
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR, PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT
Senator Dave Cortese, Chair
2023 - 2024 Regular

Bill No:	SB 799	Hearing Date:	September 13, 2023
Author:	Portantino		
Version:	August 22, 2023		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Alma Perez-Schwab		

SUBJECT: Unemployment insurance: trade disputes: eligibility for benefits

KEY ISSUE

Should the Legislature permit workers involved in a trade dispute to collect unemployment insurance (UI) benefits while they are on strike?

ANALYSIS

Existing law:

- 1) Creates a comprehensive Unemployment Insurance (UI) system, administered by the Employment Development Department (EDD), where employers pay an experienced-based tax on total payroll that are used to fund UI benefits to unemployed workers. (UI Code §§ 301, 602, 675, 926, 970, 977 & 1251)
- 2) Defines a worker as “unemployed” in any week in which they meet any of the following conditions:
 - a) Any week during which they perform no services and with respect to which no wages are payable to them;
 - b) Any week of less than full-time work, if the wages payable to them with respect to the week, when reduced by \$25 or 25% of the wages payable, whichever is greater, do not equal or exceed the worker’s weekly benefit;
 - c) Any week for which, a worker is unable to work due to mental or physical health illness or injury, as specified; or,
 - d) Any week during which they perform full-time work for five days as a juror, or as a witness under subpoena. (UI Code §1252)
- 3) Provides that an individual is disqualified for UI benefits if the individual left their most recent work voluntarily without good cause or that they have been discharged for misconduct connected with their most recent work. (UI Code §1256)

- 4) Provides that an individual is not eligible for UI benefits if the individual left their work because of a trade dispute. The individual shall remain ineligible for the period during which they continue out of work because of the fact that the trade dispute is still in active progress. (UI Code §1262)
- 5) Provides that, when EDD learns that a trade dispute is in progress, EDD must promptly conduct an investigation and make investigation findings as to the nature, location, labor organizations and employers involved, and other relevant facts it deems necessary. EDD shall provide its findings to its field offices in locations affected by the trade dispute, and must, upon request, make its findings available to any employer, employers' association or labor organization involved in the trade dispute. (UI Code §1262.5)

This bill:

- 1) Permits individuals involved in a trade dispute, other than a lockout, to be eligible to collect UI benefits after a two-week waiting period.
- 2) Defines "lockout" to mean any refusal by an employer to permit any group of five or more employees to work as a result of a dispute with such employees affecting wages, hours or other terms or conditions of employment of such employees.
- 3) Codifies a California Supreme Court Decision (*Coast Packing Co. v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board* (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 76) that found individuals who were deprived of work as a result of an employer lockout or similar action eligible for UI benefits.

COMMENTS**1. Background on the Unemployment Insurance Program:**

Created in 1935 as part of the Social Security Act of 1935, the UI program is a unique federal-state program, created by federal law and administered under state and federal laws by state employees. UI provides weekly benefits, for up to a maximum of 26 weeks, unless extended by law, to workers who are unemployed (or underemployed) through no fault of their own and who are able to, available for and actively seeking work. Eligibility for UI benefits is set by law and administered by California's Employment Development Department (EDD).

Claimant Benefit Calculations

A claimant's eligibility for benefits depends on their attachment to the labor force determined by computing a minimum earnings test. This requirement denies benefits to claimants whose earnings in a 12-month "base period" are below a specified minimum. The quarter in which the highest wages were received determines the weekly benefit amount. UI benefits range from \$40 to a maximum of \$450 per week. In 2022, the average benefit amount was \$342 per week. The United States total for the 12 month average of weekly benefit amounts ranged from \$352.67 to \$401.44.¹

¹ U.S. Department of Labor, State UI Program Data, US totals <https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/claimssum/5159report.asp>

Financing Structure

The UI program is financed by employers who pay unemployment taxes on the first \$7,000 in wages paid to each worker. The tax rates are set based on schedules laid out in state law, which require higher rates, up to a maximum of 6.2 percent, when the condition of the UI trust fund is poor.² Working much like other insurance programs, the actual tax rate varies for each employer, depending in part on the amount of UI benefits paid to former employees. Referred to as being “experience rated,” this method of taxing ensures that employers who lay off or otherwise discharge more workers bear more of the costs of paying for the UI system. An employer may earn a lower tax rate when fewer claims are made on the employer's account by former employees.

