

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

AT SACRAMENTO

2025–26 REGULAR SESSION

SENATE FILE

GOVERNOR’S VETOES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2025

Compiled Under the Direction of

ERIKA CONTRERAS
Secretary of the Senate

By

CLAUDIA FUENTES
Daily File Clerk

and

MADISON HINOJOSA
Assistant Daily File Clerk

(Please report any errors or omissions to Daily File Clerk: Phone 916–651–4171)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VETOES

Governor’s Vetoes	4
-------------------------	---

GOVERNOR'S VETOES

1

S.B. No. 76—Seyarto.

An act relating to vehicles.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 76 without my signature.

Beginning January 1, 2030, this bill would require the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to waive delinquent vehicle registration fees and penalties that became due before a private vehicle sale when the purchaser applied for transfer. The DMV would instead be required to recover those fees and penalties from the seller or transferor when they next register another vehicle or renew a driver's license.

This bill would exacerbate the structural insolvency of the Motor Vehicle Account (MVA), the primary funding source for the DMV and CHP. Shifting collection responsibility away from purchasers would reduce revenues, increase administrative costs, and deepen long-term deficits. In doing so, it would diminish resources available to support the CHP's critical public safety initiatives - including newly launched Crime Suppression Teams and regional crime-reduction partnerships - while also straining the DMV's digital transformation by imposing new duties even as funding is reduced.

As with other measures affecting the MVA, moving the operative date to a future year does not solve the underlying fiscal challenges - it only delays them. We must set a very high bar for any significant new fiscal commitments until the MVA structural deficit is addressed in a sustainable way.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 76 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

2

S.B. No. 274—Cervantes et al.

An act relating to personal information.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 274 without my signature.

This bill restricts the use and sharing of automated license plate reader (ALPR) data, including by placing a default 60-day limit on how long public entities may retain ALPR data.

I appreciate the author's intent to prevent information regarding a person's whereabouts from falling into the wrong hands. Nevertheless, this measure does not strike the delicate balance between protecting individual privacy and ensuring public safety. For example, it may not be apparent, particularly with respect to cold cases, that license plate data is needed to solve a crime until after the 60-day retention period has elapsed. Conversely, restrictions on inter-agency data sharing may impair solving crimes in real time, such as highway shootings, where the suspect may be rapidly crossing jurisdictional boundaries. Further, by restricting law enforcement agencies' use of ALPR information only for locating persons or vehicles suspected of involvement in crimes, this bill would prevent the use of this information to locate missing persons.

This bill also creates cost pressures, which are not accounted for in this year's budget, by requiring the Department of Justice to conduct random audits of public entities in order to ensure compliance with this bill. In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 274 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

3

S.B. No. 275—Smallwood-Cuevas et al.

An act relating to workforce development.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 275 without my signature.

This bill would ease the eligibility review process for training providers on the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 by establishing a uniform two-year review window.

I share the author's commitment to expanding access to high-quality training programs and preventing unnecessary disruptions in the eligibility review process. As part of that commitment, my administration established an advisory group earlier this year to engage in a collaborative, bottom-up approach to improving the ETPL process. The work of the advisory group, which includes representatives from local workforce boards, training providers, community organizations, community colleges, and adult education programs, is ongoing.

This bill undermines the advisory group's effort and could delay necessary reforms. Moreover, this measure may conflict with federal rules that require the first continued eligibility review to occur within one year of a provider's initial approval, rather than two.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 275 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

4

S.B. No. 419—Caballero et al.

An act relating to taxation, to take effect immediately, tax levy.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 419 without my signature.

This bill would establish a sales and use tax exemption for the purchase of hydrogen fuel.

I appreciate the author's ongoing commitment to encourage the deployment and adoption of more hydrogen-powered vehicles. I share this goal, which is why my Administration, in partnership with the Legislature, has invested billions of dollars in recent years toward zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) and supporting infrastructure, including hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles. This marks the most significant investments in the ZEV market in the state's history. However, new tax expenditures, such as this, should be included as part of the annual budget process, given their implications for the General Fund.

In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 419 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

5

S.B. No. 454—McNerney et al.

An act relating to water.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 454 without my signature.

This bill establishes the PFAS Mitigation Fund, to be administered by the State Water Resources Control Board, to provide financial support or technical assistance for water suppliers and sewer system providers to reduce or remove perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination.

While well-intentioned, this bill is unnecessary. The California Environmental Protection Agency has conducted significant work in coordination with other governmental agencies on PFAS concerns since 2012. Establishing a new program without a clear source of funding would divert limited available staff resources toward developing regulations without a definitive improved outcome for Californians.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 454 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

6

S.B. No. 785—Caballero.

An act relating to taxation, to take effect immediately, tax levy.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 785 without my signature.

This bill would establish a personal income tax credit for durable medical equipment purchased for a dependent with a complex medical condition.

I share the author's goal of easing the financial burden on families who must bear the high costs of medical equipment. That is why, in May 2025, my Administration submitted to the federal government an updated benchmark plan that proposes expanded insurance coverage for durable medical equipment, a vital step to reducing costs for California families. However, new tax expenditures, such as what this bill proposes, should be included as part of the annual budget process, given their General Fund implications.

In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 1—Shall Senate Bill 785 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

7

S.B. No. 88—Caballero et al.

