	7-0
Senate Public Safety	6-0	Assembly Public Safety.....	9-0
Senate Appropriations	6-0	Assembly Appropriations	15-0
Senate Floor	38-0	Assembly Floor	79-0
Senate Concurrence	40-0		

[SB 512 \(Pérez\)](#)

Vetoed

District elections: initiatives.

[Amends Section 9300 of the Elections Code]

Existing law allows voters to enact ordinances by initiative in most, but not all, districts. There is ambiguity, however, around whether the initiative process is available in certain types of districts.

Section 9300 of the Elections Code provides that the initiative process is not available in districts that meet any of five conditions. One such condition is that the initiative process is not available

in a district "formed under a law that does not provide a procedure for elections." That phrase is not defined in statute or case law. Accordingly, it is somewhat unclear whether the initiative process is available in certain districts that are authorized to impose a transportation-related transactions and use tax (TUT). TUT measures need to be approved by the voters in order to take effect. While voter approval of TUT measures could be viewed as a "procedure for elections," the governing boards of these districts are usually appointed—not elected—which could support the opposite view.

This bill would have clarified that voters in a district that has authorization to impose a TUT for transportation purposes may propose such a TUT by initiative.

On October 13, 2025, Governor Newsom vetoed this bill. In his [veto message](#), the Governor stated that the bill was unnecessary because the courts “consistently and repeatedly affirmed” the authority for jurisdictions to use the initiative process to impose transactions and use taxes for transportation purposes.

Legislative History:

Senate Governmental Organization.....	(N/R)	Assembly Elections.....	5-2
Senate Appropriations	(N/R)	Assembly Appropriations	11-4
Senate Floor	(N/R)	Assembly Floor	50-19
Senate Elections & CA (SR 29.10)	3-1		
Senate Concurrence	30-10		

[SB 621 \(Grove\)](#)

Chapter 101, Statutes of 2025

Voter registration: military and overseas voters.

[Repeals Section 3108 of the Elections Code]

In practice, conditional voter registration (CVR), also known as “same day registration,” serves as a safety net for Californians who miss the deadline to register to vote or update their voter registration information for an election. Generally, all eligible citizens who need to register or re-register to vote within 14 days of an election can complete this process to register and vote at their county elections office, polling place, or vote center. This process is accomplished in person. However, because certain voters—including military and overseas voters and voters with disabilities—may have difficulty taking advantage of that process in person, [SB 504 \(Becker\), Chapter 14, Statutes of 2022](#), required an elections official to make CVR available to military and overseas voters and voters with disabilities, and to allow those voters through a certified remote accessible vote by mail system.

With the enactment of SB 504, existing provisions of law that require a military or overseas voter to provide specified documentary proof when registering to vote after the regular voter

registration deadline are outdated and unnecessary. Accordingly, this bill repeals these provisions, thereby streamlining voter registration for military and overseas voters, eliminating unnecessary procedural hurdles, and ensuring uniformity in the CVR process for all voters.

Legislative History:

Senate Military & VA	4-0	Assembly Elections.....	7-0
Senate Elections & CA	5-0	Assembly Military & VA.....	8-0
Senate Floor	38-0	Assembly Floor	77-0

[SB 760 \(Allen\)](#)

Chapter 551, Statutes of 2025

Behested payments: public appeal for payment.

[Amends Section 84224 of the Government Code]

[SB 124 \(Karnette\)](#), [Chapter 450, Statutes of 1997](#), provided that a payment made at the behest of a candidate for purposes unrelated to the candidate’s candidacy for elective office is not a contribution, but required such payments made at the behest of a candidate who is also an elected officer, when aggregating \$5,000 or more in a calendar year from a single source, be reported to the elected officer’s agency. Examples of payments made at the behest of an elected officer that have to be reported under this provision of law include charitable donations made in response to a solicitation sent out by an elected officer or donations of supplies and refreshments made by a third party for a health fair that was sponsored by an elected officer.