It is important to remember that UI benefits only provide up to a maximum of \$450 a week. Considering the median weekly income of a Californian is roughly triple that amount, a worker is not likely to be incentivized to go on strike simply because they can get UI benefits.

Because UI is “experience rated,” striking workers who claim UI benefits impact their employer’s UI tax rate for that year and not the rates of other employers. The UI system as a whole, however, faces insolvency which impacts all employers and a remedy for this long-standing problem has yet to be addressed. (Please see section 3 and 4 below)

2. COVID-19 Pandemic and EDD:

The COVID-19 pandemic and the shutdown orders to mitigate the spread of the virus lead to a dramatic increase in unemployment beginning in March 2020. Millions of Californians were left unemployed and in critical need of assistance to replace some of the income in which they relied to pay for essentials. Supplemental benefits authorized by the federal CARES Act, including Pandemic Unemployment Assistance and Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation, further increased the volume and dollar amount of payments. By April 2020, the unemployment rate had surpassed previous peaks observed during the Great Recession. At its peak, the unemployment rate in California reached 16% in April 2020. According to EDD, since March 2020, 30.1 million UI claims have been filed and EDD has paid more than \$190 billion in UI benefits.

EDD struggled to service this unprecedented volume of claims and because of the new populations of unemployed individuals eligible for UI under the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance program (the self-employed), EDD was exposed to a range of fraudulent activity. Under scrutiny for its handling of claims and ensuing fraudulent activity, EDD has been the subject of several State Auditor reports, Legislative Analyst’s Office reports and a Governor directed EDD Strike Team to set a path for needed reforms at EDD. In addition, the Legislature held several oversight hearings on the department and passed, and the Governor signed, numerous bills that addressed the various issues facing EDD. EDD has begun implementing many of the recommendations put forth by the various reports and teams.

3. UI Trust Fund Status:

² Alamo, Chas. “Repaying the State’s Federal Unemployment Insurance Loan,” Legislative Analyst’s Office, May 26, 2021. <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4442>

Due to the sudden and immense impact of COVID-19, the UI Fund became temporarily insolvent on April 29, 2020, and fluctuated in and out of solvency until maintaining a deficit starting June 3, 2020. As a result, in 2020, California began borrowing from the federal government to pay regular UI benefits, and ended the year with a federal loan balance of \$17.8 billion. The loan balance is estimated to be \$20.3 billion by the end of 2024.³

In order to repay the principal on the federal loan, federal law imposes a tax increase on employers, referred to as the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA) credit reduction. This happens when a state UI Fund is in deficit for two consecutive years. Once this occurs, the state loses 0.3 percent of the FUTA tax credit each year, which is the equivalent of an increase in federal taxes of \$21 per worker per year. Despite a loan balance at the end of 2020, the FUTA tax credit reduction was not assessed in that year as California had not been in deficit for two consecutive years. The FUTA credit reductions started occurring for tax year 2022, with the higher federal taxes due in January 2023. An estimation of \$423 million in 2023 and \$872 million in 2024 are expected to be collected.⁴

According to the LAO, “As the administration expects the underlying gap to worsen faster than the federal surcharge revenues increase, the annual fund imbalance is expected to continue despite federal payroll tax surcharges. Consequently, the administration expects the outstanding federal UI loan balance to increase by more than \$1 billion over the two-year period, from \$19 billion in 2022 to \$20.3 billion in 2024. The state pays the interest on these loans from the General Fund. This interest payment is expected to be about \$300 million in 2023-24.”⁵ The federal loan is not expected to be paid off until between 2030 and 2032, depending on low and high-cost scenarios. In 2022, the Legislature passed and signed AB 178 (Chapter 45, Statutes of 2022) which, among other things, included a \$250 million appropriation from the General Fund to go towards paying down some of the federal UI loan.

4. How does California’s taxable wage base compare to other states?

According to the United States Department of Labor (US DOL), almost all states have adopted a higher taxable wage base than applicable under FUTA (\$7,000) for purposes of assessing state UI taxes. Some states have established flexible taxable wage bases that are automatically adjusted, generally on an annual basis. According to the US DOL, most of these states index the taxable wage base to the state’s average annual wage. Other states tie the taxable wage base to the health of the state’s trust fund balance.

