



Administration of Justice Policy Committee

2026 CSAC Legislative Conference

Wednesday, May 20, 2026 | 8:30-10:00 AM

SAFE Credit Union Convention Center | Ballroom B3

1401 K Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Supervisor Bruno Sabatier, Lake County
Supervisor Cassandra James, Solano County
Supervisor Ray Mueller, San Mateo County

AGENDA

- 8:30 AM** **I. Welcome and Introductions**
Supervisor Bruno Sabatier, Lake County
Supervisor Cassandra James, Solano County
Supervisor Ray Mueller, San Mateo County
- 8:40 AM** **II. Juvenile Justice**
Dean J. Farrah, Chief Probation Officer, Solano County
- 9:05 AM** **III. Proposition 36 (2024)**
Francine Byrne, Director, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Council of California
Randie Chance, Principal Manager, Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Council of California
Allison Haley, District Attorney, Napa County
Rachel Cardin, Lieutenant, Napa County
Shin-Mee Chang, Chief Deputy District Attorney, San Mateo County
Amanda Benson, Public Defender, Sacramento County
- 9:40 AM** **IV. Questions and Discussion**
- 9:50 AM** **V. Legislative and Budget Update**
Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate
- 10:00 AM** **VI. Adjourn**



Scan the QR code to
access materials for the
2026 CSAC Legislative
Conference

May 20, 2026

To: Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

From: Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate
Michaela Stone, Legislative Analyst**RE: Juvenile Justice**

Background. The recent history of juvenile justice in California is complex, influenced by impactful litigation, legislation, and regulatory changes. In recent years, California has generally followed national trends that allowed a more punitive approach to juvenile justice (a focus of which would eventually transition to one that centered on treatment and rehabilitation). This approach contributed to the juvenile inmate population at the state's Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) peaking in 1996. By the early 2000s, several factors coalesced that dramatically reshaped future juvenile justice policy.

Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Realignment. Originally the California Youth Authority, the DJJ operated numerous facilities and fire camps, reaching a population at one point of more than 10,000 youth housed statewide. On June 30, 2023, DJJ, which had an average daily population of roughly 600 to 700 youth over the preceding decade, ceased operations and realigned the care of these youth to counties. This meant that counties were now responsible for the vast majority of youth previously adjudicated to DJJ, which was, and remains, a population with serious offenses and intensive, expensive treatment needs. In his first budget (2019-20), Governor Newsom proposed *transferring* DJJ to a newly created, independent department within the existing California Health and Human Services Agency (CalHHS). However, this proposal was delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and then was unexpectedly and abruptly changed at the end of the 2020 legislative session to shift the entire population to counties via legislation.

Legislation

SB 823 (Chapter 337, Statutes of 2020). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Newsom's proposed plan shifted from a *proposed transfer* of DJJ to CalHHS to instead *shutter* DJJ and realign the responsibility of all youth to county probation departments under SB 823.

CSAC Officers

President
Susan Ellenberg
Santa Clara County

**1st Vice
President**
Luis Alejo
Monterey County

**2nd Vice
President**
Kent Boes
Colusa County

Past President
Jeff Griffiths
Inyo County

CEO
Graham Knaus

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 2 of 3

Additionally, SB 823 proposed to close intake at DJJ by July 1, 2021, provided counties statewide with \$225,000 per youth on an annual basis, and included a statutory formula for distribution of those funds.

SB 92 (Chapter 18, Statutes of 2021). Following SB 823's passage, a subsequent bill, SB 92, authorized counties to establish secure youth treatment facilities (SYTFs) and provided guidance on how counties adjudicate, house, and facilitate SYTF services. It also required the court to set a maximum term of confinement for the youth in an SYTF, mandated regular progress review hearings and allowed probation or the youth to make a motion to the court for transfer to a less restrictive program and required the Judicial Council to develop and adopt a matrix of offense-based classifications.

