Date of Hearing: April 23, 2025

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE
Lisa Calderon, Chair
AB 1336 (Addis) – As Introduced February 21, 2025

**SUBJECT**: Farmworkers: benefits

**SUMMARY**: Creates a rebuttable presumption that a heat-related injury arose out of the course of employment where an employer in the agriculture industry, as defined, failed to comply with existing heat illness prevention standards. Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Provides that an employee's heat-related injury, illness, or death shall be presumed to arise out of and in the course of employment if the employer fails to comply with heat illness prevention standards, as provided.

2) Requires the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) to find in accordance with the presumption unless controverted by other evidence.

3) Provides that these provisions apply to an employer, as defined in Section 3300, and in the agriculture industry listed and covered in Section 3395 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

4) Defines "injury" to include any heat-related injury, illness, or death that develops or manifests after the employee was working outdoors during or within the pay period in which an employee suffers any heat-related illness, injury, or death.

5) Requires compensation awarded under the provisions of this bill to include full hospital, surgical, medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits, as provided by workers compensation law.

6) Establishes the Farmworker Climate Change Heat Injury and Death Fund that would consist of a one-time transfer of $5 million from the Workers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund for the purpose of administrative costs relative to the provisions of this bill.

7) Makes various findings and declarations related to the intent of this bill and the conditions faced by farmworkers in relation to climate change.

**EXISTING LAW**:

1) Establishes a workers' compensation system that provides benefits to an employee who suffers from an injury or illness that arises out of, and in the course of, employment, irrespective of fault. (California Constitution Article XIV, Section 4)

2) Establishes presumptions that certain injuries or conditions arose out of employment for specified public safety officers, including:

    a) Heart trouble, pneumonia, or hernia; (Lab. Code Sections 3212, et seq.)
    b) Cancer; (Lab. Code Section 3212.1)
    c) Tuberculosis; (Lab. Code Section 3212.6)

   d) Post-traumatic Stress Disorder; (Lab. Code Section 3212.15)
   e) Blood-borne infectious disease or methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus skin infection; (Lab. Code Sections 3212.8)
   f) Exposure to a biochemical substance; (Lab. Code Section 3212.85)
   g) Meningitis. (Lab. Code Sections 3212.9)

3) Provides that the presumptions listed above are rebuttable and may be controverted by evidence. However, unless controverted, WCAB must find in accordance with the presumption. (Lab. Code Sections 3212, et seq.)

4) Provides that the compensation awarded for these injuries must include full hospital, surgical, medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits, as provided by workers compensation law. Specifies that these presumptions tend to run for 5 to 10 years commencing on the last day of employment, depending on the injury and the peace officer classification involved. Peace officers whose principal duties are clerical, such as stenographers, telephone operators, and other office workers are excluded from these presumptions. (Lab. Code Sections 3212, et seq.)

5) Defines an "employer" as:

   a) The State and every State agency;
   b) Each county, city, district, and all public and quasi-public corporations and public agencies therein;
   c) Every person including any public service corporation, which has any natural person in service; or
   d) The legal representative of any deceased employer. (Lab. Code Section 3300)

6) Provides that an employer in the agriculture industry is subject to the provisions of the heat illness standards. (8 CCR Section 3395)

7) Establishes the Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC) and WCAB within the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) and charges it with monitoring the administration of workers' compensation claims and providing administrative and judicial services to assist in resolving disputes that arise in connection with claims for workers' compensation benefits. (Lab. Code Section 3200)

8) Creates the Workers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund for the administration of the workers' compensation program, the Return-to-Work Program, and the enforcement of the insurance coverage program established by the Labor Commissioner. (Lab. Code Section 62.5)

9) Requires every employer to carry workers' compensation insurance through an insurer or by self-insuring with the consent of DIR. (Lab. Code Section 3700)

10) Specifies that upon knowledge of an injury, the employer or their agent shall provide a workers' compensation claim form to the injured employee and within one working day of the claim filing, shall authorize medical treatment up to $10,000 for 90 days or until the claim is rejected. (Lab. Code Sections 5401 and 5402)

11) Establishes the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) within DIR to, among other things, propose, administer, and enforce occupational safety and health standards. (Lab. Code Sections 6300, et seq.)

