SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2021-2022 Regular Session

SB 1100 (Cortese)
Version: April 7, 2022
Hearing Date: April 19, 2022
Fiscal: No
Urgency: No
AM

SUBJECT

Open meetings: orderly conduct

DIGEST

This bill authorizes the presiding member of a legislative body conducting a meeting to remove an individual for disrupting the meeting, and defines "disrupting" for these purposes.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ralph M. Brown Act (the Brown Act) protects public access to meetings of the legislative bodies of local agencies. The Act currently permits members of the legislative body conducting the meeting to order the meeting room cleared and continue in session, as provided, if a group or groups have willfully interrupted the orderly conduct of a meeting and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals who are willfully interrupting the meeting. This bill seeks to provide clarity around the issue of when an individual person can be removed for disrupting the orderly conduct of a meeting, by specifying that the presiding member of the legislative body can remove an individual for disrupting a meeting. "Disrupting" is defined as engaging in behavior that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting. This standard is taken from *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa* (718 F.3d 800, 811 (9th Cir. 2013)), in which the court explained that a local ordinance governing decorum at a city council meeting is not facially overbroad if it only permits the removal of an individual for actually disturbing or impeding the orderly conduct of the meeting.

The bill is sponsored by the California State Association of Counties and the Urban Counties of California. The bill is supported by local agencies, associations representing local agencies, and a coalition of Indivisible chapters from around the state. The bill is opposed by Californians for Good Governance, Stand UP, and two individuals. The bill passed out of the Senate Governance and Finance Committee on a vote of 4 to 1.

Existing law:

1) Affirms that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies are required to be open to public scrutiny. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(1).)

2) Establishes the Brown Act, which secures public access to the meetings of public commissions, boards, councils, and agencies in the state. (Gov. Code, tit. 5, div. 2, pt. 1, ch. 9, §§ 54950 et seq.)

3) Defines, for purposes of the Brown Act, the following relevant terms:
    a) A "local agency" is a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission, or agency thereof, or any other local public agency. (Gov. Code, § 54951.)
    b) A "legislative body" is the governing board of a local agency or any other local body created by state or federal statute; a commission, committee, board, or other body of a local agency, as specified; a board, commission, or other multimember body that governs a private corporation, limited liability company, or other entity that is either created by an elected legislative body to exercise delegated authority or receives funds from a local agency and includes a member of the legislative body of the local agency; or the lessee of any hospital leased pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 21131, where the lessee exercises any material authority delegated by the legislative body. (Gov. Code, § 54952.)

4) Requires that all meetings of the legislative body of a local agency be open and public, and all persons be permitted to attend any meeting of the legislative body of a local agency, except as otherwise provided in the Brown Act. (Gov. Code, § 54953.)

5) Provides that a legislative body of a local agency cannot prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body. (Gov. Code, § 54954.3(c).)

6) Authorizes the legislative body of a local agency to adopt reasonable regulations related to opportunity for the public to address the legislative body, including, but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker. (Gov. Code, § 54954.3(b)(1).)

7) Provides that the members of the legislative body conducting the meeting may order the meeting room cleared and continue in session in the event that any meeting is willfully interrupted by a group or group of persons so as to render the orderly

conduct of such meeting unfeasible, and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals who are willfully interrupting the meeting. (Gov. Code, § 54957.9.)

a) Only matters that appear on the agenda may be considered in the continued session after clearing the room. (*Ibid*.)
b) Representatives of the press or other news media are allowed to attend the continued session after clearing the room, except if they were participating in the disturbance. (*Ibid*.)
c) Specifies that these provisions do not prohibit the legislative body from establishing a procedure for readmitting an individual or individuals not responsible for willfully disturbing the orderly conduct of the meeting. (*Ibid*.)

This bill:

1) Authorizes the presiding member of the legislative body conducting a meeting to remove an individual for disrupting the meeting.