Counties are responsible for care and supervision of youth and young adults and the full juvenile justice continuum. As such, counties are required to maintain minimum standards for the detention facilities housing this population. These minimum standards are overseen by the Board of State and Community Corrections and promulgated by the regulatory process, encapsulated within Titles 15 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Simultaneously, new or recently signed juvenile justice legislation often has significant impacts on local facility operations and the delivery of probation services.

Resources:

- [AB 102](#) (Ting, Chapter 38, Statutes of 2024).
- [SB 823](#) (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 337, Statutes of 2020).
- [SB 92](#) (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 18, Statutes of 2021).
- [2022 Juvenile Titles 15 and 24 Regulations Revision](#). Board of State and Community Corrections. 2026.
 - [Title 15 Regulations Revision Text \(rev. 09/2025\)](#)
 - [Title 15 Regulations Revision Matrix \(rev. 09/2025\)](#)
 - [Title 24 Regulations Revision Text](#)
 - [Title 24 Regulations Revision Matrix](#)

Additional Resources:

- [SB 823: 2025 DJJ Realignment Report](#). Office of Youth and Community Restoration. July 2025.
- [2024 Annual Report](#). Office of Youth and Community Restoration. 2024.

CSAC Staff Contacts:

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page **3** of **3**

- Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate: rmorimune@counties.org, (916) 879-2431
- Michaela Stone, Legislative Analyst: mstone@counties.org, (916) 661-7107

May 20, 2026

To: Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

From: Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate
Michaela Stone, Legislative Analyst

RE: Proposition 36 (2024)

Overview. Proposition 36 was an initiative passed in November 2024 with approximately 68% of the vote statewide and went into effect on December 18, 2024. Composed of several elements, the proposition included the creation of a new crime, a “treatment-mandated felony” for specified repeat offenders, as well as provided general increases in penalties as well as potential sentencing enhancements for certain drug and theft offenses. While early implementation has varied across counties statewide given local capacity and needs, the primary entities involved in implementation have largely remained consistent. Each county stakeholder, which includes district attorneys, public defenders, courts, behavioral health, probation, and sheriffs, has a distinct yet overlapping role in implementation.

Funding. Counties, including CSAC affiliates, continue to call on the Legislature and Governor for sustainable funding for Proposition 36 to be included in the final 2026-27 budget spending package, and legislators in both houses have submitted budget requests to this effect. Importantly, the Budget Act of 2025 (AB 102, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2025) provided [limited] funding for the implementation. By entity, the allocations included the following:

- *\$50 million one-time funding for county behavioral health departments*, administered by the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) via non-competitive grants to counties in adherence with an allocation methodology determined by DHCS and the Judicial Council, focused on planning and capacity building, matching local funds, and other criteria to support implementation.
- *\$15 million one-time for the Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD)* to provide grants to indigent defense providers for holistic defense, although this funding was not specifically earmarked for Proposition 36 implementation.
- *\$15 million one-time for the Judicial Council to fund local pretrial services in 2025-26.* It is important to note that despite this allocation, overall probation department funding for pretrial services was reduced by \$20 million ongoing.

CSAC Officers

President
Susan Ellenberg
Santa Clara County

1st Vice President
Luis Alejo
Monterey County

2nd Vice President
Kent Boes
Colusa County

Past President
Jeff Griffiths
Inyo County

CEO
Graham Knaus

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 2 of 2

- *\$20 million one-time for the Judicial Council to distribute to trial courts for the implementation of Proposition 36 based on a methodology that ensures 50% of the funding is allocated based on each trial court's share of non-traffic misdemeanor and felony filings in 2023-24.*

As of March 2026, funding provided in the 2025 Budget Act has been distributed to impacted entities in an incremental approach. In September 2025, courts received their allocation; the DHCS Request for Information for expanding access to substance use treatment and recovery services was released on January 6, 2026, however the funding was not allocated to behavioral health departments until the end of March, despite funding being approved in the budget last summer. Most notably, the funding secured in the 2025 Budget Act did not include impacted county stakeholders beyond behavioral health.