12) Requires Cal/OSHA to investigate the employment or place of employment, with or without notice or hearings, if it learns or has reason to believe that an employment or place of employment is unsafe or injurious to the welfare of an employee. If Cal/OSHA receives a complaint from an employee or an employee's representative that their employment or place of employment is not safe, requires Cal/OSHA, with or without notice or hearing, to summarily investigate the complaint of serious violation within three working days. (Lab. Code Section 6309)

13) Establishes heat illness prevention standards applicable to agriculture and the transportation or delivery of agricultural products, as specified, including requiring all of the following:

    a) Provision of free, cool, potable water as close as practicable to areas where employees work;
    b) Access to shade, with ventilation or cooling, when temperatures exceed 80 degrees Fahrenheit (°F);
    c) Implementation of high-heat procedures when temperatures equal or exceed 95°F;
    d) Assurance of a ten minute per two hour cool down break when temperatures exceed 95°F, which may be taken with a meal break or rest period;
    e) Implementation of emergency response procedures and effective communication by voice, observation, or electronic means to ensure employees can contact a supervisor when necessary;
    f) Observation of employees during temperatures of 80°F and above to monitor acclimatization;
    g) Employee and supervisor training on heat illness detection, prevention, and occurrence; and
    h) Establishment, implementation, and maintenance of a heat illness prevention plan, either as part of the employer's written Injury and Illness Program or maintained in a separate document. (8 CCR Section 3395; Lab. Code Section 6721)

14) Requires the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, on or before July 1, 2023, to establish an advisory committee to study and evaluate the effects of heat on California's workers, businesses, and the economy, and to submit a report of its findings to the Legislature by January 1, 2026. (Government Code Section 15562.5)

**FISCAL EFFECT**: Unknown.

**COMMENTS**:

1) *Purpose*: According to the Author, "California farmworkers are indispensable to our food supply chain, our state's economy, and the communities they call home. AB 1336 protects

them from the growing dangers of extreme heat and ensures that when workers suffer heat-related injuries, they are not only compensated, but receive the necessary medical care and support that they deserve." This bill is sponsored by the United Farm Workers.

2) *Workers' compensation and presumptions*: At its core, the workers' compensation system relies on a so-called "grand bargain." If a worker is injured on the job, the employer must pay for the worker's medical treatment, including monetary benefits if the injury is permanent. In exchange for receiving the guarantee of such treatment, the worker surrenders the right to sue the employer for monetary damages in civil court. To receive such care and/or benefits, the worker must be able to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that the injury arose "out of and in the course of employment." According to recent research by the California Workers' Compensation Institute (CWCI) and RAND, more than 90% of all workers' compensation claims and requests for medical treatment are approved.

   Occupational injury presumptions (henceforth, "presumptions") reverse this burden of proof. In other words, presumptions shift the dynamic of a claim from a worker having the burden of proving that their injury is work-related to an employer having the burden to prove that the injury is not work-related. Presumptions have never been intended to imply or create work-related injuries when the injuries in question are not work-related. Rather, presumptions of compensability have been adopted, some many decades ago, to reflect unique circumstances where injuries or illnesses appear to logically be work-related, but it is difficult for the injured worker to prove them as such. As a matter of law, employers have the opportunity to rebut the presumption by establishing that the injury or condition was not the result of employment. As a practical matter, however, presumptions are rarely rebutted.

   Presumptions benefit the worker by removing a potential hurdle to treatment and minimizing the delay between a worker's injury and their ability to receive care. Historically, presumptions have also been useful for occupational injuries where causes could be difficult to precisely pinpoint. For instance, this was the case with presumptions for cancer in firefighters, who may have been exposed to carcinogens from any number of burning or crumbling buildings.