An act relating to air resources.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 88 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Air Resources Board to develop specified methods and protocols to quantify the avoided emissions and beneficial uses of forest and agricultural biomass. This bill also would direct the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to require forest health projects to include a resource disposal component, and the California Energy Commission to include biomass-derived low- and negative-carbon fuels in certain reports.

Throughout my Administration, I have been supportive of advancing methods and practices to sustainably address the growing amount of woody biomass waste in the state, primarily due to the risk it presents of exacerbating catastrophic wildfires. This is why my Administration, for years, has recommended and acted on strategies to address this challenge and risk.

While I applaud the authors' desire to further this work, most of the requirements in this bill are duplicative of existing efforts. At the same time, other provisions would trigger new and substantial costs at each of the affected agencies not accounted for in the 2025 Budget Act. In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 88 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

8

S.B. No. 224—Hurtado.

An act relating to water.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 224 without my signature.

This bill would require the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to update its water supply forecasting models and procedures to address the effects of climate change.

This bill is in response to an audit request in 2022 that incorrectly claimed the DWR overestimated the amount of water expected to run off from the Sierra Nevada and prematurely released over 700,000 acre-feet of water in 2021. The resulting State Auditor report indeed found no unnecessary release of water, but stated that DWR did not adequately account for climate change in its water supply forecasts. In June of this year, DWR submitted its final report to the State Auditor, identifying in detail how it has implemented the Auditor's recommendations, including additional climate change modeling.

I am satisfied with DWR's response to this audit and with its ongoing work to model climate change, particularly rain and snowfall, across California. As a result, this bill is unnecessary.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 224 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

9

S.B. No. 292—Cervantes.

An act relating to electricity.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 292 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to determine whether existing electric investor-owned utility (IOU) annual electric service reliability reports and post-Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) event reports should include more detailed, circuit-level, and demographic data. The bill also requires the CPUC to consider amendments to General Order (GO)166 - Standards for Operation, Reliability, and Safety During Emergencies and Disasters - and requires publicly owned utilities to post their annual electric service reliability reports online.

While I share the author's desire to improve the collection and disclosure of information related to PSPS events, this bill is duplicative of an existing CPUC public decision-making process. As such, this bill disrupts the procedures and requirements that have been developed over the past several years to effectively collect and disclose information about the factors influencing utility PSPS events and their frequency, scope, and duration.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 292 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

10

S.B. No. 541—Becker et al.

An act relating to electricity.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 541 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Energy Commission (CEC), in coordination with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and California Independent Systems Operator (CAISO), to analyze the cost-effectiveness of certain electric load-shifting strategies, estimate each electric retail supplier's load-shifting potential, and analyze and publish the amount of load-shifting that each electric retail supplier achieved in the prior calendar year.

Deploying strategies to cost-effectively manage the state's electric demand remains a critical tool for maintaining electric grid reliability during extreme events, integrating variable and intermittent renewable and clean energy resources into the electric grid, and reducing electric service costs for customers. This is why the CAISO, CEC, and CPUC continue to explore, develop, and deploy protocols, standards, electric rate tariffs, incentive programs, and new and updated valuation approaches to shape, shift, shimmy, and shed electric load that benefits both the electric grid and electric customers.

While I appreciate the author's intent, this bill is largely redundant and, in some cases, disruptive of existing and planned efforts by the CPUC, CEC and CAISO to maximize the cost-effective potential of electric load-management strategies. This bill would also impose a new workload on the CPUC and CEC, requiring additional resources to support its implementation. At a time when electric bill affordability continues to be a pervasive challenge, it is important that we consider the workload and cost impacts on the CEC and CPUC, some of which are ultimately borne by electric customers, to avoid further compounding the costs embedded in customer electric bills.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 541 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

11

S.B. No. 613—Stern et al.

An act relating to greenhouse gases.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 613 without my signature.

This bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Air Resources Board (CARB), and other state agencies to prioritize strategies to reduce methane emissions, including from imported fossil natural gas. This bill also authorizes state agencies to apply “measure, monitor, report, and verify” (MMRV) protocols and directs the CPUC to assess whether shifting to certified low-methane natural gas is consistent with the interests of ratepayers.

Fossil natural gas is primarily composed of methane gas, which is a short-lived climate pollutant with a global warming potential more than 80 times greater than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period. The potency of this gas and its climate impact have prompted numerous legislative and regulatory efforts over the years to quantify, identify, and minimize fugitive methane emissions from fossil natural gas infrastructure and to deploy cost-effective leak abatement investments and programs. Currently, our state imports up to 90 percent of its fossil natural gas from out-of-state and relies on this energy source to fuel critical industries and provide essential heating services to many Californians. This demand is expected to decrease in the coming years as we move closer to our 2045 carbon neutrality goal. During this period, we must not lose sight of the state’s immediate needs as we continue our collective efforts to transition to clean gaseous fuels and clean electricity.

While well-intended, this bill establishes new requirements that are unclear, duplicative, and risk increasing costs for gas customers in the near term, and could jeopardize fossil natural gas service reliability. I encourage the CPUC, CARB, and other state agencies to continue existing efforts to further minimize methane emissions from the fossil natural gas sector thoughtfully and pragmatically, while continuing to advance the production and use of clean fuels and the clean electrification of many end-uses in the state.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 613 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

12

S.B. No. 647—Hurtado.

An act relating to energy.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 647 without my signature.