As 2025 was the first full year that the proposition has been in effect, county departments and system partners continue to assess the funding and resource needs, as well as the full scope of progress. Nonetheless, ongoing funding for implementation remains an advocacy priority and significant topic of discussion amongst the Legislature, advocates, and service providers alike. Negotiations on whether funding for Proposition 36 will be included in the final adopted budget – and if so, how much and to which areas of county government – will continue until the June 15th deadline for the Budget Bill to be passed by both houses of the Legislature.

Resources:

- [Annual Proposition 36 Court Implementation Report](#). Judicial Council of California. March 6, 2026.
- [Criminal laws created or amended by Prop 36](#). Committee on Revision of the Penal Code. February 2025.
- [Proposition 36: Community-Based Substance Use Treatment Expansion](#). Department of Health Care Services. 2026.

CSAC Staff Contacts:

- Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate: rmorimune@counties.org, (916) 879-2431
- Michaela Stone, Legislative Analyst: mstone@counties.org, (916) 661-7107

May 20, 2026

To: Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

From: Ryan Morimune, Senior Legislative Advocate
Michaela Stone, Legislative Analyst**RE: 2026 Adopted AOJ Legislative Priorities & 2026 Public Safety Legislation**

The following are legislative priorities for the AOJ Policy Committee, as adopted at the 2025 CSAC Annual Meeting in Santa Clara County on December 2, 2025. Each year at the CSAC Annual Meeting, policy committee members discuss, and then adopt, legislative priorities that help guide the next year's advocacy efforts. This is separate from the adoption of the CSAC legislative platform, which occurs every two years, prior to the start of the two-year legislative session. Thus, the CSAC legislative platform will be revisited for discussion this summer/fall of 2026.

Please note that the list of bills below does not reflect all legislation that the AOJ staff is tracking. If you would like to learn more about AOJ legislation and positions, please visit CSAC's [legislative tracking](https://www.counties.org/policy-issues/bill-report/) tool (<https://www.counties.org/policy-issues/bill-report/>) and reach out directly to assigned CSAC staff.

2026 Adopted AOJ Legislative Priorities**Proposition 36 (2024) Implementation**

Counties are implementing Proposition 36 (2024), which looks different across counties based on local capacity needs, regional crime trends, and prosecutorial action. While some counties have seen higher levels of theft offenses charged under the proposition, other counties have seen higher levels of drug offenses charged. The 2025 Budget Act included \$100 million one-time General Fund that may be used for the implementation of Proposition 36. However, CSAC has made it clear that only \$70 million is directly tied to Proposition 36-related services, \$50 million of which is for county behavioral health departments and not other impacted county departments. Ultimately, successful implementation to meet the will of the voters is dependent on consistent coordination amongst stakeholders, funding stability, and tracking consistent data.

CSAC Officers**President**
Susan Ellenberg
Santa Clara County**1st Vice
President**
Luis Alejo
Monterey County**2nd Vice
President**
Kent Boes
Colusa County**Past President**
Jeff Griffiths
Inyo County**CEO**
Graham Knaus

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 2 of 11

Victims of Crime Act (VOCA)

The California 2025 Budget Act included \$100 million General Fund one-time to supplement the federal Victims of Crime Act (VOCA), with \$97 million allocated for grants and \$3 million allocated for grant administration administered by the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES). This built upon the previous year's efforts to secure \$103 million General Fund one-time for crime victims across California. In both years, CSAC, in collaboration with a broad coalition of over 250 victims' rights groups and direct service providers, advocated for this critical funding to be ongoing, rather than one-time, due to the consistent decline in federal revenues for VOCA through the Crime Victims Fund. In addition to state advocacy, CSAC also focused on federal efforts, joining Congressional coalition letters calling for the distribution of VOCA grants and the sustained maintenance of VOCA funding through the annual appropriations bills. CSAC will continue to drive similar state and federal advocacy efforts in 2026.

