

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

AB 62 (McKinnor)
Version: February 24, 2025
Hearing Date: July 15, 2027
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

Agency: racially motivated eminent domain

DIGEST

This bill establishes a procedure by which a dispossessed owner, as defined, of property that was taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain can apply for and receive compensation, from an agency to be determined.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Eminent domain, as enshrined in the federal and state Constitutions, permits the government to seize privately owned land and put it to a public use – provided that the owner is justly compensated for their property. Unfortunately, state and local actors have frequently targeted properties owned by racial and ethnic minorities for seizure without paying the owners a fair price – which harmed not only the former owners, but stifled the development of generational wealth that allows families to truly flourish. The Legislature has addressed some of these historic wrongs with legislation, but not all victims of racially targeted takings have been so lucky.

This bill establishes a process by which the former owners of property taken via eminent domain without just compensation on the basis of racially discriminatory motives, or their direct descendants, could apply for and obtain the present-day value of the land that was improperly taken (minus the value of what was paid at the time, if anything). The process adopted in this bill is inspired by a recommendation from the Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans, with a Special Consideration for African Americans Who are Descendants of Persons Enslaved in the United States (Task Force), but the right to apply for and receive compensation for land taken through racially motivated eminent domain is open to all persons, regardless of race or whether they are descended from a person enslaved in the United States.

This bill is sponsored by the author and is supported by 19 organizations and five individuals, including three former Task Force members. The Committee has not received timely opposition to this bill.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing constitutional law:

- 1) Limits the taking of private property for public use as follows:
 - a) Under the United States Constitution, private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. (U.S. Const., 5th & 14th Amends.)
 - b) Under the California Constitution, private property may be taken or damaged for a public use only when just compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 19.)
- 2) Provides for equal protection under the law as follows:
 - a) Under the United States Constitution, provides that no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Const., 14th Amend., § 1.)
 - b) Under the California Constitution, provides that a person may not be denied the equal protection of the laws, and that a citizen or class of citizens may not be granted privileges or immunities not granted on the same terms to all citizens. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7.)
- 3) Provides that all persons are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights, including acquiring, possessing, and protecting property. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 1.)
- 4) Provides that the State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 31.)
- 5) Provides that the Legislature does not have the power to make any gift or authorize the making of any gift of public money or thing of value to any individual, municipal, or other corporation. (Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 6.)

Existing federal law:

- 1) Acknowledges that a grave injustice was done to U.S. citizens and permanent residents of Japanese ancestry by the evacuation, relocation, and internment of civilians during World War II, which were motivated largely by racial prejudice, wartime hysteria, and a failure of political leadership; and that the interned

individuals of Japanese ancestry suffered enormous damages, both material and intangible, as a result of the fundamental violations of their basic civil liberties and constitutional rights. (50 U.S.C. § 4202(a).)

- 2) Provided, as restitution for 1), a payment of \$20,000 to each individual of Japanese ancestry who was a U.S. citizen or permanent resident and was subjected to internment during World War II, as specified; or, if the person is deceased, to their surviving spouse, child, or parent. (50 U.S.C. §§ 4215, 4218.)
- 3) Established the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund within the U.S. Treasury, which expired ten years after its creation, for the purpose of distributing the funds under 2). (50 U.S.C. § 4214.)
- 4) Acknowledges that the United States forcibly relocated Aleut civilian residents of the Pribilof Islands and the Aleutian Islands west of Unimak Island during World War II to temporary camps in isolated regions of Southeast Alaska, where the United States failed to provide reasonable care for the Aleuts, resulting in widespread illness, disease, and death; and that the United States failed to protect Aleut personal and community property while the property was under its protection or control. (50 U.S.C. § 4202(b).)
- 5) Provided, as restitution for 4), the value of land taken from the Aleut; the establishment of a trust from which to pay for destroyed and damaged property; and \$12,000 to each eligible Aleut, subject to the availability of funds, as specified. (50 U.S.C. §§ 4233, 4235, 4236.)
- 6) Establishes the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands Restitution Fund to fund 5). (50 U.S.C. § 4233.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Establishes the Eminent Domain Law, which establishes the procedures by which a court may determine the right to possession of a property and the value of a property within an eminent domain proceeding. (Code Civ. Proc., pt. 3, tit. 7, §§ 1230.010 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes the California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB), which provides the victims of certain crimes, and certain family members of victims and good Samaritans, with compensation for certain expenses incurred as a result of the crime, including health care costs, income losses, job retraining, home security installation, relocation, and mental health counseling. (Gov. Code, tit. 2, div. 3, pt. 4, §§ 13900 et seq.)

