

June 27th, 2017 - July 1st, 2017

CALIFORNIA GIRLS STATE LEGISLATURE

2017 Regular Session

ASSEMBLY BILL DIGEST

June 27th, 2017 - July 1st, 2017
AT Claremont, CALIFORNIA



Note: Official record of roll call votes; all amendments considered by the Assembly on this day are on file with the Chief Clerk and available on request. A list of all measures amended and on which amendments were offered is shown on the final page of this session's Assembly digest.

~ PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSEMBLY~

IN ASSEMBLY

Roberts North Hall – Claremont McKenna College, California
June 27th, 2017 - July 1st, 2017

The Assembly met on June 27th, 2017 - July 1st, 2017
Hon. Ananya Raghavan, Speaker of the Assembly Presiding
Reilly Welsh, Chief Clerk at the desk.
Daniela Alvarez and Claire Nakamura Assistant Clerks.

Maria Quezada, Recording Secretary.
Maria Quezada, Timer.

ROLL CALL

The following were placed upon session roll call:

Balboa	Lidster, Carolyn
Balboa	Park, Chloe
Burbank	Johnson, Annapurna
Burbank	Fernandes, Analie
Burnett	Barr, Madison
Burnett	Baker, Mara
Cabrillo	Williams, Kasity
Cabrillo	Gonzalez, Bryanna
Carson	Mitchell, Hannah
Carson	Johnson, Emily
Crocker	Harrington, Maxie
Crocker	Shellstrom, Rachel
DeAnza	Yoon, Amy
DeAnza	Vance, Madison
Fremont	Nair, Varsha
Fremont	Brannon, Mackenzie

Harte	Schald, Brooke
Harte	Valdez, Rebecca
Lassen	Banal, Jacqueline
Lassen	Knutson, Taelynn
Marshall	Singh, Ambreen
Marshall	Raghavan, Ananya
Muir	Dorsey, Emma
Muir	Marsh, Carlyn
Portola	Krogh, Colleen
Portola	Spainhour, Briana
Serra	Abdallah, Ariel
Serra	Song, Sarah
Sutter	Song, Kathleen
Sutter	Moesel, Stevie
Vallejo	Youkana, Vivian
Vallejo	Slyker, Asha

Quorum present.

AB 1

Introduced by Sutter

June 29, 2015

Referred to the Assembly
Referred to Education Committee

PURPOSE: To shift funding from school and district administration to legitimate instruction and decrease the education budget in order to increase efficiency and have the largest possible impact on students.

TITLE: Education Administration Salary Limit Act of 2017

SUMMARY: District superintendents are the highest paid workers in education, with 82 California Superintendents making more than \$300,000. This bill is designed to prevent the excessive spending in the California Department of Education on Administration salaries.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I: The legislation finds and declares all of the following:

- a. Superintendents are often paid huge salaries, such as James Hammond from the Ontario-Montclair School District was paid \$516,573.13 of the tax payers money, compared to the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Torlakson, who received \$158,722.44 in total compensation (including benefits) in 2016.
- b. School Districts in California range in size and employees, so compensation should be proportional to students population.

SECTION II: Section 44021 is added to *Title 2, Division 3, Part 25, Chapter 1, Article 1* of the California Education Code, to read

- a. The salary of any administrator should be limited to a maximum proportional value to the compensation of the negotiated teacher instructor salaries.
- b. Administration salaries (*defined as non instructional leadership support staff tasked with creating and enforcing rules on or off of a school campus, including principals, attendance staff, book keepers, ect. not employed as an independent contractor*) are limited to a 200% increase from the average teacher salary within the school district, whether unified or other.
- c. Teacher compensation includes regular pay, overtime pay, other pay, and total benefits.
- d. Section 44021 applies to all public or charter schools under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Education
- e. Enforcement of this regulation will be overseen by the California State Board of Education.
- f. The excess money from cutting local superintendent salaries will be put towards student programs such as special programs, extracurriculars and sports.

AB 3
Introduced by Balboa
June 29, 2015

Referred to the Assembly
Referred to Ways and Means Committee

PURPOSE: To relieve a financial burden so that parents and women will not be taxed for sanitary napkins, tampons, menstrual sponges, menstrual cups, and diapers.

TITLE: This act may be cited as the "Sanitary Necessities Tax".