Indigent Defense

All criminal defendants are guaranteed the right to legal counsel per the 6th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and in California, counties have a unique responsibility to provide indigent defense. In 33 counties, this is provided by an institutional county public defender's office, whereas other counties utilize alternative models, such as contract systems. Counties establish a method of defense service provision that best suits their local resources and capacity. The State Legislature, advocacy organizations, research bureaus, and other arms of government have increasingly focused on this subject in recent years. We anticipate this will continue, presenting challenges for counties with little to no state financial support. CSAC will continue to advocate for county authority and flexibility and urge the state to allocate necessary funding for counties to uphold their constitutional mandate and improve the quality of defense, regardless of the county and indigent defense system in place.

Juvenile Justice

On June 30, 2023, the state's Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) ceased operations and realigned the care of incarcerated youth to counties. Those previously adjudicated to DJJ had the most serious criminal backgrounds and intensive treatment needs. Since DJJ's closure, counties are required to provide wrap-around services, programming, specialized treatment, maintain and increase staffing where necessary, in addition to improving correctional design and creating additional space within existing facilities, all while facing continual changes via legislation and proposed Title 15 and Title 24 regulations through the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). CSAC will continue its advocacy to ensure counties have the

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 3 of 11

necessary funding, resources, and flexibility to meet the public safety needs of all communities, as well as all justice-involved youth and young adults under county care.

Felony Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) Growth Cap & Penalty Program

Over the past few years, CSAC, alongside county affiliates and partners, have advocated for substantial changes to the California Department of State Hospitals' (DSH) IST growth cap and penalty program. While our advocacy efforts spurred changes with regards to how county penalties are calculated, the number of counties exceeding their growth cap has increased. Additionally, the existing tiered penalty rate structure, which sunsets in 2026-27, will inevitably result in higher penalty amounts for many counties. Given these ongoing concerns with the program and its impact on counties statewide, CSAC will continue to advocate for changes that will better equip counties to serve this population prior to criminal justice involvement. We will also continue to be engaged with any legislation and budget items that affect local systems and the IST population that are served by counties.

California Advancing and Innovating Medi-Cal Justice-Involved Initiative (CalAIM JI)

In January 2023, California became the first state in the nation to receive approval of the Section 1115 waiver to begin providing specified Medicaid services in adult and youth correctional facilities. This multi-pronged initiative endeavors to facilitate the continuous provision of healthcare services to individuals transitioning out of correctional settings; extensive readiness assessments and cross-departmental coordination are required to be approved prior to implementation. As counties continue to implement this program alongside various system stakeholders, CSAC will continue to provide ongoing updates and guidance from the state, convene counties for vital information sharing and learning opportunities, and advocate for adequate, long-term funding necessary for successful implementation of the CalAIM JI initiative. Notably, this waiver is in effect through December 2026. Due to unprecedented federal uncertainty, CSAC will keep counties updated with funding opportunities and waiver renewal discussions continue. Other waivers will remain in place through their effective dates.

2026 Public Safety Legislation

- **[AB 690 \(Schultz\)](#) Criminal procedure: indigent defense compensation.**

CSAC position: *Oppose*

Status: *Senate Appropriations Committee*

This two-year measure would impose several significant changes to the contracts overseen by boards of supervisors regarding the administration and provision of

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 4 of 11

indigent defense services, a constitutional requirement of California counties. Specific changes proposed by the measure include a blanket prohibition on the use of flat fees, as specified, as well as compliance with newly established and expansive standards. Taken together, these changes will limit counties' ability to secure contracts and provide critically important, adequate quality, indigent representation. CSAC opposed this measure alongside the Urban Counties of California (UCC) and the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC) in 2025. The bill is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee and, as of late spring 2026, is now expected to continue moving forward in the legislative process as it was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee last August.

- **[AB 1549 \(Krell\)](#) Alternative domestic violence program.**

CSAC position: *Co-Sponsor*

Status: *Senate Public Safety Committee*

This measure extends existing pilot authority for six counties – Napa, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Yolo – to offer an alternative domestic violence batterer's intervention program until July 1, 2030, as the current authority expires on July 1, 2026. This measure would also add Sacramento County to the list of currently authorized counties able to offer alternative programming. CSAC is co-sponsoring this measure alongside the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) and the California District Attorneys Association (CDAA).