- 3) Establishes procedures by which a person may apply for compensation from the CalVCB and for the CalVCB to consider and approve or deny an application. (Gov. Code, §§ 13952-13954, 13959.)
- 4) Establishes, contingent on an appropriation, the Forced or Involuntary Sterilization Compensation Program, administered by the California Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB), which is intended to provide compensation to individuals who are the survivors of state-sponsored sterilization conducted pursuant to eugenics laws that existed in the State of California between 1909 and 1979 or of coercive sterilization performed on an individual in the custody and control of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation after 1979. (Health & Saf. Code, div. 20, ch. 1.6, §§ 24210 et seq.)
- 5) Establishes the Forced or Involuntary Sterilization Compensation Account in the State Treasury, which is administered by the CalVCB; funds appropriated for the Account must be used for the purpose of providing payment to persons determined eligible. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 24212, 24213.)

Former state law established the Task Force to develop reparations proposals for African Americans, with special consideration for African Americans who are descended from persons enslaved in the United States, and provided that the Task Force statutes would remain in effect until July 1, 2023, and as of that date be repealed. (former Gov. Code, §§ 8301-8301.7, repealed by Gov. Code, § 8301.7.)

This bill:

- 1) States the following:
 - a) The Legislature finds and declares that is in the public interest to compensate victims of racially motivated eminent domain, which deprived persons of just compensation for their property due to racially discriminatory motives. The unjust taking of land without fair compensation destroyed communities, forced many from their historical neighborhoods, deprived those persons of the fair value of their property, and, in many cases, prevented the accumulation of generational wealth. Providing compensation to these victims of racial discrimination will restore the value of wrongfully taken property to dispossessed owners and hold government entities responsible for those wrongful discriminatory acts.
 - b) The provisions set forth below shall govern the procedure by which dispossessed owners and their descendants may seek a determination that they were the victims of racially motivated eminent domain and seek the return of the taken property, other property of equal value, or financial compensation.
- 2) Defines the following terms:

- a) "Dispossessed owner" means a person who has had property taken from them by the state, county, city, city and county, district, or other political subdivision of the state without just compensation as a result of racially motivated eminent domain, or a direct descendant of the person whose property was taken.
 - b) "Publicly held property" means property that is owned by the state or local agency that took possession of the property that is the subject of an application submitted pursuant to 4).
 - c) "Racially motivated eminent domain" means when the state, county, city, city and county, district, or other political subdivision of the state acquires private property for public use and does not distribute just compensation to the owner at the time of the taking, and the taking, or the failure to provide just compensation, was due, in whole or in part, to the owner's ethnicity or race.
- 3) Provides that, upon appropriation, the Office of Legal Affairs (Office) within an agency to be determined shall accept applications from persons claiming to be a dispossessed owner and decide those claims using the process set forth in 4)-9).
- 4) Requires the Office to accept applications from persons who claim they are the dispossessed owner of property taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain and:
 - a) Review and investigate the applications.
 - b) As part of its review, request submission of additional information supporting the application that is reasonably necessary to verify the application, to determine whether the applicant is a dispossessed owner, or to determine whether the application was racially motivated. If the Office makes a request for any additional documentation, it shall communicate that request to the applicant with a notice of the additional information required, and consider any additional information provided by the applicant within 30 days of the receipt of the notice.
 - c) After reviewing all of the relevant materials, determine whether the applicant is a dispossessed owner of property taken through racially motivated eminent domain.
- 5) Provides that, if the Office determines that an applicant has established that they are a dispossessed owner under 4), the Office shall determine all of the following:
 - a) The present-day fair market value of the property that was taken by the state, county, city, city and county, district, or other political subdivision of the state as a result of racially motivated eminent domain.
 - b) Whether issuing property or just compensation to that dispossessed owner would serve to redress past acts of racial discrimination, prevent future acts of racial discrimination, and benefit the whole of the community and its general welfare.