2) Defines "disrupting" as engaging in behavior that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, both:
    a) A failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body pursuant to Section 54954.3 or 54957.9 of the Government Code or any other law.
    b) Engaging in behavior that includes the use of force or true threats of force.

3) States various findings and declarations of the Legislature, including:
    a) it is the intent of the Legislature to prescribe requirements for governing public meetings to protect civil liberties in accordance with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and relevant law; and
    b) it is further the intent of the Legislature to codify the authority and standards for governing public meetings in accordance with *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*, 718 F.3d 800, 811 (9th Cir. 2013), in which the court explained that an ordinance governing the decorum of a city council meeting is not facially overbroad if it only permits a presiding officer to eject an attendee for actually disturbing or impeding a meeting.

4) Finds and declares that the bill furthers, within the meaning of paragraph (7) of subdivision (b) of Section 3 of Article I of the California Constitution, the purposes of that constitutional section as it relates to the right of public access to the meetings of local bodies; and finds the act is necessary to give legislative bodies clear authorization to restore order to meetings in the event of actual disruptions that are disturbing, disrupting, impeding, or rendering infeasible the orderly conduct of the

meeting and, thereby, preserve the rights of other members of the public at the meeting and allow the legislative body to continue its work on behalf of the public.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

The author writes:

> It has become increasingly clear that the mechanisms provided by the Brown Act to deal with disruptions during public meetings are insufficient. Across California, public officials and public attendees continue to deal with disorderly conduct during meetings at such a high magnitude that critical business and the legislative process as a whole has become impaired.
>
> As we have undoubtedly seen, many troubling incidents across the state, including those involving harassment and threats of violence, have demonstrated the need to protect public safety and public meeting access by modernizing the Brown Act so that it provides clearer standards around when removal of a meeting participant is warranted and what authority members of a legislative body can exercise.
>
> These are only a few examples that speak to the need for SB 1100: (1) in 2021, Los Gatos Mayor Marico Sayoc and her family faced targeted bullying and harassment efforts at public meetings, including anti-LGBTQ rhetoric; (2) in 2022, the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Board has had to end multiple meetings early due to meeting disruptions; and (3) recent San Diego Board of Supervisor meetings have made national headlines, in part, due to racist comments as well as threats of violence and personal attacks.
>
> We must take steps to clarify what behavior should be deemed as disruptive to ensure that this definition is only used with absolute neutrality for those rare occurrences and prioritize the safety of our officials who sit on local governing bodies as well as the public.

2. Access to open and public meetings of local legislative bodies

   a. *Brown Act guarantees access to open and public meetings of local legislative bodies*

The California Constitution enshrines the rights of the people to instruct their representatives and to access information concerning the conduct of government, and requires the meetings of public bodies to be accessible for public scrutiny.[1] To that end,

[1] Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(a) & (b)(1).

the Brown Act provides guidelines for how local agencies must hold public meetings.[2] The legislative intent of the Brown Act was expressly declared in its original statute, and has remained unchanged despite numerous amendments:

> The Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.
>
> The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.[3]

The Brown Act generally requires that meetings of the legislative body of a local agency be open and accessible to the public, and requires local agencies to provide notice of the meeting, its agenda, and its location in advance of a meeting to ensure that the people have adequate notice and opportunity to attend.[4] However, these rights are not unlimited.

For example, a legislative body can adopt reasonable regulations limiting the time limit of public testimony.[5] In addition, existing law authorizes members of the legislative body conducting a meeting to clear the meeting room and continue in session if the meeting is willfully interrupted by a group or groups of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting unfeasible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals who are willfully interrupting the meeting.[6] Only matters that were listed on the agenda can be considered in the session held after the room is cleared and members of the press must be allowed to attend, unless they were participating in the disturbance.[7] The legislative body is authorized to establish a procedure for readmitting an individual or individuals not responsible for willfully disturbing the orderly conduct of the meeting after clearing a meeting.[8]