- **[SB 926 \(Strickland\)](#) Public safety: Funding of Proposition 36 Act.**

CSAC position: *Support*

Status: *Held in Appropriations Committee*

This measure establishes the California Public Safety Services Fund. Upon appropriation, the Board of State and Community Corrections would administer an equitable grant program for the ongoing implementation and administration of Proposition 36 (2024). Entities eligible to receive funding are specified in the measure, and include county behavioral health departments, probation, county jails, and counties for administration. Additionally, this measure requires the Governor to include annual General Fund transfers to the California Public Safety Services Fund in each January budget proposal at an amount sufficient to fund the ongoing administration of the proposition.

- **[AB 2605 \(Arambula\)](#) State Public Defender: county public defenders: data collection.**

CSAC position: *Removed opposition with May 18 amendments*

Status: *Assembly Floor*

This measure proposes that counties collect specified information with regards to indigent defense and report to the Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD) every two years — (1) Type of primary and conflict public defense systems used; (2) Method and timing of case assignment; (3) Budget and expenditures on public defense; (4) Funded and filled public defense positions by type; and (5) The number of cases assigned to the public defense system, which the OSPD will make publicly available on their website. The author's office agreed to our proposed amendments ensuring that the bill's requirements are contingent upon appropriation of funds from the Legislature.

Juvenile Justice

- **[SB 1157 \(Archuleta\)](#) Juveniles: secure youth treatment facilities: less restrictive programs.**

Status: *Senate Floor*

This measure requires the Judicial Council to develop guidelines to assist courts in determining whether a less restrictive program (LRP) is an appropriate placement for a ward, with potential LRPs codified in existing statutes. Courts would consider specified information (for example: insurance coverage) when determining placement suitability.

- **[AB 1646 \(Bryan\)](#) Juvenile facilities: visitation.**

Status: *Assembly Floor*

Titled the *Hugs Act*, this measure would require all youth confined in a juvenile detention facility to have the right to engage in specified nonsexual physical contact during in person visits, and facilities would be required to establish regulations and procedures to this effect. The act specifies nonsexual physical contact to include hand holding and hugging at the beginning and end of visits.

- **[AB 1647 \(Bryan\)](#) Juveniles: transfer to criminal court: criminal procedure.**

Status: *Senate Public Safety Committee*

This measure prohibits statements made by a minor during either a transfer hearing or to their probation officer from being used against them in subsequent juvenile or criminal legal proceedings for that offense. Notably, the bill does not prohibit any statements made by a minor at a transfer hearing or to their probation officer from being used at sentencing.

- **[AB 1902 \(Pellerin\)](#) Secure youth treatment facilities.**

Status: *Assembly Floor*

This measure modifies the process by which a court may order continued detention of an individual beyond their date of discharge from a secure youth treatment facility (SYTF) based on a finding that the individual poses a public threat to safety and is physically dangerous, amongst other changes.

- **[SB 1009 \(Becker\)](#) Juveniles: detention.**

Status: *Senate Floor*

This measure generally would require minors to be released from custody unless clear and convincing evidence indicates that the individual committed certain, specified violations, and would prohibit the removal of a minor from the physical custody of their parent or guardian unless the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that a less restrictive alternative disposition for the ward is unsuitable. Additionally, this measure provides limited situations, facilities (including a secure youth treatment facility), and timeframes in which a ward may be detained.

- **[AB 1886 \(Elhawary\)](#) Wards: probation.**

Status: *Assembly Floor*

Existing law provides exclusions from existing statutes that generally limit probation terms to 12 months for specified youth. This measure specifically removes the existing exclusion of wards that have been ordered to be under the supervision of probation for placement in specified out-of-home placements from the 12-month probation term limit.

- **[AB 1959 \(Patel\)](#) Juvenile justice.**

Status: *Assembly Floor*

Authorizes a district attorney to make a motion to transfer a minor from juvenile to adult court if the individual was previously convicted as an adult for a crime committed while 14 or 15 years of age and is now subject to resentencing by the juvenile court following a grant of recall under the life without possibility of parole (LWOP) resentencing statute.