California, however, has neither a taxable wage base above \$7,000 nor a provision in law that automatically adjusts the taxable wage base if FUTA is amended to apply to a higher amount.⁶ In reviewing the US DOL data comparisons, it appears that Washington is the state with the highest taxable wage base at \$62,500. At the lower end, California shares the lowest \$7,000 taxable wage base with Tennessee, Arizona, Florida, Puerto Rico and Louisiana at

³ EDD May 2023 UI Fund Forecast

⁴ Employment Development Department: May 2023 Unemployment Insurance (UI) Fund Forecast.
<https://edd.ca.gov/siteassets/files/pdf/edduiforecastmay23.pdf>

⁵ Alamo, Chas. “New Unemployment Insurance Fund Forecast Shows Imbalance,” Legislative Analyst’s Office, July 7, 2023.
<https://lao.ca.gov/LAOEconTax/article/Detail/779>

⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, Comparison of State Unemployment Laws 2022. Chapter 2 – Financing, 2-4 and 2-5.
<https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/pdf/uilawcompar/2022/complete.pdf>

\$7,700.⁷ According to the US DOL, besides the U.S. Virgin Islands, California's trust fund was the least adequately funded of all 53 UI programs heading into the pandemic.⁸

5. Other Challenges and Changes Facing EDD:

EDD – High-Risk Agency:

Unfortunately, EDD continues to face scrutiny and on August 24, 2023, as part of its State High-Risk Audit Program, the California State Auditor included EDD as a “new high-risk agency.” According to the State Auditor, EDD is on the list “because of its mismanagement of the UI program. Specifically, EDD is unable to reliably estimate improper payments under the UI program, thus adversely affecting the State’s financial statements as well as impairing efforts to independently evaluate the efficacy of EDD’s own fraud prevention activities. Further, EDD needs to improve customer service to unemployment insurance claimants, while also taking steps to ensure its eligibility decisions are not frequently overturned on appeal. EDD’s mismanagement of the UI program has resulted in a substantial risk of serious detriment to the State and its residents.”⁹

EDD disagreed with the classification citing compliance with all the State Auditor recommendations and notes, “The Auditor’s risk scenarios in this high-risk report do not reflect the fraud prevention measures in place today and instead reflect outdated challenges that impacted the department at the height of the pandemic. EDD’s significant advancements and enhancements to its fraud prevention and detection measures have proven highly effective in safeguarding benefit payments from fraudsters.”¹⁰

EDDNext System Modernization:

Additionally, as noted by the Assembly Insurance Committee analysis of this bill, “EDD is currently in the middle of a multi-year project called “EDDNext.” EDDNext is a full system modernization of EDD that is expected to take at least five years to fully implement. The project is currently in its second year. The purpose of EDDNext is to create a user-centric and secure technology environment to support timely and quality service to California’s workers. EDDNext includes updates to online applications, call centers, the claims process, policies, procedures, and forms.

It is unclear if any changes to UI eligibility requirements, such as the ones sought by this bill, would impact the rollout of EDDNext and how long it would take EDD to make system changes to add new classifications (i.e. striking workers).”

6. Similar Laws in New York & New Jersey:

As noted by the Assembly Insurance Committee analysis on this bill, “New York and New Jersey are currently the only two states that allow individuals on strike to collect UI benefits. In 2020, New York reduced the amount of time an employee has to be on strike before they can begin collecting unemployment, from seven weeks to 14 days. In 2018, New Jersey

⁷ U.S. Department of Labor, Comparison of State Unemployment Laws 2022. Chapter 2 – Financing, 2-5.
<https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/pdf/uilawcompar/2022/complete.pdf>

⁸ U.S. Department of Labor, “State Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund Solvency Report 2020,”
<https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/docs/trustFundSolvReport2020.pdf>

⁹ <http://auditor.ca.gov/reports/2023-601/index.html#section2>

¹⁰ <http://auditor.ca.gov/reports/2023-601/index.html#section5>

enacted a law allowing striking workers to collect UI benefits. Recently, that law was amended to decrease the waiting period from 30 days to 14 days.”

New York Telephone Company v. New York State Department of Labor:

The issue of striking workers receiving UI and whether it complies with federal law was the subject of a lawsuit and eventual 1979 SCOTUS decision. In 1971, the Communication Workers of America recommended a nationwide strike when negotiations for a labor contract with Bell Telephone Company and affiliated companies had reached an impasse. The strike began on July 14, 1971, and lasted only a week for most workers. In New York, however, the 38,000 union members employed by the New York Telephone Company remained on strike for seven months. After an eight-week period, the striking employees began to collect unemployment insurance benefits.