---

[2] Gov. Code, tit. 5, div. 2, pt. 1, ch. 9, §§ 54950 et seq.
[3] *Id.*, § 54950.
[4] Gov. Code, § 54953.
[5] Gov. Code § 54954.3(b)(1).
[6] Gov. Code, § 54957.9.
[7] *Ibid*.
[8] *Ibid*.

b. The bill intends to provide clarity and address recent troubling interactions at local government meetings

According to the author, this bill is intended to provide clarity to the existing provisions of the Brown Act around when a legislative body of a local agency can remove an individual who is willfully interrupting a meeting, as existing law currently only applies to a group or groups of individuals. The author points to several concerning instances as examples of why this bill is needed, such as the targeted bullying and harassment faced by the Los Gatos mayor at city council meetings in 2021, the fact that the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School Board had to end multiple meetings this year due to disruptions by protesters, and the recent racist comments as well as threats of violence and personal attacks at meetings of the San Diego Board of Supervisors.

The bill seeks to provide clarity to this issue while simultaneously balancing the rights of public participation and the authority of local agencies to adequately address behavior that disrupts their ability to orderly and efficiently conduct the people's business. Under the bill, the presiding member of the legislative body conducting a meeting is authorized to remove an individual for disrupting the meeting. "Disrupting" is defined as engaging in behavior that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, both (1) a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body pursuant to Section 54954.3 or Section 54957.9 of the Government Code or any other law; and (2) engaging in behavior that includes the use of force or true threats of force.

c. Legislative findings and declarations

The bill contains various findings and declarations regarding the intent of the Legislature in enacting the bill including:

- it is the intent of the Legislature to prescribe requirements for governing public meetings that are consistent with subdivision (c) of Section 54954.3 of the Government Code, which provides that a legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body;
- it is further the intent of the Legislature to prescribe requirements for governing public meetings to protect civil liberties in accordance with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and relevant law; and
- it is further the intent of the Legislature to codify the authority and standards for governing public meetings in accordance with *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*, 718 F.3d 800, 811 (9th Cir. 2013), in which the court explained that an ordinance governing the decorum of a city council meeting is not facially overbroad if it only permits a presiding officer to eject an attendee for actually disturbing or impeding a meeting.

3. Bill drafted to meet requirements of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution

Several Ninth Circuit cases have held that a legislative body can remove individuals for disrupting or impeding the orderly conduct of a local government meeting. The court has held that "[c]itizens have an enormous first amendment interest in directing speech about public issues to those who govern their city" and, therefore, public local government meetings have been considered limited public forums:

> […] a City Council meeting is still just that, a governmental process with a governmental purpose. The Council has an agenda to be addressed and dealt with. Public forum or not, the usual first amendment antipathy to content-oriented control of speech cannot be imported into the Council chambers intact.[9]

The court noted that a speaker could not be stopped from speaking because the moderator disagreed with the speaker's viewpoint, but could be stopped if their speech was irrelevant, repetitious, or too long because the local agency would be disrupted or prevented from accomplishing its business in a "reasonably efficient manner" and that "such conduct may interfere with the rights of other speakers."[10] In *White v. City of Norwalk*, the court upheld a local statute that prohibited "loud threatening, personal or abusive language" or "any other disorderly conduct which disrupts, disturbs or otherwise impedes the orderly conduct" of the meeting stating that the ordinance was not on its face substantially or fatally overbroad because restriction on a speaker's speech only applied when the speech disrupted, disturbed, or impeded the orderly conduct of the meeting.[11]

The court revisited this issue in *Norse v. City of Santa Cruz* and held that a person could be ejected from a meeting for an actual disruption but not a "constructive disruption, technical disruption, virtual disruption, *nunc pro tunc* disruption, or imaginary disruption.[12]" The court explained that a local agency cannot define disruption in any manner it chooses, stating a city "cannot define disruption so as to include non-disruption."[13] Most recently the court addressed this issue in *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*, where the court explained that an ordinance governing the decorum of a city council meeting is not facially overbroad if it only permits a presiding officer to eject an attendee for actually disturbing or impeding a meeting.[14] Again the court reiterated that disruption cannot be defined in any manner, such as a violation of rules of decorum, but has to be an actual disruption of a meeting.[15]