   There is essentially no difference in care and benefits between an employee who successfully accesses workers' compensation with a presumption and an employee that accesses workers' compensation without one. A presumption alone does not increase the quality or nature of care that is received. Accordingly, within industries with a low rate of rejected workers' compensation claims, the positive impact of a presumption is limited. The standard medical verification process, which is subverted in the case of presumptions, is intended to minimize fraudulent claims that can drain the resources of the workers' compensation system, maintaining the solvency of the workers' compensation system and ensuring its capacity to cover legitimate claims for injuries in the workplace. As a result, adoption of presumptions where they are not demonstrably necessary has the potential to provide little benefit, while threatening the delicate equilibrium underlying a functional workers' compensation system.

   With few exceptions, all existing presumptions for workers' compensation claims apply exclusively to peace officers or firefighters, and are limited to a subset of injuries common in those professions, such as hernias, cancer, and heart disease. This means any additional costs resulting from potentially fraudulent claims made under these presumptions are borne by the state, rather than a private employer. As policy rationales for these presumptions, the

Legislature has generally relied on three main characteristics that distinguish these professions and associated injury claims from other workers' compensation claims:

- Peace officers and firefighters take steps to reduce occupational hazards, but it is not possible to effectively abate all occupational hazards in these professions. Peace officers and firefighters are instead responsible for directly confronting occupational hazards such as fires, panic, civil unrest, and violent confrontations.

- Peace officers and firefighters face higher relative injury rates compared to other similarly situated workers.

- Prior to adopting these presumptions, peace officers and firefighters faced high claim denial rates for the specified injuries, largely due to the difficulty in proving the injury was work-related.

This bill would create a new presumption applicable to heat-related injuries suffered by agricultural workers only if their employer was determined to be out of compliance with heat-illness prevention standards promulgated by Cal/OSHA at the time of the injury. In many ways, this presumption would represent a considerable departure from the scope and structure of existing presumptions.

3) *SB 1299 and Governor's Veto Message*: This bill is virtually identical to SB 1299 (Cortese, 2024), which passed out of this committee 12-3 and out of both houses of the Legislature before being vetoed by the Governor. In his veto message, the Governor expressed incredulity that the creation of a heat-illness presumption in the workers' compensation would be an effective means of protecting California farmworkers against the risks of heat-related illness, arguing:

> Current laws establishing, regulating, and enforcing heat illness prevention standards fall under the jurisdiction of Cal/OSHA, not the Division of Workers' Compensation, and the workers' compensation system is not equipped to make determinations about employers' compliance with Cal/OSHA standards.

The message outlined several other steps this administration has taken to "[protect] Californians from the perils of extreme heat," including: developing the Extreme Heat Action Plan, "a comprehensive multi-year strategy to strengthen community resiliency through partnerships and investments in equitable solutions to protect all Californians – especially vulnerable populations such as farmworkers and other outdoor workers"; establishing a new Agricultural Unit within Cal/OSHA "that specializes in worker protections and hazards found at agricultural worksites"; continuing outreach by Cal/OSHA and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to "increase public awareness to ensure that workers, especially farmworkers, have access to critical and timely information on how to protect themselves from heat illness"; partnering with "community-based organizations to inform workers of their rights under California labor laws"; and, through the Rural Strategic Engagement Program, "creating spaces in farmworker communities where agricultural workers will be able to obtain information about their rights, file claims or complaints, and get access to legal assistance."

The message also identified two bills signed by the Governor intended to address heat-illness risks to farmworkers: AB 1643 (R. Rivas, Ch. 263, Stats. 2022), which created an advisory

committee "comprised of labor, business, academic, and government stakeholders to study the effects of heat on California's workers, businesses, and the economy"; and SB 1105 (Padilla, Ch. 525, Stats. 2024), which provides for the "use of accrued paid sick leave for outdoor agricultural workers to avoid smoke, heat, or flooding conditions created by a local or state emergency."