This bill would make several changes related to the state's energy efficiency programs and the Low-Income Oversight Board (LIOB), including expanding the Board's membership. The bill also requires the California Energy Commission's (CEC) Equitable Decarbonization program to notify applicants of other available incentive programs overseen by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

I support providing Californians greater access to the state's customer energy programs. However, this bill proposes changes that expand the scope of the LIOB beyond its intended purpose and increase the CPUC and CEC's administrative costs. Additionally, the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG), already coordinates with the LIOB and advises the CEC and CPUC on customer energy programs available to disadvantaged communities throughout the state. I encourage the DACAG and LIOB to continue their coordination and identify additional methods and strategies to enhance customer access to various energy programs.

At a time when electric bill affordability continues to be a pervasive challenge, it is important that we maximize existing coordination groups and consider the new workload and costs impacts to the CEC and CPUC, some of which are ultimately borne by electric customers, to avoid further compounding the costs embedded in customer electric bills.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 3—Shall Senate Bill 647 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

13

S.B. No. 5—Cabaldon.

An act relating to local government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 5 without my signature.

This bill would prohibit enhanced infrastructure financing districts (EIFDs) from including taxes levied upon parcels enrolled in a Williamson Act or a farmland security zone contract from the allocation to an EIFD.

Under existing law, local jurisdictions have full authority to choose whether they wish to exclude Williamson Act lands from EIFD eligibility, or set conditions for their inclusion, without state intervention. As such, I am concerned that this bill inappropriately reduces the ability of local agencies to choose how and where to use the infrastructure development tools that are within their discretion.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 6—Shall Senate Bill 5 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

14

S.B. No. 317—Hurtado et al.

An act relating to wastewater.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 317 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to administer the statewide wastewater surveillance program, known as the California Surveillance of Wastewaters network (CalSuWers network), in consultation with local health departments, wastewater utilities, academic institutions, and other partners, to monitor pathogens and other public health indicators.

While I share the author's commitment to increasing surveillance tools available to monitor public health, this bill will result in ongoing General Fund cost pressures not accounted for in the 2025 Budget Act. In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 6—Shall Senate Bill 317 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

15

S.B. No. 717—Richardson.

An act relating to cancer.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 717 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Department of Public Health to maintain a regional registry infrastructure and statewide system for the California Cancer Registry, which provides statewide cancer surveillance and reporting and is funded through the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

I appreciate the author's intent to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of California's cancer surveillance system in the face of federal funding cuts - a recent NIH directive mandates a 15 percent cut in contracts, including those funding the California Cancer Registry. Unfortunately, by locking a regional cancer surveillance model in statute, this bill would constrain the Department's ability to update its infrastructure, respond to evolving public health needs, and implement cost-saving strategies to sustain the program. The state needs flexibility to adapt to reduced federal funding, which is not provided for by this measure.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 6—Shall Senate Bill 717 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

16

S.B. No. 24—McNerney et al.

An act relating to public utilities.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 24 without my signature.

This bill would prohibit electric or gas investor-owned utilities from recovering the costs of certain political influence activities and expenses related to opposing efforts to municipalize electric service by customers. This bill also expands the authority of the Public Advocates Office (PAO) to gather information and review the financial accounts of these utilities, much like the authority currently held by the California Public Utilities Commission.

Thoughtful and effective accountability of our state's private utilities is essential for ensuring the provision of safe, reliable, and affordable electric and gas service to customers. This bill seeks to build on the existing regulatory framework that oversees these utilities. However, this bill contains a significant clerical error related to the definition of "political influence activity," where two provisions directly contradict one another, making this bill unimplementable. While I support clarifying the authority of the PAO to collect information relevant to the affordability of customer electric and gas rates and bills, the drafting error is concerning and must be corrected.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 24 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

17

S.B. No. 36—Umberg et al.

An act relating to price gouging.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 36 without my signature.

This bill expands price gouging protections following a State of Emergency or Local Emergency declaration, establishes a housing listing program to report and remove listings that violate price gouging, and imposes criminal and civil penalties on violators. This bill would also allow the Legislature to terminate an extension of price gouging limitations via a concurrent resolution.

I appreciate the author's intent to strengthen and expand protections against price gouging for those displaced by a state or local emergency. Unfortunately, this bill includes a provision that would allow the Legislature to terminate extensions of emergency protections by concurrent resolution. This shift would weaken the Governor's authority under the Emergency Services Act and undermine the executive branch's flexibility to respond to rapidly evolving disasters. In times of emergency, Californians expect swift and decisive action to protect public safety, deliver resources, and maintain stability. Making the Governor's actions subject to termination by concurrent vote of the Legislature could delay critical measures and create uncertainty when Californians can least afford it.

For that reason, I am unable to sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 36 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

18

S.B. No. 263—Gonzalez et al.

An act relating to international trade.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 263 without my signature.

This bill requires the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GOBiz), in consultation with the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) and the Department of Finance, to conduct a study on how increases in tariffs and reciprocal tariffs affect the state's international trade of imports and exports.

The chaos brought by the Trump administration's trade policy is undisputed. California is pushing back through all avenues available, including challenging the legality of these actions in court. In addition to taking legal action, my Administration is actively assessing and responding to the impact of tariffs through various initiatives. GO-Biz's International Affairs and Trade Unit has produced a "Tariff Resource Guide" for businesses, and CalSTA's Freight Policy Team has developed a supply chain dashboard as they continuously coordinate with stakeholders from the logistics and supply chain community. We are also investing in improving and modernizing our own systems, including \$27 million in Go-Biz's Containerized Ports Interoperability Program and CalSTA's \$1.5 billion investment to build a more efficient, sustainable, and resilient supply chain across the state.