SUMMARY: Sanitary napkins, tampons, menstrual sponges, menstrual cups, and diapers, will be exempt from taxes since they are necessities. These items will no longer be deemed "luxury items" since they are essential for all women and young children.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS: SECTION

1: The legislation finds and declares all of the following:

1. Necessary sanitation items – sanitary napkins, tampons, menstrual sponges, menstrual cups, and diapers – will be exempt from taxes. This will alleviate some financial burden for lower income individuals and families.
2. These items will no longer be deemed "luxury items" because they are necessities for women and young children. Making these items a necessity will increase gender equality because other "necessities" include Viagra for men.
3. Since the State will lose money on these products, the tax on alcohol and cigarettes could then be increased since it is low. Therefore, the State of California will not be losing any revenue.

AB 7
Introduced by Portole
June 29, 2015

Referred to the Assembly
Referred to Education Committee

PURPOSE: To maximize the educational opportunities and acceptance rates for California residents in the University of California (UC) and California State (Cal State) colleges after August 1st, 2017.

TITLE: This act may be cited as the “College Acceptance Act of 2017.”

SUMMARY: The University of California and California State colleges have proportionately increased their acceptance rates of out-of-state applicants in proportion to in-state applicants to maximize revenue generation opportunities from out-of-state tuition premiums. This practice unfairly reduces and limits the acceptance rates of California residents, and the taxpayers who fund the California educational institutions. As these institutions are funded by California taxpayers to serve the educational needs of California’s citizens, it is imperative that the institutions provide educational opportunities to in-state applicants at a priority over out-of-state applicants. This law would mandate a fixed acceptance rate of in-state applicants each year into each campus in the University of California and the California State college systems.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I. The legislation finds and declares all of the following:

- (a) There is a demonstrated increase in number of accepted out-of-state applicants in proportion to in-state applicants. This is because out-of-state tuition is higher than in-state tuition, and the increased tuition is favored by the UC and Cal State colleges.
- (b) By accepting more out-of-state students, UC and Cal State colleges put in-state resident applicants at an unfair and inappropriate disadvantage.
- (c) In-state residents of California pay taxes that fund the UC and Cal State colleges in California. The purpose of this is to provide higher educational opportunities to all residents in the State of California. Therefore, in-state residents should be provided the opportunity for an in-state education based on merit, and not be unfairly disadvantaged based on inappropriate administrative revenue generation biases.

SECTION II. The legislation is added to the California Education Code to read:

- (a) The College Acceptance Act of 2017 requires that 60% of the annual student admissions to each UC and Cal State colleges must be in-state residents.
- (b) Penalties for any UC or Cal State college not abiding to this bill by August 1st 2017 will result in a 1% reduction of California tax appropriations for every 1% of in-state admission rates not achieved.

AB 11

Introduced by Lassen

June 29, 2015

Referred to the Assembly
Referred to Economic Committee

PURPOSE: To provide procedures and create a committee that will oversee an active enforcement of the Equal Pay Act on or after July 1, 2017.

TITLE: This act may be cited as “California Fair Pay Act Committee”

SUMMARY: Nearly 70 years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act, women, especially those in marginalized groups, continue to experience unequal pay on all levels of work. Several different studies and statistics have shown that women continue to earn less than their male counterparts, and that gender pay inequity is still an ongoing phenomenon across various professions and industries. The U.S. Census Bureau shows that while women’s median annual earnings have continuously grown since the 1980s, they still earn roughly 80 percent of men’s annual earnings, therefore constituting a 20 percent wage gap. The Equal Pay Act and California’s Fair Pay Act have both addressed this issue and have made efforts to strengthen the legislation, but an active reinforcement of the act has yet to be made. If left alone, it will take women at least 100 more years (as per the Association of University Women’s projection) before they truly have pay equity. Creating a committee, along with active participation from both public and private employers, this act hopes to reduce the existing pay gap.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I. The legislation finds and declares all of the following:

- (a) Numerous academic studies and statistics have consistently shown that women earn less than their male counterparts. Although there is no one reason for this phenomenon, it has been widely agreed upon across academic and sociopolitical circles that gender pay inequity has and still exists.
- (b) According to the data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau, in California, women earn roughly 0.86 cents for every dollar men earn. Values may differ for various locations.
- (c) Several surveys conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, shows that the pay gap can also differ by a significant amount based on race, level of education, and age. The difference can range from about 50 percent to nearly 90% of men’s wages.
- (d) A 2014 Pew Research Center survey shows that “77% of women and 63% of men” both recognize some form of gender discrimination in their workplace.
- (e) Ever since the passage of the Fair Pay Act, women, especially those in marginalized groups, have yet to truly see a significant decrease in the gender pay gap. Creating a committee and seeking active involvement from public and private employers is believed to bring about significant change in a reasonable amount of time.