The veto message closed by reiterating:

> I stand firmly committed to continuing to work with the Legislature, and with worker advocates, on strengthening safety and health enforcement strategies to ensure aggrieved workers can come forward without fear of retaliation.
>
> However, conditioning a workers' compensation presumption on compliance with standards set and enforced by another regulatory division is not an effective way to improve working conditions.
>
> For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

4) *A novel presumption with little precedent*: This bill takes a novel approach to presumptions in that it only requires the presumption to apply if the agricultural employer has violated Cal/OSHA heat illness prevention standards. The United Farm Workers (UFW), who sponsor the bill, explain:

> This bill […] would promote employer compliance with existing state outdoor heat illness prevention standards by creating a rebuttable presumption – if a farm worker's heat-related injury or death occurs in the same time frame as their agricultural employer is found to be noncompliant with the state heat illness prevention standards, the injury or death is presumed to have occurred in the course of employment.
>
> This rebuttable presumption is unlike any other rebuttable presumption in existing law, whether in the public sector or private sector. And, it is unlike any other workers' compensation bill approved by the Legislature. Under AB 1336, no rebuttable presumption is triggered unless a heat-injured employee can show that their employer was out of compliance with the existing outdoor heat regulation. […]
>
> Nothing in AB 1336 changes workers compensation from a no-fault system. Nothing in the bill prevents Cal/OSHA from continuing with their responsibilities. Nothing in the bill changes the existing outdoor heat regulation – ensuring farm workers have access to water, shade and breaks. Nothing in the bill changes the worker compensation benefit levels for farm workers.
>
> **Rather, this bill is a market based approach to compliance that serves to supplement inadequate state efforts.**

The function of the workers' compensation system is to ensure that workers injured in the course of employment receive the treatment and compensation they need to allow them to return to gainful employment, or to be compensated when such return is not possible. Presumptions, to the extent they have been deemed appropriate, are typically intended to better serve this function by ensuring treatment and/or compensation are received when the causal link between a particular employment and resulting injury can be difficult to

demonstrate, but robust evidence supports that the injury is generally related to that employment. Staff notes that, as UFW allude, presumptions have never before been used to incentivize behavior or to punish noncompliance with other labor laws or standards.

Under existing presumptions, it is also not necessary for WCAB to make a determination of fact before the presumption applies – the presumption applies as soon as the injury occurs at which time the employer can attempt to rebut it. In this case, however, the presumption is only applicable under the limited circumstances in which a violation of the heat illness prevention standards has occurred, meaning such a determination must be made by WCAB before the presumption can take effect. As further discussed below, it is unclear whether WCAB's role in making the determination required under this bill would cause potential conflicts with Cal/OSHA's own investigation and determination related to whether heat illness standard were violated.

Finally, this bill would, uniquely, indefinitely expand presumptions to the private sector. With very narrow exceptions for privately employed firefighters for public facilities, presumptions of compensability have been granted only to public safety officers – fire and peace officer employees. Thus, the costs of presumptions are borne only by state and local government employers, and only for the narrow class of employees, broadly referred to as public safety employees, whose jobs regularly require them to confront unabated hazards. To date, the only conditions under which presumptions have been expanded to the private sector has been under the narrow and temporary circumstances of the COVID-19 presumption, which sunset on January 1, 2024. (SB 1159 (Hill, Ch. 18, Stats. 2020); AB 1751 (Daly, Ch. 758, Stats. of 2022))

5) *Farmworker heat illness claims are denied at similar rates to other claims*: In a report evaluating the potential impacts of SB 1299, the California Workers' Compensation Institute (CWCI), a "nonprofit organization of insurers licensed to write workers' compensation in California, as well as public and private self-insured employers," analyzed the prevalence of farmworker heat illness claims and their relative rates of claim denial.