The employer sued the New York State Department of Labor arguing that the New York provision authorizing the payment of UI benefits to strikers was in conflict with Federal labor law and was, therefore, invalid.¹¹ The District Court granted the relief sought, holding that the benefits paid had a measurable impact on the strike's progress, and their payment conflicted "with the policy of free collective bargaining established in the Federal labor laws and was, therefore, invalid under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution."

The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed, upon appeal, noting that Congress had not expressly forbidden State unemployment benefits for strikers. In 1979, the U.S. Supreme Court, upon further appeal, affirmed the Court of Appeals decision agreeing that the National Labor Relations Act does not preempt the New York law.

Opponents of this measure note that this decision preceded (and therefore did not consider) the recent 2012 change to federal law enacted by the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation (Public Law 112-96, February 22, 2012) which required claimants to “be able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work’ in order to qualify for benefits.”

7. California’s Hot Labor Summer:

Dubbed as the “hot labor summer,” the past couple of months in California have been challenging for many workers who are taking action and striking against their employers demanding higher wages and better working conditions. With dozens of strikes since May covering a wide range of industries, from Hollywood writers and actors, university employees to city and hospital workers, the impact of strikes is being felt across the state.

According to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), from 2012-2022, there were at least 56 strikes in California with only two that lasted over two weeks. BLS tracks strikes where at least 1,000 workers participated. The two strikes that lasted over two weeks both occurred in 2022, with one lasting 64 days total (Kaiser Permanente 8/15/22 to 10/18/22) and the other lasting 39 days total (University of California 11/14/22 to 12/23/22).¹² Currently, the Writers Guild of America members have been on strike since May 2023 and members of SAG-AFTRA have been on strike since July 2023.

¹¹ *New York Telephone Company, et al v. New York State Department of Labor, et al*, (U.S. Supreme Court, No. 77-961, 1979).

¹² U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, <https://www.bls.gov/web/wkstp/monthly-listing.htm>.

The National Employment Law Project, after analyzing the potential impact of this bill, found that expanding UI to striking workers whose employers have been paying into the UI trust fund on their behalf will not change California's longstanding UI trust fund crisis. They note "that the number of potentially eligible striking workers simply pales in comparison to the overall pool of UI claimants, including the 157,000 workers who are, on average, laid off each month.¹³ For context, in 2022, California paid out nearly \$5 billion in regular state UI benefits to 890,000 workers.¹⁴ In comparison, from 2012 to 2022, there were only two strikes that lasted over two weeks.¹⁵ Additionally, it is highly unlikely that all eligible striking workers would receive UI. In 2022, only 43% of California's unemployed workers received UI.¹⁶"

8. Need for this bill?

According to the author, "There is tremendous concern within our workforce across California. Currently, we see writers, hotel workers, nurses, city and county workers all striking, and it is deeply concerning. It's better for the worker and the economy to have job security and a seat at the table as we negotiate the future of the workforce, while business and economic models change. Even coming out of a strike, when folks eventually get a contract that they agree on, their families have suffered during this time. SB 799 will help workers put food on their table when they need it most, in the middle of a labor negotiation."

9. Proponent Arguments:

According to proponents, "Workers have gone on strike in part because of the intransigence of employers to come to fair and reasonable agreements. The entertainment industry employers, represented by the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers (AMPTP), have made it clear that they are willing to exploit workers' financial precarity in order to break the strike. One studio executive was quoted saying the employer's strategy is to "allow things to drag on until union members start losing their apartments and losing their houses." Another executive doubled down on that strategy calling it "a cruel but necessary evil.""

Proponents further argue that, "The decision to go on strike is not one that union members take lightly. Striking workers lose all income for the duration of their job action. Workers deplete their savings as bills pile up, rent and mortgages go unpaid, and debt accumulates. Corporations rely on the expectation that striking workers will have few resources, and their strategy is often to starve workers until they give up their demands for better wages, fair compensation, and job security."

In response to opponent arguments, they write, "the opposition, claims that this bill will extend tax increases on all employers, but that is due to the existing UI debt caused by the structural insolvency of our system. UI benefits are generally charged to an individual employer, not the system overall. Employers that drag out strikes to force workers from their homes and into debt would bear any increase in UI taxes, not all employers."

¹³ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, https://bls.gov/regions/west/news-release/jobopeningslaborturnover_california.htm.