The purpose of the behested payment reporting requirements is to provide public disclosure of payments that are not contributions or gifts to officials, but are payments in which the public may have an interest due to the potential for influence over a public official. One of the challenges to public officials for complying with behested payment reporting rules, however, is that the payments covered by those rules are not made by nor necessarily received by the elected official or the official’s agent. In fact, payments with very little involvement by a public official may nonetheless trigger behested payment reporting.

For instance, under state law, a payment is considered to be made at the behest of a public official if the payment is made *at the suggestion of* the official. Even if the public official does not *know* that the payment was made at the official’s suggestion, it may nonetheless trigger a requirement to file a behested payment report. That’s true even where the public official does not have the details necessary to make that report—details, for example, about the timing of the payment, the amount of the payment, or even the entities making or receiving the payment.

As a result, public officials may be wary about making general appeals to the public for donations to charitable causes due to concerns about the official’s inability to comply with behested payment reporting rules. This bill makes a narrow exception to the behested payment reporting

requirements to exclude certain payments that result from a public appeal made by an elected officer. To the extent that the elected officer *knows* about a payment that was made in response to such a public appeal, that payment is still reportable under this bill as long as it meets the other requirements for reportable behested payments under existing law.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	5-0	Assembly Elections.....	7-0
Senate Floor	39-0	Assembly Floor	77-0
Senate Concurrence	37-0		

[SB 851 \(Cervantes and Pellerin\)](#)

Chapter 238, Statutes of 2025

Elections. Urgency.

[Amends Sections 15371, 15372, 15375, 15400, 18545, 18568, 19006, 19101, 19212, 19215, 19284, and 19290 of, and adds Section 21 to, the Elections Code]

In 2002, President Bush signed the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) into law to address irregularities in voting systems that came to light in 2000. Among other provisions, HAVA mandated the replacement of all punch card and lever voting machines in the country, and required all voting systems to meet a set of minimum standards to be used in federal elections. HAVA also established the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to serve as an independent, bipartisan commission responsible for developing guidance to meet HAVA requirements, adopting voluntary voting system guidelines (VVSG), and serving as a national clearinghouse of information on election administration. The EAC also accredits testing laboratories and certifies voting systems. Using the VVSG and the EAC's testing and certification program are not mandatory and many states use the VVSG or the EAC's testing and certification program as a baseline while also adding their own state requirements and testing protocols.

[SB 360 \(Padilla\), Chapter 602, Statutes of 2013](#), required the Secretary of State (SOS) to adopt and publish voting system standards and regulations governing the use of voting systems, and required those standards to meet or exceed federal VVSG set forth by the EAC. SB 360 was enacted, in part, in response to the fact that federal voting system standards had not been updated because the EAC had lacked a quorum of commissioners for an extended time. Accordingly, in 2014, California established its own standards—the California voting system standards (CVSS)—for electronic components of voting systems. The CVSS standards exceed the federal VVSG guidelines and are considered the most rigorous in the country and have been used in the evaluation and testing of all voting technology certified for use in California. This bill updates the Elections Code and repeals obsolete provisions of law that require the SOS to adopt voting system standards that meet or exceed federal VVSG and instead require the state standards to meet the minimum requirements of HAVA and to incorporate best practices in election technology.

On March 25, 2025, the Trump Administration issued an executive order (EO) titled “Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections,” containing a number of directives on policies that have traditionally been the purview of states and directing federal agencies to conduct specific activities related to election integrity. Several lawsuits have been filed challenging aspects of the EO, and asking courts to block many of its provisions, arguing that they unconstitutionally preempt state authority and amount to executive overreach. In at least two such cases, including one case brought by the State of California and 18 other states, courts issued preliminary injunctions that blocked implementation of key provisions of the EO. This bill requires a state or local agency to notify the SOS and Attorney General (AG) before entering into any court-approved agreement relating to elections that contains a claim arising under federal law thereby ensuring the SOS and the AG have the opportunity to aid in defending against attacks by the federal government.