   CWCI identified a total of 659 workers' compensation claims filed by agricultural workers from 2019 to 2023, which constituted 0.65% of all workers' compensation claims from agricultural workers. According to the report, this "is comparable to other industries covered by the Cal/OSHA high-heat procedures, such as landscaping (0.65%), construction (0.67%), and mining, oil and gas extraction (0.56%)." For these claims, agricultural workers faced a claim denial rate of 11.0%, which is marginally lower than the claim denial rates of approximately 13% for other outdoor occupations covered by the Cal/OSHA high-heat standards, and of 14.7% for all workers' compensation claims.

   In other words, data from 2019 to 2023 seem to indicate a relatively small number of workers' compensation claims based on heat illness or injury among farmworkers, comprising a fairly typical percentage of overall claims from outdoor industries, and subject to more or less average rates of claim denial.

6) *Cal/OSHA enforcement of heat illness standards*: The author, sponsors, and supporters of this bill do not dispute that Cal/OSHA heat illness prevention standards have likely reduced the occurrence of occupational heat illnesses since the standards were first implemented in 2005. Nonetheless, the author asserts that farmworkers continue to suffer from heat-related

illnesses and death in part due to failure by agricultural employers to sufficiently comply with the standards.

In 2019, Cal/OSHA conducted more than 4,000 heat-related inspections, and cited employers for noncompliance with the heat illness prevention standards in 47% of the inspections. However, persistent issues with staffing and funding at Cal/OSHA have limited the state's ability to conduct inspections in order to adequately enforce the standards. According to reporting by Capital & Main, from 2017 to 2023, the number of field inspections conducted by Cal/OSHA dropped by nearly 30%, and the number of violations issued to employers fell by more than 40%.

On January 1, 2024, Cal/OSHA increased penalties for certain violations. According to DIR, for citations issued on or after January 1, 2024, the maximum penalties for violations classified as Regulatory, General, Willful, or Repeat are as follows:

- The maximum penalty for General and Regulatory violations, including Posting and Recordkeeping violations is $15,873.
- The maximum penalty for Willful and Repeat violations is $158,727.
- The minimum penalty for Willful violations is $11,337.

It is unclear to what extent these penalties are levied and collected, and, considering many employers remain out of compliance with heat illness prevention standards, it is also unclear whether existing penalties are serving as an effective deterrent.

In 2015, two lawsuits brought by UFW against Cal/OSHA, alleging that the state had failed to adequately protect the safety of farmworkers and ensure compliance with its heat regulations, were settled. In the settlement, Cal/OSHA agreed to revise its policies and procedures to complete inspections more quickly and to take action against repeat violators. Cal/OSHA also agreed to allow the UFW and the UFW Foundation, through a memorandum of understanding with the state, to report and refer potential violations to Cal/OSHA, conduct confidential internal audits of Cal/OSHA, take farmworker testimony in the field during heat inspections, and focus on outdoor workplaces during periods of high heat, among other commitments. As a result of this settlement, Cal/OSHA has since updated its heat illness prevention standards. Still, since these lawsuits were settled, the state continues to experience record-breaking heat due to climate change, and farmworker heat injuries and deaths have continued to occur.

7) *WCAB as arbiter of compliance with Cal/OSHA standards*: The coalition of business groups also raises concerns with how a determination will be made as to whether an employer is in violation of applicable heat illness prevention standards, and therefore whether the presumption is in fact available. As previously discussed, existing presumptions do not require a determination of fact to apply, and therefore do not present this problem. As a coalition of groups representing business interests including the California Chamber of Commerce, the Agricultural Council of California, and the California Restaurant Association explain in their letter of opposition:

> The bill does not include mechanics as far as how establishing applicability of the presumption would work. The bill does not specify how it would be determined that an employer did in fact violate the applicable provisions of the heat illness prevention

> standard. If the bill contemplates that determination being made by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB), we have strong concerns with imparting that responsibility on an entity that specializes in workers' compensation claims, not workplace safety.