Conservatorship

- **[SB 1221 \(Stern\)](#) Lanterman-Petris-Short Act: conservatorships.**

Status: *Held in Appropriations Committee*

This measure authorizes district attorneys to participate in specified conservatorship proceedings and allows district attorneys to challenge certain public conservator

determinations. It also authorizes counties with populations of 750,000 or greater to prioritize Department of State Hospital placements, as well as includes county detention facilities as a temporary placement of conservatees on an interim basis.

Criminal Procedure

- **[AB 1958 \(Kalra\)](#) Criminal procedure: discrimination.**

Status: *Assembly Floor*

Existing law establishes the Racial Justice Act (RJA), which prohibits the state from seeking or obtaining a criminal conviction or seeking, obtaining or imposing a sentence on the basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin. This measure clarifies and expands the process by which a defendant may show evidence they were charged or convicted of a more serious offense than other similarly situated defendants of a different race, ethnicity, or national origin.

- **[SB 1401 \(Stern\)](#) Criminal procedure: competence to stand trial.**

Status: *Senate Floor*

Specifies timeframes for the dismissal of charges for a felony incompetent to stand trial (IST) defendant, who is ineligible for mental health diversion, and referred to one of several specified programs: assertive outpatient treatment, conservatorship, or CARE Court. It also authorizes a county behavioral health agency and jail medical provider to share certain medical information with the court for the purpose of determining the likelihood of eligibility for behavioral health services and programs, and allows referral of a misdemeanor IST defendant to the county conservatorship investigator in the county of commitment for possible conservatorship proceedings if the defendant appears to be gravely disabled in the opinion of the court or a qualified mental health expert.

County Coroner

- **[SB 1379 \(Cervantes\)](#) County of Riverside: separation of county offices: in-custody reports.**

Status: *Assembly pending referral*

Requires the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to separate the offices of sheriff and coroner by July 1, 2027, specifies requirements for medicolegal death investigations, and requires the publishing of certain data and information publicly.

- **[SB 1427 \(Committee on Public Safety\)](#) Public safety: omnibus.**

Status: *Assembly pending referral*

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 8 of 11

The annual committee omnibus bill typically includes various updates, clean-up, and non-controversial changes to current statute. As part of this year's omnibus bill, CSAC was able to get clarifying language included as a follow-up to [AB 1108](#) (Chapter 389, Statutes of 2025), which prohibits a county that has a combined Sheriff-Coroner office from conducting cause of death determinations for in-custody deaths and instead require that in-custody deaths be referred to an independent county coroner, a medical examiner, or a third-party provider for medical examination services. We proposed an amendment to ensure that boards and counties do not have to annually solicit contracts for independent coroner services. Should this measure be signed into law, it will save time, resources, and potentially reduce contractual costs since they will not be one-year contracts.

Diversion

- [AB 46 \(Nguyen\) Diversion](#).

Status: Senate Floor

This measure makes numerous changes to the mental health diversion law, including but not limited to: providing that the court has discretion to grant or deny diversion in all cases; that the defendant must have been diagnosed, or re-diagnosed, with a mental disorder within five years prior to the offense for the mental disorder presumption to apply; requires a qualified mental health expert opine that the proposed mental health diversion plan is clinically appropriate; requires that the defendant will not pose a substantial and undue risk to physical safety of those in the community; amongst other requirements when determining suitability for mental health diversion.

Indigent Defense

- [AB 1962 \(Hart\) California Indigent Defense Commission](#).

Status: Not moved by author

This measure remains in intent form and will not be moving forward in this legislative session. Its intent statement indicates that the bill would have proposed the creation of the *California Indigent Defense Commission*, an entity responsible for ensuring that indigent defense services meet constitutional and professional standards.

Corrections

- [AB 2257 \(Hart\) Corrections: jail administrators](#).

Status: Assembly Floor

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 9 of 11

Authorizes boards of supervisors to establish a department of corrections and rehabilitation and appoint an executive officer to oversee operations and staffing, as well as require the board to set forth its reasons for establishing the department.