Due to escalating hostility and acrimonious discourse surrounding elections over the years, the Legislature has taken steps to ensure there are laws in place to protect election workers and voters. This bill additionally protects voters and elections officials by expanding an existing law that makes it a crime for a person to hire or arrange any person with a firearm or uniformed officer, as defined, to be stationed in the immediate vicinity of a polling location such that it applies to such a person or officer outside a county elections office without authorization of the appropriate elections official.

Certification, the statutory process by which officials sign off on the completion of election results, has historically been an uncontroversial postelection formality across the country. State law has long established that officials have a mandatory, nondiscretionary duty to certify elections. Despite this, since the 2020 election, more than 30 local officials nationwide have refused or threatened to refuse to certify election results. Their efforts failed because state courts and state officials intervened to protect the certification process. State officials have several legal tools available to respond to and protect against future election certification issues. This bill clarifies that the duty to certify election results is a ministerial and nondiscretionary duty of the elections official, and requires the SOS, if an elections official fails to timely certify and report the election results in accordance with the law, to call the violation to the attention of the district attorney of the county or to the AG.

During the November 2020 statewide general election, there were instances of unauthorized and non-official vote by mail (VBM) drop boxes. Subsequently, [SB 35 \(Umberg\), Chapter 318, Statutes of 2021](#), prohibited displaying a ballot collection container with the intent to deceive a voter into casting a ballot in an unofficial ballot box and prohibited directing or soliciting a voter to cast a ballot into an unofficial ballot collection container. During the November 2024 general election, the state Department of Justice received a report of a potentially misleading ballot return envelope being delivered to a voter. To protect voters and deter this type of conduct from occurring, this bill expands current prohibitions on the use of unauthorized and non-official VBM drop boxes to include the use of unauthorized and non-official VBM ballot return envelopes.

This bill contains an urgency clause and took effect on October 1, 2025.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	(N/R)	Assembly Elections.....	(N/R)
Senate Floor	(N/R)	Assembly Elections (AR 77.2)	5-2
Senate Concurrence	29-6	Assembly Floor	60-19

[SB 852 \(Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments\)](#)

Chapter 331, Statutes of 2025

Political Reform Act of 1974: Citizens Redistricting Commission.

[Amends Sections 8252.5, 81012, 84309, and 87500 of the Government Code]

This is an omnibus bill authored by the Senate Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments, containing various changes to state law in the jurisdiction of the committee.

AB 3502 (Agnos), Chapter 920, Statutes of 1982, prohibits a person from receiving, delivering, or attempting to deliver a campaign contribution in the State Capitol, any state office building, or any office for which the state pays the majority of the rent other than a legislative district office. It is unclear why AB 3502 exempted legislative district offices. This bill expands this prohibition to apply to any local government office building, any office which local government pays rent, and legislative district office buildings.

To prevent conflicts of interest by public officials, the Political Reform Act (PRA) requires certain high-level state and local officials to file statements of economic interests (SEIs, commonly referred to as a Form 700). [AB 1170 \(Valencia\), Chapter 211, Statutes of 2024](#), required individuals who file their SEIs with the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) to do so electronically. However, one group of high-level officials—public officials who manage public investments—was inadvertently excluded. This bill closes that gap by requiring public officials who manage public investments to file their SEIs electronically using the FPPC's system.

When an initiative statute is enacted into law by California voters, that statute can be amended or repealed by another statute that becomes effective when approved by the electors. Alternately, an initiative may allow for it to be amended by the Legislature without voter approval, and may set conditions for any such amendments. When California voters passed Proposition 9 in 1974, it allowed the PRA to be amended without voter approval if certain conditions were met. One condition for such amendments was a requirement that the bill in its final form be delivered to the FPPC for distribution to the news media and interested persons by a specified number of days before the final vote. In accordance with that requirement, FPPC staff send manual notifications by email whenever a PRA bill is introduced or amended. According to the FPPC, three individuals are currently signed up for that email list.