---

[9] *White v. City of Norwalk*, 900 F.2d 1421, 1425 (9th Cir. 1990) (footnote omitted).
[10] *Ibid*.
[11] *Ibid*.
[12] *Norse v. City of Santa Cruz*, 629 F.3d 966, 976 (9th Cir. 2010).
[13] *Ibid*.
[14] *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*, *supra*, 718 F.3d 800, 811.
[15] *Ibid*.

In order for a person or persons to be removed from a meeting under the bill, they have to be disrupting the meeting. Disrupting is defined in the bill as engaging in behavior that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting. As such, it seems that the provisions of the bill would comply with the holding in *Acosta* and not be considered facially overbroad under the First Amendment.

The bill also provides that disrupting includes, but is not limited to, both (1) a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body pursuant to Section 54954.3 or Section 54957.9 of the Government Code or any other law; and (2) engaging in behavior that includes the use of force or true threats of force. The First Amendment permits a state to place restrictions upon the content of speech in a few prescribed areas, which includes true threats.[16] In regards to the provision that includes a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body or any other law, it is unclear if this is the type of behavior that in all situations would cause an actual disruption to, or impede the orderly conduct of, a meeting. However, if a court was interpreting this language it would more likely than not interpret it to be qualified by the language preceding it in proposed subdivision (b), which specifies that *disrupting* is behavior *that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting* and would therefore not find the statute facially overbroad under the First Amendment (emphasis added).[17] The court has held that a statute may be considered valid if its provisions are "reasonably susceptible to an interpretation" in line with the Constitution and that the court should interpret a statute in a manner to limit "its effect and operation to matters" that can be regulated or prohibited under the Constitution.[18] This conclusion is bolstered by the legislative findings and declarations of the bill stating that it is the intent of the Legislature that the bill's provisions be enacted in accordance with relevant constitutional and state law and consistent with the holding in *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa.*

4. Prior version of the bill included a warning, request, and curtailment requirement

The prior version of this bill provided that before removal of an individual could occur the presiding member was required to provide a warning that the behavior is disrupting the proceedings, a request that the disruptive behavior be curtailed, and that a reasonable opportunity to cease the disruptive behavior be afforded to the individual. Though these provisions are not specifically required by the Ninth Circuit case law, they do afford members of the public the ability to correct any disruptive behavior before being removed, which furthers the right of public access to public meetings. Some civil rights organizations have expressed concerns with the removal of these provisions and indicate that they may oppose the bill if they are not included. As these

[16] *Virginia v. Black* (2003) 538 U.S. 343, 359.
[17] *See White v. City of Norwalk*, *supra* 900 F.2d 1421, 1425 (the court concluded that a sentence in a local ordinance was susceptible to a limiting construction even though the first sentence was unconstitutional on its own.)
[18] *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*, *supra*, 718 F.3d 800, 811

provisions strike a good balance between the right of the public to access open meetings and the ability of the local governing body to efficiently and orderly conduct the people's business, the Author may wish to amend the bill to include the warning, request, and curtailment provisions described above.

5. Proposed Amendments[19]

Amend added Section 54957.95 of the Government Code to read:

54957.95. (a) *(1)* In addition to authority exercised pursuant to Sections 54954.3 and 54957.9, the presiding member of the legislative body conducting a meeting may remove an individual for disrupting the meeting.

(2) Removal pursuant to this subdivision shall be preceded by a warning from the presiding member of the legislative body that the individual is disrupting the proceedings, a request that the individual curtail their disruptive behavior or be subject to removal, and a reasonable opportunity to curtail their disruptive behavior. This paragraph does not apply to any behavior described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(b) As used in this section, "disrupting" means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, both of the following:

(1) A failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body pursuant to Section 54954.3 or 54957.9 or any other law.