¹⁴ U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Data, Benefits Paid Reports, https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/data_summary/DataSummTable.asp.

¹⁵ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, <https://bls.gov/web/wkstp/monthly-listing.htm>

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Chartbook, "Reciprocity Rates by State," <https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/chartbook.asp>.

Lastly, they argue that, “As long as striking workers are ineligible for UI benefits, the State is giving employers a weapon against the interests of workers, their families, and communities. The prohibition on striking workers receiving UI enables employers to wait out a strike, hoping that the precarious financial situation of their workers, many of whom will face inability to stay in their homes, loss of health care, and strangling debt, will lead to a swifter end to the strike.”

10. Opponent Arguments:

A coalition of employers, including the California Chamber of Commerce, are opposed to the measure arguing that it would effectively require employers to subsidize striking workers, even if those workers or labor strikes had nothing to do with the employer. They argue that giving striking workers the ability to claim unemployment will add the cost of those benefits to California’s outstanding loans. They note that, though the amount that such strikes would add to the UI Fund debt is hard to calculate specifically – due to uncertainty as to how many strikes occur, how long they last, and how many workers take part – they “estimate that, if SB 799 had been in effect during the previous twelve months, it would have added approximately \$215 million to the UI Fund’s debt. Additionally, we would expect it to add approximately \$30 million per week if it were in effect now.” Furthermore, they write that, “SB 799 will also add to the state’s general fund obligation regarding the UI Fund. For example, in 2023-2024, the interest payment is expected to cost the state approximately \$300 million – and similar payments will continue until the UI Fund returns to solvency.”

Additionally, they argue that, “SB 799 creates a fundamental unfairness by forcing employers with *absolutely no involvement in any* strikes to pay for labor disputes that *they have no involvement in*. As noted above, UI Fund loans from the federal government are paid off via tax increases on all employers across the state – not just employers who have striking workers. Though individual strikes will have different facts – some caused by unreasonableness on one side of a negotiation, some caused by new technology or new conditions – they are part of a negotiation between two parties. Taking money from every other employer in the state (small employers included) and forcing those uninvolved parties to pay the costs of one side of a labor dispute is profoundly unfair.”

Regarding EDDNext, the coalitions writes, “we are concerned that the EDDNext overhaul will be slowed by SB 799, which will add an entirely new category of UI claimant (a person on strike). In order to verify this new claimant is properly qualified, EDD will need to develop new processes to investigate what strikes are ongoing, how long those strikes have been ongoing, whether the covered individual is engaged in such a strike, and potentially also monitor when those strikes end. We believe EDD has enough work on its plate with improving its process to ensure truly unemployed claimants get benefits – and that process should not be slowed by introducing an entirely new class of claimants who are employed but choosing not to work.”

Lastly, opponents argue that, “SB 799 fundamentally alters the nature of UI by providing unemployment to workers *who still have a job and have chosen to temporarily refuse to work as a negotiating tactic*. Striking is obviously a federally protected right and has historically been a key strategy in labor disputes. But – to put it simply – *being on strike is not the same as being terminated*.”

11. Prior Legislation:

AB 1066 (Gonzalez, 2019) would have permitted individuals in a trade dispute to collect UI compensation after a three-week waiting period. AB 1066 failed on the Senate Floor and was later amended to address another issue in the UI Code (authorizing the director of EDD to delegate its authority to collect and recover funds from a business or employer to the Attorney General when the business or employer has 500 or more employees, including misclassified independent contractors). That subsequent version of AB 1066 was then vetoed by the Governor.

SB 227 (Durazo, 2023), upon an appropriation by the Legislature, establishes the Excluded Workers Program within the Employment Development Department (EDD) to provide income assistance to unemployed excluded workers who are not eligible for regular state or federal unemployment insurance benefits due to their immigration status. Pending in Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 2847 (E. Garcia, 2022, Vetoed), SB 227 is substantially similar to AB 2847 from last year which would have established a pilot program to provide UI type benefits, at slightly lower rates, to workers who are not eligible for regular state or federal unemployment insurance benefits due to their immigration status. The measure was vetoed by the Governor.