- 6) Provides that, if the Office determines that providing property or just compensation is warranted under 5), the Office shall certify that the dispossessed owner is entitled to the return of the taken property if it is still in possession of the public entity that did the taking, other publicly held property of equal value, or financial compensation.
 - a) If just compensation is warranted, the compensation from the state or local agency shall be in the amount of the fair market value of the property, as determined under 5), minus the amount paid at the time of the taking, adjusted for inflation.
 - b) If the Office determines that the dispossessed owner is entitled to other publicly held property of equal value, it shall solicit and select from the state or other jurisdiction, as applicable, a list of recommendations of publicly held properties that are suitable as compensation. If no publicly held property is suitable as compensation, the Office shall determine an amount of just compensation pursuant to (a).
- 7) Provides that, if the state or local agency that took property by racially motivated eminent domain rejects the Office's determination under 5) and 6), the dispossessed owner who is entitled to compensation as determined by the Office may bring an action to challenge the taking or the amount of compensation under the relevant provisions of the Eminent Domain Law.
 - a) An action brought under 7) shall not be subject to the Eminent Domain Law's statute of limitations, whether the action was brought before or after the enactment of this bill.
 - b) Nothing herein shall be a basis for disturbing or invalidating the title to any property taken by racially motivated eminent domain, other than the procedures set forth in 2)-9).
- 8) Provides that, if the Office determines that an applicant is not a dispossessed owner or that issuing property or just compensation is not warranted under 4) or 5), the Office shall notify the applicant of the finding.
 - a) The applicant may appeal the determination within 60 days of receiving the notice and provide additional information to support their claim.
 - b) The Office shall consider the appeal and any new information provided and issue a determination on the appeal within 120 days.
- 9) Provides that every finding, decision, or other official act of the agency to be determined is subject to judicial review in accordance with law.
- 10) Prohibits the Attorney General from modifying the structure of the agency to be determined or its work.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

According to the author:

AB 62 seeks to provide a pathway for restitution to individuals and families who were displaced through the use of racially biased eminent domain.

Throughout the 20th century, local and state governments used eminent domain to clear land for public development, urban renewal, and highway construction. These actions disproportionately targeted poor Black and Latino communities, causing significant emotional, physical, and economic harm. Families lost their homes and businesses, generational wealth was destroyed, and entire communities were fractured — all in the name of progress that rarely benefited those most affected.

AB 62 responds to these injustices by authorizing local and state agencies to evaluate past eminent domain takings and, where inappropriate or unjustified takings are identified, offer appropriate restitution. This may include returning land or providing direct compensation.

This bill builds on the precedent set by SB 796, authored by former Senator Steven Bradford, which enabled the return of Bruce's Beach to the Bruce family in Los Angeles County. It also aligns with recent efforts by the City of Palm Springs to provide restitution to Black and Latino families displaced from Section 14.

California has already taken steps to examine and address the legacy of racist policies through the Racial Equity Commission and related efforts. AB 62 continues that work by confronting one of the most significant forms of harm imposed by racially motivated government actions.

This bill is about more than acknowledgement. It is about creating a process to repair the damage still felt today and affirming that justice delayed does not have to be justice denied.

2. The Task Force's report and recommendations

In 2020, the Legislature enacted AB 3121 (Weber, Ch. 319, Stats. 2020), which created the first-in-the-nation Task Force to explore options for providing reparations to African Americans, and particularly the descendants of enslaved persons, in recognition of California's role in the heinous institution of slavery and the post-abolition

perpetuation of racist institutions.¹ The Task Force released an interim report on June 1, 2022, which provided the Task Force’s preliminary findings regarding the ongoing and compounding harms caused by federal, state, and local governments from slavery and the “ ‘badges and incidents of slavery’ ” that continued to be imposed on African Americans long after slavery was formally abolished.² The report notes that, because “the effects of slavery infected every aspect of American society over the last 400 years...it is nearly impossible to identify every ‘badge and incident of slavery,’ to include every piece of evidence, or describe every harm done to African Americans.”³

On June 29, 2023, the Task Force issued its final report to the California Legislature, known as the California Reparations Report.⁴ The California Reparations Report incorporates and updates the interim report and recommends appropriate remedies, including compensation, for African Americans as recompense for the State’s gross human rights violations against African Americans and their descendants.⁵ The California Reparations Report explains:

[T]he harms inflicted upon African Americans have not been incidental or accidental – they have been by design. They are the result of an all-encompassing web of discriminatory laws, regulations, and policies enacted by government. These laws and policies have enabled government officials and private individuals and entities to perpetuate the legacy of slavery by subjecting African Americans as a group to discrimination, exclusion, neglect, and violence in every facet of American life. And there has been no comprehensive effort to disrupt and dismantle institutionalized racism, stop the harm, and redress the specific injuries caused to descendants and the larger African American community.⁶

The Task Force developed its recommendations for reparations taking into account this willful infliction of harm and applying international standards and principles for the remedy of wrongs and injuries caused by a government.⁷

One of the Task Force’s recommendations is to provide restitution to the owners of property that was taken through the use of eminent domain without providing just

¹ HR 40 (Pressley, 119th Cong., 2025-2026), a federal bill to create a federal commission to study the effects of slavery and discrimination on African Americans and devise reparations proposals, is pending before the House Committee on Judiciary. The bill has been introduced every year since 1989.

² California Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans, Interim Report (June 1, 2022), available at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121/reports>. All links in this analysis are current as of July 10, 2025.

³ *Id.* at p. 5.

⁴ See generally California Reparations Report (2023), available at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121/reports>.

⁵ *Id.* at p. 4.

⁶ *Id.* at p. 48.

⁷ *Id.* at p. 512.

compensation.⁸ The Task Force recommended that this remedial project be run by a newly created agency, which would, among other things, review and investigate complaints from people who claim their property was taken without just compensation.⁹ While legislation was introduced in 2024 to implement these recommendations, none of those bills was ultimately signed into law.¹⁰

3. The prevalence of racially motivated eminent domain

Eminent domain, as enshrined in the federal and state Constitutions, permits the government to seize privately owned land and put it to a public use – provided that the owner is justly compensated for their property.¹¹ “Just compensation” “means in most cases the fair market value of the property on the date it is appropriated,” which entitles the owner “to receive what a willing buyer would pay in cash to a willing seller at the time of taking.”¹² Historically, however, federal, state, and local governments have frequently targeted properties owned by racial and ethnic minorities for seizure without paying the owners a fair price – which harmed not only the former owners, but stifled the development of generational wealth that allows families to truly flourish.¹³

Examples in California include Manhattan Beach’s racially motivated seizure of Bruce’s Beach¹⁴ and the decade-long clearing of Chavez Ravine, the land that is now home to Dodger Stadium.¹⁵ The Legislature and Los Angeles County took action to return Bruce’s Beach to Willa and Charles Bruce’s descendants,¹⁶ but the former residents of Chavez Ravine, and a multitude of other individuals whose property was taken unjustly, have yet to be fully compensated.

4. This bill requires an agency, to be determined, to accept applications from persons whose property was taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain and to provide for just compensation, as specified

This bill requires an Office in an agency to be determined to accept, and to rule on, applications from persons whose property, or the descendants of people whose

⁸ *Id.* at p. 687.

⁹ Final Report, *supra*, at p. 687.

¹⁰ See SB 1403 (Bradford, 2024); SB 1050 (Bradford, 2024).

¹¹ U.S. Const., 5th amend.; Cal. Const., art. I, § 19.

¹² *Kirby Forest Industries, Inc. v. U.S.* (1984) 467 U.S. 1, 9-10 (internal quotation marks omitted).

¹³ See, e.g., California Reparations Report, *supra* at pp. 209-210.

¹⁴ Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, Bruce’s Beach (2024) <https://ceo.lacounty.gov/ardi/bruces-beach/>; Xia, *Manhattan Beach was once home to Black beachgoers, but the city ran them out. Now it faces a reckoning*, Los Angeles Times (Aug. 2, 2020) available at <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-02/bruces-beach-manhattan-beach>.

¹⁵ Shatkin, *The Ugly, Violent Clearing of Chavez Ravine Before It Was Home To The Dodgers*, LAist (Oct. 17, 2018; updated May 1, 2023) <https://laist.com/news/la-history/dodger-stadium-chavez-ravine-battle>; Baxter, *Orphans of the Ravine*, Los Angeles Times (Mar. 29, 2008) <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2008-mar-29-sp-ravine29-story.html>.