While I appreciate the author's intent to study the impacts of tariffs, this bill is duplicative of ongoing work; another study is not needed to understand the economic chaos created by the Trump administration.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 263 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR’S VETOES—Continued

19

S.B. No. 326—Becker et al.
An act relating to wildfire safety.
Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 326 without my signature.

This bill would require the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to prepare a Wildfire Risk Mitigation Planning Framework, a Wildfire Risk Baseline and Forecast, and a Wildfire Mitigation Scenarios Report, and to update each report at regular intervals. The bill would also expand the list of eligible entities for Wildfire Prevention Grants Program funding to include activities that support early compliance with Zone Zero regulations.

The requirements of this bill would trigger substantial, ongoing costs that are not accounted for in the budget. In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government’s hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 326 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

20

S.B. No. 629—Durazo et al.

An act relating to wildfires.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 629 without my signature.

This bill would, among other things, create a newly defined post-wildfire safety area designation and would require the Office of the State Fire Marshal of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to include new criteria when mapping Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs).

Wildfire risk and hazard modeling are crucial tools for informing wildfire mitigation strategies and allocating resources to prevent ignitions and effectively respond to wildfires before they become catastrophic. Since 2019, my Administration, in partnership with the Legislature, has invested over \$5 billion in wildfire mitigation, response, and forest resilience. All of which have been guided by leading-edge science and modeling, with most of it developed right here in California.

I remain strongly supportive of this work and the work of OSFM to enhance its modeling capabilities and maintain updated, robust FHSZs to further inform wildfire mitigation measures. This work is actively underway, and though I find this bill's intent laudable, it presents new, ongoing, and significant costs to the state not accounted for in this year's budget.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 629 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

21

S.B. No. 757—Richardson.

An act relating to local government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 757 without my signature.

This bill would permit a city or county to collect fines for specified violations related to nuisance abatements using a nuisance abatement lien or a special assessment.

I appreciate the author's intent to provide local agencies with additional tools to efficiently enforce health and safety violations. However, I am concerned about this bill's expansion of local authority. Balancing the due process rights of homeowners with a local government's authority to levy nuisance abatement fines is crucial. I believe existing law, which mandates judicial approval for imposing a lien for unpaid fines, effectively achieves this balance.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 11—Shall Senate Bill 757 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

22

S.B. No. 7—McNerney et al.

An act relating to employment.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 7 without my signature.

This bill would establish new rules for employers using automated decision systems (ADS) to make employment-related decisions. Proposed rules include requiring the employer to notify a worker before deploying an ADS that makes employment-related decisions, prohibiting an employer from relying solely on an ADS when making a disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decision, and giving a worker the right to request data used by the ADS to help make such a decision.

I share the author's concern that in certain cases unregulated use of ADS by employers can be harmful to workers. However, rather than addressing the specific ways employers misuse this technology, the bill imposes unfocused notification requirements on any business using even the most innocuous tools. This proposed solution fails to directly address incidents of misuse.

Moreover, this measure proposes overly broad restrictions on how employers may use ADS tools. For example, prohibiting an employer from using customer ratings as the primary input data for an ADS takes away a potentially valuable tool for rewarding high-performing employees. To the extent that customer reviews are unfairly or inappropriately used to make decisions about a worker, legislation should address those specific scenarios rather than ban this practice altogether.

Finally, I share the author's concern about situations where an employer uses an ADS to make disciplinary, termination, or deactivation decisions. Such situations are partially covered by forthcoming California Privacy Protection Agency regulations, which would allow employees and independent contractors to better understand how their personal data is used by automated decision technology. Before enacting new legislation in this space, we should assess the efficacy of these regulations to address these concerns.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 7 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

23

S.B. No. 11—Ashby.

An act relating to artificial intelligence technology.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 11 without my signature.

This bill would amend existing statutes regarding the right of publicity and the crime of false impersonation to address situations involving digital replicas. It would also direct the Judicial Council to consider issues raised by evidence generated or manipulated by artificial intelligence (AI).

I commend the author for working to ensure that our state is prepared for the challenges raised by AI's ability to produce highly realistic digital content. I share the author's concern over the risks posed by synthetic content, including the use of AI to impersonate or appropriate another's likeness without their consent.

However, this bill also requires any AI technology that enables a user to create a digital replica to include, wherever a user may input a prompt, a hyperlink to a clear and conspicuous disclosure to warn users of potential civil or criminal liability. Failure to include the hyperlink exposes the technology provider to significant civil liability under this measure.

This year, I have signed bills requiring companion chatbot operators to disclose to users that they are interacting with an artificial system (SB 243, Padilla) and internet companies to warn minors of the potential dangers of social media use (AB 56, Bauer-Kahan). Under certain circumstances, public disclosures and warning labels can play a key role in providing transparency to the public and mitigating harm. In this case, however, it is unclear whether a warning would be sufficient to dissuade wrongdoers from using AI to impersonate others without their consent.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 11 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

24

S.B. No. 34—Richardson.

An act relating to air pollution.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 34 without my signature.