[SB 681 \(Allen\), Chapter 499, Statutes of 2023](#), requires the Legislative Counsel to allow the public to receive email alerts of legislative activity related to bills to amend the PRA. In light of this new tracking service, this bill eliminates the requirement for the FPPC to manually notify interested persons about bills that propose to amend the PRA without being submitted to the voters.

Proposition 11, which was approved by the voters at the 2008 statewide general election, created the Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC), and gave it the responsibility for establishing district lines for Assembly, Senate, and the Board of Equalization. Proposition 11 also modified the criteria to be used when drawing district lines. Proposition 20, which was approved by the voters at the 2010 statewide general election, gave the CRC the responsibility for establishing lines for California's congressional districts, and made other changes to the procedures and criteria to be used by the CRC.

Proposition 11 included a procedure for filling vacancies on the CRC. Under that procedure (as modified by [SB 1096 \(Committee on Elections & Constitutional Amendments\), Chapter 271, Statutes of 2012](#)), the CRC has 30 days to fill a vacancy that occurs before December 31 of a year ending in the number two, and has 90 days to fill a vacancy occurring after that point.

In December 2024, one of the members of the CRC passed away. The CRC subsequently held a public meeting on March 28, 2025, at which the CRC discussed the resulting vacancy. The CRC filled the vacancy at that meeting, and also voted unanimously (with two members absent from the vote) to propose statutory amendments to make it discretionary, rather than mandatory, for the CRC to fill a vacancy that occurs on or after December 31 in the year ending in the number two. This bill makes that change.

Legislative History:

Senate Elections & CA	5-0	Assembly Elections.....	7-0
Senate Appropriations	(SR 28.8)	Assembly Appropriations	13-0
Senate Floor	34-0	Assembly Floor	78-0
Senate Elections & CA (SR 29.10)	5-0		
Senate Concurrence	40-0		

Index of Chaptered Bills

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Lead Author</u>	<u>Chapter #</u>	<u>Page</u>
AB 5	Berman	250	<u>4</u>
AB 16	Alanis	140	<u>5</u>
AB 17	Alanis	80	<u>5</u>
AB 94	Bennett	251	<u>6</u>
AB 287	Lackey	253	<u>7</u>
AB 359	Ramos	257	<u>8</u>
AB 604	Aguiar-Curry	96	<u>9</u>
AB 789	Bonta	621	<u>10</u>
AB 808	Addis	278	<u>11</u>
AB 827	Berman	279	<u>12</u>
AB 930	Ward	282	<u>13</u>
AB 953	Pacheco	170	<u>14</u>
AB 1029	Valencia	85	<u>15</u>
AB 1072	Pellerin	289	<u>16</u>
AB 1079	Ávila Farías	178	<u>17</u>
AB 1249	Wilson	296	<u>18</u>
AB 1286	Boerner	186	<u>19</u>
AB 1370	Patterson	191	<u>20</u>
AB 1392	Sharp-Collins	300	<u>21</u>
AB 1411	Sharp-Collins	301	<u>22</u>
AB 1441	Soria	730	<u>23</u>
AB 1511	Committee on Elections	249	<u>24</u>
AB 1512	Committee on Elections	303	<u>25</u>
AB 1513	Committee on Elections	304	<u>26</u>
SB 3	Cervantes	307	<u>29</u>
SB 42	Umberg	245	<u>29</u>
SB 280	Cervantes	97	<u>30</u>
SB 398	Umberg	246	<u>31</u>
SB 621	Grove	101	<u>33</u>
SB 760	Allen	551	<u>34</u>
SB 851	Cervantes	238	<u>35</u>
SB 852	Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments	331	<u>37</u>

Index of Chaptered Constitutional Amendments

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Lead Author</u>	<u>Res. Chapter #</u>	<u>Page</u>
ACA 8	Rivas	156	27

Index of Vetoed Bills

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Lead Author</u>	<u>Page</u>
AB 699	Stefani	9
SB 512	Pérez	32