¹⁶ See SB 796 (Bradford, Ch. 435, Stats. 2021).

property, was taken without just compensation, in whole or in part, because of the property owner's ethnicity or race. The bill establishes the process by which applications can be submitted, allows the Office to seek additional information if needed, and requires the Office to determine whether the property was, in fact, taken through racially motivated eminent domain. If the Office determines that the property was taken through racially motivated eminent domain, the Office must also determine the present-day fair market value of the property taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain, and whether issuing property or just compensation to the dispossessed owner would serve to redress past acts of racial discrimination, prevent future acts of racial discrimination, and benefit the whole community and its general welfare.

In the event that the Office determines that an award is justified, the bill permits the PRD to certify that the dispossessed owner is entitled to the return of the property, an award of comparable property, or monetary compensation, depending on the circumstances. The dispossessed owner can take that certification to the state agency or local entity that was responsible for the unjust taking to seek the certified form of restitution. If the state or local entity does not provide the restitution, the bill permits the dispossessed owner to bring a suit against the state or local entity through the procedures set forth in the Government Claims Act,¹⁷ and that the statutes of limitations on any such claim (e.g., a violation of the Eminent Domain Law) shall not apply. The author has agreed to amendments to clarify these procedures.

The procedure established by this bill will permit a limited revival of claims otherwise barred by the applicable statutes of limitations. The California Supreme Court has held that the Legislature "has authority to establish – and to enlarge – limitations periods" provided that the language of revival is explicit.¹⁸ This bill includes the requisite express language, so there should be no question that the Legislature intends to permit certified claims arising from racially motivated eminent domain to proceed notwithstanding the otherwise-expired statute of limitations. At the same time, the bill's certification structure – wherein the PRD has to certify a claim before the rightful owner can proceed with the claim – should provide security against meritless claims being filed against state and local entities. Finally, amendments agreed to by the author specify that the court is not bound by the PRD's determination, meaning the state or local entity is ensured a true *de novo* review of the claim, thereby protecting their due process rights.

¹⁷ Gov. Code, tit. 2, div. 4, pt. 7, §§ 17500 et seq.

¹⁸ *Quarry v. Doe I* (Quarry) (2012) 53 Cal.4th 945, 955-957.

5. This bill is one of two racially motivated eminent domain bills pending in the Legislature

This bill is substantially similar to a portion of SB 518 (Weber Pierson, 2025), which this Committee passed earlier this year with a vote of 11-2 and which is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee. SB 518 would establish an entity to be known as the Bureau of Descendants of American Slavery, and tasks the Property Reclamation Division within the Bureau with, among other things, accepting and deciding claims of racially motivated eminent domain.

The processes set forth in the two bills are, for the most part, identical. The lone substantive difference lies in how the deciding bodies determine whether to award land, the return of the taken property, or a substantive property: this bill gives the Office a fair degree of discretion in determining which form of compensation (monetary or land) to return, whereas SB 518 prescribes a three-step analysis for the Property Reclamation Division to conduct. Otherwise, the processes for applications, determinations, and a dispossessed owner's rights following a certification are the same.

6. Constitutional considerations

Although this Committee has not received timely opposition to this bill, opposition raised in other committees argued that this bill is unconstitutional, apparently because the bill attempts to compensate victims of racism. These arguments misunderstand the law. They cite opinions that apply strict scrutiny to state action that creates preferences or grants privileges on the basis of race, i.e., grants one race a benefit not granted to the other. These opinions are irrelevant here.

AB 62 creates a system for compensating victims of racially motivated eminent domain. The bill is entirely race neutral: anyone, no matter their race, can apply for and receive compensation if they were the victim of racist state action, i.e., the taking of their land as a result of racist motives.

The cases cited by the opponents, such as *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*,¹⁹ apply strict scrutiny to racial classifications that result in discrimination on the basis of race—for example, racially segregated schools.²⁰ None of these opinions holds that compensating any victim of racially targeted action a remedy—regardless of their race—violates the Equal Protection Clause. The approach urged by the opposition would seem to invalidate any state action that *mentions* race, calling into question longstanding antidiscrimination laws. This is the opposite of equal protection.

¹⁹ 600 U.S. 181.

²⁰ *Id.* at pp. 203-204.