This bill would impose new requirements on the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for any adoption or amendment of a rule or regulation passed after July 1, 2025 that imposes new or additional emissions reduction requirements on sources of air pollution associated with port operations. The bill also would prohibit any port-related action that imposes a cap on cargo throughput or cruise ship passengers, or uses public funds to require or incentivize the use of automated or remotely operated equipment or supporting infrastructure. All these prohibitions and requirements would remain in effect until January 1, 2031.

California's ports are critical to the stability of our national and global supply chains and are relied upon by most Americans to meet their everyday needs. Today, our ports handle about 40 percent of the nation's containerized imports and 30 percent of our nation's exports, making them vital points in the flow of goods and commerce. At the same time, ports are also one of the most significant sources of local air pollution due to their reliance on fossil fuels. Over the past several years, our ports have made tremendous progress in building zero-emission infrastructure to reduce harmful air and climate pollution that benefits not just the ports, but also the surrounding communities.

With the current federal Administration directly undermining our state and local air and climate pollution reduction strategies, it is imperative that we maintain the tools we have and encourage cooperative action at all levels to avoid the worst health and climate impacts. To that end, I am encouraged by the productive discussions between the SCAQMD and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to identify and advance prudent air quality improvement measures and the SCAQMD's recent unanimous direction to staff to further their efforts to reach a Cooperative Agreement. This locally driven and collaborative approach toward reducing air and climate pollution is the type of consensus that should be supported and encouraged. This bill interferes with this approach, the progress made, and the ongoing good faith efforts made by the SCAQMD and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 34 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

25

S.B. No. 75—Smallwood-Cuevas.

An act relating to prisons.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 75 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), in partnership with the Department of Industrial Relations, to launch a pre-apprenticeship pilot program for five different trades in at least two institutions by 2028 through 2032, with annual reporting starting in 2029.

Providing the incarcerated population with skills to use upon release is critical to the successful reintegration of these individuals back into their communities. In this spirit, California has made significant, targeted investments over the past several years to support multiple educational and work-based programs within the state prison system. This includes the Adult Basic Education program, partnerships with institutions of higher education, the availability of Career Technical Education courses, and apprenticeship work opportunities.

While I am proud of this ongoing work, I appreciate the author's commitment to expand rehabilitative programming and career pathways - and I acknowledge there is more work to be done. However, this bill would establish a structure that cannot be implemented, conflicts with existing work, and creates cost pressures exceeding several million dollars annually to establish and operate a new pre-apprenticeship pilot program.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

I encourage the Legislature to revisit this issue as part of next year's budget process, so that targeted investments in CDCR's rehabilitative programming can be considered in the context of ongoing work to assist the incarcerated population with reentry into the community.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 75 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

26

S.B. No. 257—Wahab et al.

An act relating to health care coverage.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 257 without my signature.

This bill would make pregnancy a triggering event for purposes of enrollment or changing a health benefit plan.

I thank the author for her commitment to ensuring pregnant individuals have access to early and regular prenatal care and am supportive of policies that provide timely access to health care coverage. Unfortunately, this bill risks the overall affordability of health care in California, and is projected to increase health care spending by tens of millions of dollars annually - at a time when California is taking steps to control costs, as consumers are facing uncertainty and double-digit rate increases in their health care premiums across the nation.

Additionally, just this spring, California submitted a new essential health benefits (EHB) benchmark plan, which establishes minimum coverage requirements for specified plans as required by the ACA, to include specified infertility services, specified durable medical equipment, and hearing exams and hearing aids. This proposed expansion reached the upper limit of projected premium increases permitted by federal regulations. Passing additional policies that will lead to further premium increases while the EHB benchmark plan is still pending federal consideration would be irresponsible.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR’S VETOES—Continued

Finally, this bill would set a dangerous precedent for condition-specific special enrollment periods. The individual health insurance market can easily become unstable if persons are allowed to enroll when medical expenses first occur. This is why I signed a bill in 2019, SB 78, establishing an individual shared responsibility penalty for people who do not have or maintain their health insurance coverage. Individual market instability will lead to even higher costs in this fragile market.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 257 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

27

S.B. No. 298—Caballero et al.
An act relating to air resources.
Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 298 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Energy Commission (CEC), in coordination with the State Lands Commission, California State Transportation Agency, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB), to develop a plan by December 31, 2030, for the alternative fuel needs of Ocean-Going Vessels (OGVs) at ports that will meet ports’ emission reduction goals.

As the nation’s premier gateway for international trade, California’s ports are an essential component of the nation’s economy. I strongly support efforts to plan and deploy zero-emission infrastructure and technologies at our ports. This is why CARB has already begun the informal rulemaking phase for an OGV In-Transit Regulation to reduce harmful air pollution from OGVs while transiting, maneuvering, and anchoring in waters off the California coastline.

Though well-intentioned, the plan required by this bill could complicate CARB’s active OGV In-Transit rulemaking and result in costs to the CEC’s primary operating fund, which is currently facing an ongoing structural deficit, thus exacerbating the fund’s structural imbalance. I encourage the supporters of this measure to work with CARB through its rulemaking process to collaboratively identify solutions for deploying alternative fuels at our ports.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 298 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

28

S.B. No. 355—Pérez et al.

An act relating to employment.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 355 without my signature.

This bill would require an employer subject to a final judgment for unpaid wages to provide the Labor Commissioner's Office with documentation that the judgment was paid. If the employer fails to provide the information, the Labor Commissioner's Office would be required to transmit the judgment to the Employment Development Department (EDD) as a notice of potential tax fraud and assess a civil penalty against the employer.