SUPPORT

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, California (Co-Sponsor)
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO (Co-Sponsor)
California State Legislative Board of the SMART-Transportation Division (Co-Sponsor)
California State Treasurer Fiona Ma (Co-Sponsor)
United Food & Commercial Workers Western States Council (Co-Sponsor)
Actors Equity Association
Attorney General Rob Bonta
California-Nevada Conference of Operating Engineers
California Alliance for Retired Americans (CARA)
California Conference Board of The Amalgamated Transit Union
California Conference of Machinists
California Democratic Socialists of America
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
California IATSE Council
California Nurses Association
California Professional Firefighters
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
California State Pipe Trades Council
California State University Employees Union (CSUEU)
California Teachers Association
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
Central Coast Labor Council
City of Oakland
City of West Hollywood

Communication Workers of America, District 9
Directors Guild of America, INC.
Engineers and Scientists of California, IFPTE Local 20
Entertainment Union Coalition
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 18
Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara / California Department of Insurance
Monterey Bay Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO
National Union of Healthcare Workers (NUHW)
Northern California District Council of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union
Peace and Freedom Party of California
SAG-AFTRA
Service Employees International Union, California State Council
Service Employees International Union, Local 1000
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond
Transport Workers Union of America
United Auto Workers, Region 6
United Domestic Workers/AFSCME Local 3930
Union of American Physicians & Dentists
UNITE-HERE, AFL-CIO
United Farm Workers
United Nurses Associations of California/Union of Health Care Professionals
United Steelworkers, District 12
Utility Workers Union of America
Western States Council of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, & Transportation Workers
Writers Guild of America West

OPPOSITION

Acclamation Insurance Management Services
Agricultural Council of California
Air Conditioning Sheet Metal Association
Alameda Chamber of Commerce
Allied Managed Care
American Council of Engineering Companies
Anaheim Chamber of Commerce
Association of California School Administrators
Associated General Contractors
Associated General Contractors - San Diego Chapter
Association of California Healthcare Districts (ACHD)
Association of Western Employers
Auto Care Association
Bay Area Council
BizFed Los Angeles County Business Federation
Brea Chamber of Commerce
Building Owners and Managers Association
Calforests
California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities (CAJPA)
California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates

California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
California Association of Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Attractions and Parks Association
California Bankers Association
California Building Industry Association
California Business Properties Association
California Business Roundtable
California Chamber of Commerce
California Employment Law Council
California Farm Bureau
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Golf Course Owners Association
California Grocers Association
California Hospital Association
California Hotel & Lodging Association
California League of Food Producers
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
California Special Districts Association
California Staffing Professionals (CSP)
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
California Taxpayers Association
California Tire Dealers Association
California Travel Association
California Trucking Association
Can Manufacturers Institute
CAWA - Representing the Automotive Parts Industry
Central Coast Labor Council
Coalition of Small and Disabled Veteran Businesses
Construction Employers' Association
Corona Chamber of Commerce
Dixon District Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce
Family Business Association of California
Family Winemakers of California
Finishing Contractors Association of Southern California
Flasher Barricade Association
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Fremont Chamber of Commerce
Fresno Chamber of Commerce
Gateway Chambers Alliance
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce
Hawthorne Cat
HOLT of California

Housing Contractors of California
Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce
Laguna Niguel Chamber of Commerce
League of California Cities
Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Lodi Chamber of Commerce
Lomita Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Manteca Chamber of Commerce
Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
NAIOP California
National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA)
National Federation of Independent Business
North Bay Leadership Council
Northern California Allied Trades
Norwalk Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Orange County Taxpayers Association
Palos Verdes Peninsula Chamber of Commerce
Paso Robles & Templeton Chamber of Commerce
Peterson CAT
Peterson Power Systems
Peterson Tractor
Peterson Trucks
Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
Resource Recovery Coalition of California
Ridgecrest Chamber of Commerce
Roofing Contractors Association of California
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce
Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce
Southern California Contractors Association
Southern California Glass Management Association (SCGMA)
Southwest California Legislative Council
TechNet
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
Tri County Chamber Alliance
Tulare Chamber of Commerce
Twenty First Century Alliance
United Chamber Advocacy Network
United Contractors (UCON)
Urban Counties of California (UCC)
Vacaville Chamber of Commerce
Vista Chamber of Commerce

Wall and Ceiling Alliance
Walnut Creek Chamber of Commerce
West Ventura County Business Alliance
Western Carwash Association
Western Electrical Contractors Association
Western Growers Association
Western Line Constructors Chapter
Western Painting & Coating Contractors Association
Western Wall & Ceiling Contractors Association (WWCCA)
Yorba Linda Chamber of Commerce
Yuba Sutter Chamber of Commerce

-- END --