Opponents also appear to argue that, because this bill arises from an idea proposed by the Task Force, we should assume that the remedy will be limited to descendants of enslaved persons. That is not how legislation works. Moreover, the Supreme Court has acknowledged that racial classifications – which again, this bill does not have – are permissible to remedy specific, identified actions of past discrimination that violated the Constitution or a statute.²¹

Finally, the racially motivated eminent domain process appears consistent with the constitutional limits on when public funds may be provided to an individual.²² The procedure is roughly modeled on the California Victim Compensation Board, and the bill makes findings and declarations relating to the Legislature’s determination that providing restitution serves an important public purpose. Additionally, the bill requires the Office to determine that each specific award of compensation will serve the public purposes of preventing discrimination and benefitting the community as a whole, which is intended to ensure that individual inequitable awards are not made. Overall, therefore, it appears that this bill provides an adequate legislative justification for the use of public funds.

7. Arguments in support

According to the Alliance for Reparations, Reconciliation, and Truth:

Eminent domain allows governmental entities to take private property for public use -- provided that the property owner receives just compensation. While this power has been useful in building infrastructure and public access, it has also been inappropriately used in ways that have harmed minority and marginalized communities. Historically, the construction of public infrastructure disproportionately displaced and fractured African American communities across the country throughout the 20th century. As documented in Chapter Five: Housing Segregation, in The Final Reparations Task Force Report, the state of California and local governments built its cities over the bones of the African American neighborhoods, torn apart through eminent domain, building the highways, cities, and parks that which enabled the State of California to become one of the largest economies in the world.

Existing eminent domain laws do not currently provide mechanisms for redress or reparative justice for these victims. In the spirit of the U.N. principles of restitution and compensation, AB 62 acknowledges the injustices experienced by descendants and works to provide greater pathways for redress, whether through the return of property or equitable compensation.

²¹ *Id.* at p. 207.

²² See Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 6.

SUPPORT

Alliance for Reparations, Reconciliation, and Truth
Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders for Civic Empowerment
Black Equity Collective
California Black Power Network
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
Catalyst California
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
Don Tamaki, former Task Force Member
Dr. Cheryl Grills, former Task Force Member
Japanese American Citizens League
Greater Sacramento Urban League
Lisa Holder, former Task Force Member
Live Free California
Multi-faith ACTION Coalition
NAACP California-Hawai'i State Conference
Oakland Privacy
Prevention Institute
Santa Monica Democratic Club
Western Center on Law and Poverty
Where Is My Land
Two individuals

OPPOSITION

None received

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending legislation: SB 518 (Weber Pierson, 2025) establishes the Bureau for Descendants of American Slavery (Bureau) and requires the Bureau, among other things, to consider racially motivated eminent domain claims pursuant to a procedure substantially similar to the one in this bill; the differences are discussed further in Comment 6 of this analysis. SB 518 is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Prior legislation:

SB 1331 (Bradford, 2024) would have established the Fund for Reparations and Reparative Justice in the State Treasury with the purpose of funding policies approved by the Legislature and the Governor that address the harm that the State of California

caused to descendants of an African American chattel enslaved person or descendants of a free Black person living in the United States prior to the end of the 19th century. SB 1331 died on the Assembly Floor.

SB 1050 (Bradford, 2024) would have established a procedure by which a dispossessed owner, as defined, of property that was taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain, as defined, could apply for the return of the property, property of equal value, or compensation. SB 1050 was vetoed by the Governor, who stated in his veto message that, while he applauded the author's "commitment to redressing past racial injustices," the bill "task[ed] a nonexistent state agency to carry out its various provisions and requirements, making it impossible to implement."

AB 1950 (Carrillo, 2024) would have established the Chavez Ravine Displaced Residents Task Force, subject to appropriation by the Legislature, for the purpose of investigating whether and how to provide compensation to former residents and landowners displaced from the Chavez Ravine area of Los Angeles between 1950 and 1961, as specified. AB 1950 was vetoed by the Governor, who stated in his veto message that "a task force to study the events that occurred should be established at the local level."

SB 796 (Bradford, Ch. 435, Stats. 2021) required the Director of Parks and Recreation, by December 31, 2021, to execute a deed amendment to exclude Bruce's Beach, a portion of land within Manhattan State Beach, from the requirement to use the property for recreational purposes only; and authorized Los Angeles County to sell, transfer, or encumber Bruce's Beach, upon terms and conditions determined by the county board of supervisors to be in the best interest of the county and the general public.

AB 3121 (Weber, Ch. 319, Stats. 2020) established the Task Force and its mission, with a sunset date of July 1, 2023.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 57, Noes 4)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 2)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 1)