My Administration is committed to combatting wage theft and ensuring workers receive the pay they are owed. However, the proposed referral process would be costly, duplicative, and unlikely to significantly improve collections of unpaid wages. The Labor Commissioner's Office already coordinates extensively with EDD regarding potential employer tax fraud cases through existing task forces that combat the underground economy, including the Joint Enforcement Strike Force and the Labor Enforcement Task Force. Through these partnerships, the Labor Commissioner's Office shares information about cases, and EDD investigates and conducts enforcement when tax fraud is found. In 2024 alone, these coordinated efforts resulted in over 2,000 payroll tax audits and investigations and \$213.5 million in assessments. Given limited resources and department capacity, creating an additional process that duplicates this focused work is not prudent.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 355 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

29

S.B. No. 369—Padilla.

An act relating to the Salton Sea.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 369 without my signature.

This bill would impose new workforce requirements on contractors, subcontractors, and entities at every other tier that work on state restoration projects at the Salton Sea starting January 1, 2026.

Over the course of my Administration, the state's Salton Sea Management Program has dramatically increased the pace and scale of its restoration projects, covering miles of previously exposed lakebed with bird and fish habitat, as well as native plants.

These efforts are addressing severe habitat loss and the public health risks of exposed lakebed dust emissions. Simultaneously, these investments are providing job opportunities for local workers in a region long burdened by high unemployment. These mutually beneficial outcomes are a transformative step for this region. That is why I was proud to collaborate with the author last year on the creation of the Salton Sea Conservancy, which will further advance these shared objectives and enhance these outcomes.

I appreciate the author's efforts and commitment to addressing the pervasive issues in the Salton Sea region. Though well-intended, I am concerned this bill may result in delays to critical, shovel-ready restoration projects. Recognizing the importance of prioritizing efforts to provide high-quality, local jobs while balancing the urgent need to accelerate restoration projects at the Salton Sea, I am directing the California Natural Resources Agency, in consultation with the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, to identify and publish recommendations on increasing regional workforce development opportunities and promote long-term economic mobility in the community.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 369 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

30

S.B. No. 388—Padilla et al.

An act relating to state government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 388 without my signature.

This bill would establish the California Latino Commission to advise and make recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on policy matters affecting Latino communities.

California is home to more than 15 million Latinos - nearly 40 percent of the state's population. Latinos play a central role in California's economy and culture, and my Administration will continue ongoing work to identify and address the challenges that face this community. While I am appreciative of the intent to provide this distinct venue to further address disparities and drive opportunity through data collection and analysis, initiatives, partnerships, evaluation, and other powers and duties, this bill would lead to ongoing implementation costs in the millions of dollars while duplicating existing efforts, many of which are supported by state funding.

In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 388 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

31

S.B. No. 404—Caballero et al.

An act relating to hazardous waste.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 404 without my signature.

The bill would establish a comprehensive regulatory program for metal shredding facilities to be administered by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and would require metal shredding facilities to obtain a permit from DTSC.

I support the author's intent to create a uniform structure for permitting metal shredding facilities in California. These facilities are critical to maintaining supply chain stability, recycling millions of end-of-life vehicles, household appliances, and other metallic items produced, used, and discarded annually in California. Unless recycled, these metal materials would overwhelm available landfill capacity, creating a massive accumulation of damaged and abandoned cars, appliances, and other items.

However, this bill lacks clear definitions regarding the materials processed at these facilities, including what "hazardous waste" requirements are applicable. Without this clarity, this bill is not as protective, places a significant burden on DTSC, and cannot be successfully implemented.

I encourage the author to work closely with DTSC and interested parties to remedy this issue, as well as ensure that any future legislation requires metal shredding facilities operate, and be permitted to operate, in a health-protective manner.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 404 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

32

S.B. No. 411—Pérez et al.

An act relating to pupil meals.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 411 without my signature.

This bill requires the California Department of Education (CDE), with support from the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), to develop and provide a statewide web application enabling families to submit federally required information, in adherence with specified requirements, to determine eligibility for school meal programs beginning with the application for summer 2028 benefits, contingent upon an appropriation.

Through California's Universal School Meals program, all students, regardless of income, now have access to two free meals each school day. In addition, the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer (SUN Bucks) program assists eligible families to ensure students are fed during the summer months. While I wholeheartedly support the author's intent to increase access to school meal programs, this bill imposes additional costs on the Department of Education to build, maintain, and operate a new statewide online data management system to determine eligibility. This should be considered as part of the budget process, rather than through legislation.

In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 411 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

33

S.B. No. 414—Ashby.

An act relating to school accountability.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 414 without my signature.

This bill makes changes to the oversight, auditing, and funding systems for nonclassroom-based (NCB) charter schools, expands local educational agencies' auditing procedures, and establishes a new Office of the Education Inspector General.

In the wake of several high-profile cases of fraud by NCB charter schools, in partnership with the Legislature, we charged the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team with studying ways to improve oversight and accountability, and to provide policymakers with recommendations to address those issues.

I deeply appreciate the efforts of the author and the negotiating parties to develop legislation that builds on these recommendations and the findings from the State Controller. However, this bill falls short. While the oversight and auditing provisions are meaningful, other sections are unworkable, would face legal challenges, and require hundreds of millions of dollars to implement. Additionally, provisions added late in the legislative process undermine important agreements my Administration made during my first term.