- **[AB 2727 \(Nguyen\)](#) Corrections: parole and prerelease treatment.**

Status: Assembly Floor

This measure prohibits those convicted of certain specified offenses from suitability under the existing Elderly Parole Program but *would allow* parole once an individual attains 65 years of age *and* has served a minimum of 25 years of continuous incarceration on their current sentence. This measure also would revise criteria for eligibility of *indeterminately* sentenced, sexually violent predators (SVPs) to be referred to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) for evaluation pre-release and would allow this referral to occur within 4 months of anticipated parole. Current law generally provides referrals to DSH for evaluation for *determinately* sentenced SVPs within 6 months of their anticipated parole date.

Immigration

- **[SB 747 \(Wiener\)](#) Civil rights: deprivation of federal constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities.**

Status: Assembly Judiciary Committee

This measure establishes the "No Kings Act" which provides a cause of action against government officials when one's constitutional rights have been violated. It also provides a statutory pathway to sue any local, state, or federal official under the U.S. Constitution and authorizes fees and costs to be applied retroactively.

- **[SB 1105 \(Pérez\)](#) Law enforcement.**

Status: Senate Floor

As specified, this measure restricts the arrest authority *or* peace officer status for federal criminal investigators, law enforcement officers, and federal employees, and prohibits a law enforcement agency from entering into an interagency agreement if the activities include racial or identity profiling. Any existing interagency agreements would be required to undergo revisions to specifically prohibit racial and identity profiling.

- **[SB 1004 \(Wiener\)](#) Law enforcement: masks.**

Status: Assembly pending referral

This measure clarifies that state employed peace officers are indeed subject to existing state law prohibiting facial coverings while on duty and includes certain exemptions.

- **[AB 1801 \(Lee\)](#) **Public agencies: approval: detention facilities.****

Status: *Senate Judiciary*

This measure revises and recasts existing laws that generally prohibit a public entity from issuing a permit to a private corporation or contractor for purposes of civil immigration proceedings without first providing public notice at least 180 days prior to the execution of a permit. As such, this bill proposes prohibiting specified entities, including public agencies, from approving or executing documents indicating approval for the building or reuse of existing buildings for purposes of civil immigration custody before a public review period, public access to related documents, and at least two minimum opportunities for public comment. Included in the language are specific noticing requirements.

- **[AB 1627 \(Ávila Farías\)](#) **Public employment: disqualifications.****

Status: *Assembly Floor*

Clarifies that previously employed peace officers who are listed in the National Decertification Index of the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training, or other databases designated by the federal government, whose certification was revoked for misconduct, are disqualified from employment as a peace officer in California.

- **[SB 938 \(Menjivar\)](#) **Peace officers: qualifications.****

Status: *Senate Floor*

Prohibits an individual from being employed as a peace officer if they were previously employed as a sworn law enforcement officer by an entity engaging in immigration enforcement, or those who personally assisted in immigration enforcement, after January 2025. Additionally, this measure requires a minimum ten-year cooling-off period prior to a disqualified individual applying for eligibility, and provides for limited exemptions

- **[AB 1896 \(González\)](#) **Public employment: disqualifications.****

Status: *Assembly Floor*

This measure disqualifies an individual from being a peace officer or from public employment because they were employed by an entity that engages in immigration enforcement activities during specified timeframes.

Administration of Justice (AOJ) Policy Committee

May 20, 2026

Page 11 of 11

- **[AB 1605 \(Ransom\)](#) Driving under the influence: alcohol sales.**

Status: *Held in Appropriations Committee*

Authorizes a court, when granting probation, to prohibit alcohol purchases if a related offense occurred within ten years of two or more offenses. It also requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to issue identification cards with special designations indicating a prohibition on alcohol sales for that individual.

- **[SB 907 \(Archuleta\)](#) Driving under the influence and other driving offenses: comprehensive reform.**

Status: *Senate Floor*

This measure expands the existing definition of a violent felony to include vehicular manslaughter, as well as providing various sentencing enhancements for reckless driving and driving under the influence related offenses.