SECTION 2. This section is added to the Labor Code, to read:

- a) The California Fair Pay Act Committee will be created and ran by the California State Legislature. Appropriate funding for the committee will be settled in a separate hearing with the appropriate fiscal committees.
- b) The California Fair Pay Act Committee's primary goal is to ensure that public and private employers are properly enforcing the Fair Pay Act, attending to their workers' complaints or requests to discuss a suspected pay gap, and following the proper procedures should any conflict arise regarding a worker's wage or labor conditions.
- c) The California Fair Pay Act Committee will require private employers to submit an official transcript of their workers' wages every three to five years and submit data into database; public employers, typically government agencies, will be required to do the same.
- d) Should the committee find that an employer did not abide by the provisions of this bill, penalties for non-compliance will be:
 - i) Required to pay a fine of at least \$5,000 for each employee affected by the misconduct.
 - ii) Required to pay the employee the amount of the wages (and other benefits consequently withheld, if possible) deprived of them for the entire duration of the matter.
 - iii) If a particular employer or group of employers are found to be in violation of the aforementioned provisions for more than two occasions, they may be subject to heavier penalties, including higher fines.
- e) No employer may prevent free discussion of wages and salaries in the workplace and no employer may instate penalties, including but not limited to pay deductions and termination of employment, against free discussion of wages and salaries.
- f) This bill would pertain to any situation in which the job with the pay gap contains comparable duties for both male and female.

SECTION 3. For the purposes of this act, the following terms are defined as:

Employers, referring to public and private employers, or any such person who has the legal authority to hire a worker under proper and acceptable conditions.

Marginalized, referring to any group of individuals that are underrepresented in society.

Significant, with regards to the change in the percentage of the pay gap, refers to to any difference that is greater than or equal to 5 percent.

June 29, 2015

Referred to the Assembly
Referred to Environment Committee

PURPOSE: To protect marine wildlife sanctuaries and coastal environments from the dangers of oil drilling.

TITLE: This act may be cited as the “Marine Protection Act of 2017”

SUMMARY: Marine life are an integral part of California’s coastal environment, and some species need protection through reserves in order to survive. Our current means for protecting marine wildlife, the Marine Life Protection Act, has failed to protect marine wildlife because of the imposing presence of big name oil companies, who use these areas for means other than conservation. This law would amend the current Marine Life Protection Act by redefining the means for which a protected area can be used and would place a ban on oil drilling in or within close proximity to designated marine life protection areas.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION I.

- (a) The oil industry fracked ocean waters off the Southern California coast at least 203 times over a 20 year period, according to an Associated Press investigation in 2013. These so called “marine protected areas” are at the “discretion of the commission,” and can legally allow oil companies to engage in “specified commercial activities.”
- (b) Oil drilling is detrimental to the California coast as exhibited in the oil spill off Refugio State beach on May 19, 2017. This spill led to 21,000 gallons of oil stretching across 9 miles of the coast. Wildlife experts have counted 60 live and 161 dead seabirds and 46 live and 87 dead sea mammals to date.

SECTION 2. Section is added to the Fish and Game Code, to read:

- (1) The Marine Protection Act of 2017 prohibits petroleum companies from oil drilling in marine life protection areas or within a 100 mile radius of a marine life protection area.
- (2) The Marine Protection Act of 2017 also establishes mandatory compliance with this law. All oil companies along California’s coast may not drill for oil unless they are away from a marine life protection area.
- (3) Penalties for non-compliance to the provisions of this bill will be: Any oil company who is guilty of operating within a 100 mile radius of a marine life protection area on or after January 1, 2018 will be subject to the discretion of the court and may be fined.

June 27th, 2017 - July 1st, 2017

JR 1

Introduced by President Pro Tempore from Harte and Speaker of the Assembly from Marshall

June 27, 2017

Referred to the Senate and Assembly

Resolution

Whereas the American Legion Auxiliary has many causes that it dedicates itself to

Whereas most adults do not volunteer for extended periods of time

Whereas the food staff must satisfy 500 growing girls three times a day

Whereas the pages, clerks, and Sergeant at Arms, are effective workers who support the foundation of the legislature

Whereas the campus of Claremont McKenna hosts numerous youth groups

Whereas the Girls Staters manage various activities with little time

Therefore, be it resolved the Senate and Assembly of California Girls State, that would humbly like to express our deepest appreciation to all of the members of Girls State who have made this week unforgettable, including: American Legion Auxiliary, the counselors, the food staff, legislative staff, Claremont McKenna College, and fellow Girl Staters.