While I cannot sign this bill, I remain committed to improving oversight of our education system while preserving the ability of high-quality charter schools to continue educating the students they serve. As such, I am calling on all interested parties to work together in the coming months to find a swift resolution on remaining unresolved issues, so that follow-up legislation can be introduced and passed when the Legislature returns early next year. This legislation must ensure that public funds are properly utilized, address fraud and malfeasance, improve accountability and oversight, and acknowledge our fiscal reality to allow for successful implementation.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 414 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

34

S.B. No. 418—Menjivar et al.

An act relating to health care coverage, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 418 without my signature.

This bill would require health plans and insurers to cover a 12-month supply of federal Food and Drug Administration-approved prescription hormone therapy, and necessary supplies for self-administration, prescribed by an in network provider and dispensed at one time without utilization management (UM).

I appreciate the author's intent to ensure patient access to the comprehensive care they need. While there are provisions of this bill that are worthy of support, I am concerned about the limitation on the use of UM, which is an important tool to ensure enrollees receive the right care at the right time. Prohibiting this cost containment strategy is likely to result in an increase in enrollee premiums to offset costs incurred by health plans and insurers. At a time when individuals are facing double-digit rate increases in their health care premiums across the nation, we must take great care to not enact policies that further drive up the cost of health care, no matter how well-intended.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 418 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

35

S.B. No. 485—Reyes.

An act relating to local government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 485 without my signature.

This bill would allow an appointed county public defender to be removed from office only upon a three-fifths vote of the board of supervisors and a showing of good cause.

I appreciate the importance of protecting public defenders from undue political interference, as their role sometimes requires taking unpopular positions to fulfill their legal and ethical duties to their clients.

That said, I have not been presented with evidence that California's current system in any way impairs the effectiveness or independence of public defenders. Proponents only cite a handful of examples from other states of public defenders being removed from office for controversial advocacy.

Further, since the law does not place term limits on public defenders, this bill may ultimately make it unduly difficult to replace public defenders for legitimate reasons and leave incumbents entrenched, which I do not support.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 485 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

36

S.B. No. 509—Caballero et al.

An act relating to state government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 509 without my signature.

This bill would require the Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), in consultation with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), to develop training on recognizing and responding to transnational repression.

While I appreciate the author's intent to enhance the state's ability to identify and respond to transnational repression, this issue is best addressed through administrative action in coordination with federal agencies. By codifying definitions related to this training, this bill would remove the state's flexibility and ability to avoid future inconsistencies related to this work, especially since no unified federal definition exists.

Cal OES has already developed a training to help law enforcement recognize and respond to transnational repression. Information about this Transnational Repression Awareness class can be found on Cal OES's California Specialized Training Institute Criminal Justice / Homeland Security webpage. This work was done in coordination with Cal OES, POST, and federal partners to ensure alignment with national standards and equip local law enforcement with the tools needed to identify and react to this threat.

My administration moved quickly to provide local agencies with the necessary tools to protect these impacted communities while maintaining the essential administrative flexibility to adapt to this evolving issue.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 509 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

37

S.B. No. 512—Pérez et al.

An act relating to elections.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 512 without my signature.

This bill reaffirms that jurisdictions may use the initiative process to impose transactions and use taxes for transportation purposes.

The courts have consistently and repeatedly affirmed this existing authority; therefore, this bill is unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 512 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

38

S.B. No. 616—Rubio et al.

An act relating to state government.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 616 without my signature.

This bill would establish an independent Community Hardening Commission within the Department of Insurance (CDI) to review current and develop new wildfire community hardening standards every quarter starting January 1, 2026, and make recommendations to expedite certain community hardening practices.

At a time when Californians are grappling with rising insurance costs due to natural disasters exacerbated by climate change, the state has launched multiple efforts to expedite proven and cost-effective home hardening practices, aiming to improve insurability for millions of homeowners.

(CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

CAL FIRE currently administers California's Wildfire Mitigation Program, established in 2019 to strengthen community-wide resilience against wildfires. The California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) and CAL FIRE, working side-by-side with counties and cities, have launched a statewide wildfire home-hardening playbook that at-risk communities can lift straight off the shelf. In 2022, CDI introduced its "Safer from Wildfires" framework, a first-of-its-kind regulation that requires insurance companies to offer discounts to homeowners and businesses that take specific wildfire mitigation steps. These are just a few examples demonstrating the state's commitment to tackling this important issue.

This year, the Legislature sent me multiple bills with the intention of building upon this ongoing work. Unfortunately, rather than providing a coordinated approach, these measures are in conflict with one another, tasking different state entities with similar objectives. The lack of harmony between these efforts will not only result in conflicting outcomes but also in confusion for consumers, insurance companies, local governments, and emergency responders.

I encourage the Legislature to revisit this important issue next year and work collaboratively to navigate the different approaches to setting hardening standards, including determining the responsible state entity. In the meantime, California will continue to aggressively implement the multiple initiatives underway to mitigate wildfire risk, encourage cost-effective structure hardening and retrofitting, facilitate vegetation management, and address the availability and cost of insurance.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 616 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

39

S.B. No. 641—Ashby et al.

An act relating to professions and vocations, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 641 without my signature.