Indeed, while it is not explicitly specified in the bill, this bill would require some authority, presumably WCAB, to make a factual determination of whether Cal/OSHA heat illness standards have been violated before the presumption would apply. This could present particular complications if, for instance, WCAB makes a determination of a violation while the Cal/OSHA board is actively considering a potential violation, particularly if the WCAB's determination ultimately conflicts with the determination made by Cal/OSHA.

The principal function of WCAB is to serve as the statewide administrative law court of appeal for workers' compensation claims – WCAB only hears those claims that are appealed following a decision by a DWC administrative law judge. It is generally *not* the role of WCAB to determine if a violation of Cal/OSHA standards has occurred. Accordingly, this bill would grant additional authority and responsibilities to WCAB.

It should also be noted that WCAB is currently facing a heightened workload that has resulted in a substantial backlog of cases. In 2024, WCAB submitted a budget change proposal (BCP) requesting additional staff positions to deal with the current backlog. According to the BCP, as of June 30, 2023, the WCAB's backlog totaled 745 cases. In light of this backlog, the impact of the additional workload this bill would require of WCAB is unclear. In order to continue efforts to reduce the existing backlog, this bill could necessitate additional positions beyond those accounted for in the 2024 budget, as the BCP only requested enough additional positions to enable WCAB to manage the existing workload and reduce the size and average age of the existing case backlog.

8) *Language of presumption may limit potential utility*: In the case of the presumption this bill would create, WCAB would be required to find in favor of compensability for heat-related injuries, unless controverted by sufficient evidence, but only if the presumption is first determined to be applicable. In other words, in order for WCAB to rely on the presumption in its decision, it must first find that the employer was in violation of Cal/OSHA heat illness prevention standards at the time of the injury, and that the injury *resulted* from that violation. The specific language of the presumption reads that "[i]f an employer [in the agriculture industry subject to the Cal/OSHA heat illness prevention standards] fails to comply with the heat illness prevention standards […], any *resulting* heat-related injury to the employee shall be presumed to arise out of and in the course of employment." [Emphasis added]

In a footnote in their letter of opposition, a coalition of groups representing business interests including the California Chamber of Commerce, the Agricultural Council of California, and the California Restaurant Association, points out that a semantic detail of this language could limit the potential utility a presumption of this nature could provide:

> Proposed section 3212.81 provides that any injury "resulting" from an employer's failure to comply with applicable heat standards would fall under the presumption. If the worker has demonstrated that an injury "resulted" from their job, they have already met their burden of proof under the workers' compensation system and that injury would be covered without the need for a presumption.

Demonstrating that an injury *resulted* from a violation of workplace safety standards seems to, by definition, necessitate demonstration that the injury was work-related to begin with. If the WCAB finds that a violation of the heat illness prevention standards occurred and that the injury resulted from that violation, it would not be necessary to rely on the presumption since the evidence would already support a compensable claim. As such, this language may significantly limit the applicability of the presumption.

9) *Pending and Prior Legislation*:

SB 230 (Laird, 2025) would grant active firefighting members of a fire department that serves a United States Department of Defense installation, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) installation, or that provides fire protection to a commercial airport regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), as specified, the same workers' compensation presumptive coverages currently afforded to firefighters and public safety officers. This bill is currently in the Assembly Rules Committee pending referral.

SB 632 (Arreguin, 2025) would grant an industrial injury rebuttable presumption for infectious disease, COVID-19, cancer, musculoskeletal injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, or respiratory disease to certain hospital employees that provide direct patient care. This bill is currently awaiting hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1125 (Nguyen, 2025) would expand an existing industrial injury rebuttable presumption for heart trouble in security officers at Atascadero State Hospital to include any peace officer employed by the Department of State Hospitals. This bill is currently awaiting hearing the Assembly Insurance Committee.

SB 1105 (Padilla, Ch. 525, Stats. 2024) authorizes the use of accrued paid sick leave for outdoor agricultural workers to avoid smoke, heat, or flooding conditions created by a local or state emergency.