(2) Engaging in behavior that includes use of force or true threats of force.

6. Opposition and Concerns

The bill is opposed by Californians for Good Governance, Stand UP, and two individuals. Educate Advocate also expressed concerns with the current language in the bill. The opposition generally feels that the language in the bill is either vague or does not give enough guidance to local governing bodies about what behavior can and should warrant removal. They argue that disturbing, disrupting, and impeding is too subjective and worry about how locals will apply the law. The opposition arguments do not account for the fact that the language in the bill says *actually* disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible *the orderly conduct of the meeting* (emphasis added). Furthermore, the bills findings make it clear the intent of the bill is for its provisions to be interpreted and applied consistently with the holding in *Acosta v. City of Costa Mesa*. It is impossible to state that all local governing bodies will apply the law consistently

[19] The amendments may also include technical, nonsubstantive changes recommended by the Office of Legislative Counsel.

with the First Amendment. These scenarios would be as applied challenges to the law under First Amendment jurisprudence and would be highly fact specific. The bill on its face, as described above, is in line with current Ninth Circuit case law on this matter and the proposed amendments provide additional protections for members of the public in exercising their right to access public meetings.

7. Statements in Support

The California State Association of Counties and the Urban Counties of California, the sponsors of the bill, write:

> This important change to the Brown Act will help local agencies address an unfortunate, but notable, increase in disruptive behavior, hate speech, intimidation, and threats against local elected officials, staff, and members of the public with opposing views.
>
> Like many local agencies across the state and around the country, California counties are experiencing an increase in incidence of disruptive behavior by members of the public during public meetings. Regrettably, this behavior has included foul language, racist, misogynist, and homophobic slurs, and threats of violence toward county supervisors and county staff. In many instances, other members of the public are also targeted for expressing opposing views.
>
> These behaviors not only disrupt the proceedings of the day, but fundamentally break the promise of the Brown Act, undermining the ability of members of the public to participate in the conduct of the public's business safely and productively. To say that these types of behaviors have been disruptive to the normal conduct of county business is an understatement; they are stressful, demoralizing, and in some cases, frightening for their targets.
>
> Worse, when performative acts of disruption occur during recorded meetings, the footage is then shared on social media to garner additional attention and encourage others to do the same for the sole purpose of weakening government structure and function and shut out opposing voices.
>
> To be clear, counties are committed to ensuring the public's right to access public meetings and scrutinize the decisions of public officials. However, as participants in our democratic government, we must also provide safe and accessible environments in which the public can express their views freely and without intimidation. SB 1100 offers an important tool for local agencies to make certain that public meetings are available to everyone.

Together We Will/Indivisible - Los Gatos writes in support:

> […] As residents of Los Gatos and surrounding communities, we were deeply affected by the incidents disrupting Los Gatos Town Council meetings in 2021. It was shocking to us that anyone would choose to derail meetings and harass our public servants. Our town struggled to figure out an appropriate path to restore order and protect people from bullying,
>
> By establishing common-sense mechanisms to de-escalate significant disruptions and allow members of a legislative body to return to their important governmental business in a swift manner, this bill would enhance public access to meetings.
>
> Notably, the bill presents adequate safeguards to ensure implementation consistent with our First Amendment principles. […]

8. Statements in Opposition

Californians for Good Governance writes in opposition:

> […] Our concern is that the language of this bill is too vague to give meaningful guidance to local bodies in how to ensure rules comport with constitutional rights and would instead be interpreted as a general license to limit public participation in their meetings. Public participation in meetings inherently disrupts and impedes the orderly imposition of rules by governing bodies. That is the point. The reality is that participatory democracy is a messy business, but limiting public input is not the answer as it moves our government towards authoritarianism and away from democracy. […]

Stand Up writes in opposition:

> […] The verbiage: "actual disruptions that are disturbing, disrupting, impeding…" are open to interpretation. Is a t-shirt saying something a presiding member of the Legislative body finds to be offensive being "disruptive"? Is someone in chambers not wearing a mask due to severe PTSD, at a time where mask wearing is "highly recommended" but not "required", "disturbing"? Is a person having a coughing fit due to a tickle in their throat "impeding" the meeting?
>
> Too much is left open to interpretation and with that enters the slippery slope of the First Amendment of the US Constitution being violated in the public ability to redress their grievances and hold elected officials accountable. There is nothing in the language to strictly define the parameters of what can be construed as disturbing, disrupting, and impeding, leaving it open to the subjective nature of the feelings of the legislative body on any given day. County

> Board of Supervisors, City Councils and Legislators have challenged constituents over the last few years on the saying on their hats, on a member of the public clapping after another member of the public gives public comment, or for presenting research/evidence that the presiding official doesn't agree with, all of which could be deemed as "disturbing" or "impeding" the public meeting. This is arbitrary and opens the door wide for censorship of thought and speech. For that reason, we strongly oppose SB1100 and ask that you do too. […]

SUPPORT

California State Association of Counties (sponsor)
Urban Counties of California (sponsor)
California Contract Cities Association
California Special Districts Association
Change Begins With ME
City Clerks Association of California
Cloverdale Indivisible
Contra Costa MoveOn
County of Monterey
Defending Our Future: Indivisible in CA 52nd District
East Valley Indivisibles
El Cerrito Progressives
Feminists in Action Los Angeles (Indivisible CA 34 Womens)
Hillcrest Indivisible
Indi Squared
Indivisible 30/Keep Sherman Accountable
Indivisible 36
Indivisible 41
Indivisible Auburn CA
Indivisible Beach Cities
Indivisible CA-3
Indivisible CA-7
Indivisible CA-25 Simi Valley-Porter Ranch
Indivisible CA-29 Indivisible CA-33 Indivisible CA-37
Indivisible CA-39
Indivisible CA-43
Indivisible Claremont/Inland Valley
Indivisible Colusa County
Indivisible East Bay
Indivisible El Dorado Hills
Indivisible Elmwood

Indivisible Euclid
Indivisible Lorin
Indivisible Los Angeles
Indivisible Manteca
Indivisible Marin
Indivisible Media City Burbank
Indivisible Mendocino
Indivisible Normal Heights
Indivisible North Oakland Resistance
Indivisible North San Diego County
Indivisible OC 46
Indivisible OC 48
Indivisible Petaluma
Indivisible Sacramento
Indivisible San Bernardino
Indivisible San Jose
Indivisible San Pedro
Indivisible Santa Barbara
Indivisible Santa Cruz County
Indivisible Sausalito
Indivisible Sebastopol
Indivisible SF
Indivisible SF Peninsula and CA-14
Indivisible Sonoma County
Indivisible South Bay LA
Indivisible Stanislaus
Indivisible Suffragists
Indivisible Ventura
Indivisible Windsor
Indivisible Yolo
Indivisible: San Diego Central
Indivisibles of Sherman Oaks
Livermore Indivisible
Mill Valley Community Action Network
Mountain Progressives
Nothing Rhymes with Orange
Orchard City Indivisible
Orinda Progressive Action Alliance
Our Revolution Long Beach

RiseUp
Rooted in Resistance
San Diego Indivisible Downtown
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
SFV Indivisible
Silicon Valley Clean Energy
Tehama Indivisible
The Resistance Northridge Together We Will
Town of Los Gatos
Together We Will/Indivisible - Los Gatos
Vallejo-Benicia Indivisible
Venice Resistance
Women's Alliance Los Angeles
Yalla Indivisible

OPPOSITION

Californians for Good Governance
Stand Up
Two individuals.

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: None known.

Prior Legislation: None known.

PRIOR VOTES

Senate Governance and Finance Committee (Ayes 4, Noes 1)

****