SB 1299 (Cortese, 2024) was virtually identical to this bill (*see* Comment 2). This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

AB 2264 (Arambula, 2024) would have required an employee to obtain and maintain a heat illness prevention training certification from Cal/OSHA within 30 days after the date of hire and require an employer to reimburse the employee for training time. This bill was held in the Assembly Committee on Labor and Employment.

SB 391 (Blakespear, 2023) would have granted an industrial injury rebuttable presumption for skin cancer to certain peace officers of the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Parks and Recreation. This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

SB 623 (Laird, Ch. 621, Stats. 2023) extends, until January 1, 2029, an existing industrial injury rebuttable presumption for a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder for specified firefighters and public safety officers, and requires the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation to submit reports to the Legislature that review the effectiveness of this presumption and workers' compensation claims by public safety dispatchers.

AB 699 (Weber, 2023) would have granted year-round, full-time lifeguards employed by the City of San Diego in the Boating Safety Unit the same workers' compensation presumptive

coverages currently afforded to firefighters and public safety officers. This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

AB 1145 (Maienschein, 2023) would have extended, for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2024, an industrial injury rebuttable presumption for a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder to certain nurses, psychiatric technicians, and various medical social services specialists who work in state prisons, state veteran's homes, state developmental centers, and state hospitals, and would have remained in effect until January 1, 2030. This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

AB 1751 (Daly, Ch. 758, Stats. 2022) extended the January 1, 2023, sunset date for the existing COVID-19 workers' compensation presumptions until January 1, 2024.

AB 1643 (R. Rivas, Ch. 263, Stats. 2022) required, on or before July 1, 2023, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency to establish an advisory committee of specified representatives to evaluate and recommend the scope of a study on the effects of heat on California's workers, businesses, and the economy.

AB 2676 (Calderon, 2012) would have made it a misdemeanor, punishable by jail time and fines, to fail to provide water and shade, as specified, to employees. This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

AB 2346 (Butler, 2012) would have, among other things, made growers and the farm labor contractors they hire jointly liable for failure to supply farm workers with shade and water. This bill was vetoed by the Governor.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION**:

**Support**

California Environmental Voters (formerly Clcv)
California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio
United Farm Workers

**Oppose**

African American Farmers of California
Agricultural Council of California
American Property Casualty Insurance Association
Associated Equipment Distributors
Association of California Egg Farmers
Brea Chamber of Commerce
Building Owners and Managers Association
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities
California Association of Wheat Growers
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Bean Shippers Association
California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Citrus Mutual

California Coalition on Workers Compensation
California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association
California Farm Bureau
California Fresh Fruit Association
California Grain and Feed Association
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California League of Food Producers
California Pear Growers Association
California Restaurant Association
California Seed Association
California State Floral Association
California Strawberry Commission
California Walnut Commission
Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce
Corona Chamber of Commerce
Cupertino Chamber of Commerce
Danville Area Chamber of Commerce
Family Business Association of California
Family Winemakers of California
Fontana Chamber of Commerce
Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce
Gateway Chambers Alliance
Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce
Huntington Beach Chamber of Commerce
Imperial Valley Regional Chamber of Commerce
LA Canada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce
Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Lodi District Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Modesto Chamber of Commerce
Murrieta Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
Naiop California
National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB)
Newport Beach Chamber of Commerce
Nisei Farmers League
Norwalk Chamber of Commerce
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
Orange County Business Council
Pacific Egg and Poultry Association
Paso Robles Templeton Chamber of Commerce
Porterville Chamber of Commerce
Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce
Rancho Mirage Chamber of Commerce
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce
San Pedro Chamber of Commerce

Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce
Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce
Santee Chamber of Commerce
Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
Southwest California Legislative Council
Tri County Chamber Alliance
Tulare Chamber of Commerce
West Ventura County Business Alliance
Western Growers Association
Western Tree Nut Association
Wine Institute

**Analysis Prepared by**: Landon Klein / INS. / (916) 319-2086