This bill would authorize licensing boards under the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Real Estate to waive the application of specified laws for licensees and applicants who are impacted by a proclaimed federal, state, or local emergency, or whose homes or businesses are located in a disaster area. Additionally, this bill would ban unsolicited offers by real estate licensees and their clients that are below market value, as it was the day before the disaster, and would ban it throughout the entire geographic area in which the disaster is proclaimed.

I appreciate the intent of the author to help those impacted by natural disasters to find regulatory relief quickly and to protect those with property in disaster areas. In response to recent disasters, my Administration worked closely with the Legislature to coordinate targeted relief and consumer protections to disaster victims - absent the authority sought in this bill.

With respect to the real estate protection provisions, the bill is overly broad, applying to all natural disasters even when housing is unaffected. It also leaves an enforcement gap by regulating licensees only when acting for clients, not for themselves. Together, these issues call into question whether the bill is properly tailored to achieve its stated goals.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 641 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

40

S.B. No. 643—Caballero et al.

An act relating to climate change.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 643 without my signature.

This bill would require, among other things, the California Air Resources Board to establish and administer the Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) Purchase Program as a competitive grant process for eligible carbon dioxide removal projects within the state and, between July 1, 2026, and December 31, 2035, to fund CDR projects in an amount totaling \$50 million.

Deploying CDR technologies and projects is an increasingly necessary strategy to achieve our 2045 carbon neutrality goal, and it is why I signed Senate Bill 905 (Caballero) in 2022 as part of that year's Climate Action Package, to support the development and growth of these technologies. Additionally, I recently signed Senate Bill 840 (Limón), which provides for a continuous appropriation from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund of \$85 million per year for climate-focused innovation that may include CDR technologies. I also recently signed Senate Bill 614 (Stern), which allows for the construction of safe carbon dioxide pipelines throughout the state to transport this greenhouse gas from where it is captured and removed to areas where it can be permanently sequestered.

While I applaud the author for her continued leadership in this area, given recent efforts to advance CDR technologies and projects, the program created by this bill is duplicative and not accounted for in this year's budget. In partnership with the Legislature this year, my Administration has enacted a balanced budget that recognizes the challenging fiscal landscape our state faces while maintaining our commitment to working families and our most vulnerable communities. With significant fiscal pressures and the federal government's hostile economic policies, it is vital that we remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications that are not included in the budget, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 643 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

41

S.B. No. 682—Allen.

An act relating to product safety.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 682 without my signature.

The bill, beginning January 1, 2028, prohibits a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale a cleaning product, dental floss, juvenile product, food packaging, or ski wax, as specified, that contains intentionally added PFAS. Additionally, this bill, beginning January 1, 2030, prohibits a person from distributing, selling, or offering for sale cookware that contains intentionally added PFAS.

I share the author's goal to protect human health and the environment by phasing out the use of PFAS in consumer products. However, the broad range of products that would be impacted by this bill would result in a sizable and rapid shift in cooking products available to Californians. I appreciate efforts to protect the health and safety of consumers, and while this bill is well-intentioned, I am deeply concerned about the impact this bill would have on the availability of affordable options in cooking products. I believe we must carefully consider the consequences that may result from a dramatic shift of products on our shelves.

I encourage the author and stakeholders to continue discussions in this space, while ensuring that we are not sacrificing the ability of Californians to afford household products like cookware with efforts to address the prevalence of PFAS.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 682 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

42

S.B. No. 703—Richardson.

An act relating to employment.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 703 without my signature.

This bill would require trucking companies and independent contractor truckers to annually provide the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles with information about their business structure and employees. It would also require each port to collect truck-related data, including the name listed on the truck's insurance policy. The ports would then publish both sets of information.

I appreciate the author's concern about the misclassification of truckers operating at the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach. However, this bill would significantly disrupt port operations by requiring these ports to collect and retain information on thousands of trucks each day. Given the variety of information required to be collected, this process will be challenging to automate or streamline.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 703 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

43

S.B. No. 756—Smallwood-Cuevas.

An act relating to motion picture tax credits.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 756 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Film Commission (CFC) to establish new data collection and compliance protocols for the California Film & TV Tax Credit Program.

I share the author's goal of ensuring that California's tax credit program lifts up underrepresented workers and communities. Recent legislation expanded support for productions that hire trainees from the Career Pathways Program, the CFC's workforce development initiative to expand access to film and television careers.

This measure, though well-intentioned, is premature and would impose significant and costly new obligations on the CFC. It proposes a process that requires the CFC to work with outside stakeholders and payroll companies to develop new definitions and standardized reporting templates. In addition, the CFC would need to create protocols to reduce nonresponse rates and collect more detailed demographic data. These requirements would necessitate a major overhaul of the CFC's data collection procedures, which were only recently refined during the rollout of Film Tax Credit 4.0, the current iteration of the program that began in July 2025.

While I am supportive of the author's effort to understand the full economic and community impact of the Film & TV Tax Credit Program, we should allow more time for the recent reforms to be implemented.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 756 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

44

S.B. No. 761—Ashby et al.

An act relating to public social services.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 761 without my signature.

This bill requires the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) to amend its Grant Delivery System to ensure students who may be eligible for CalFresh are identified. The bill also requires data-sharing agreements between CSAC and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), as well as between county welfare departments and the systemwide offices of the public postsecondary education systems, for the purpose of conducting direct outreach to students about CalFresh eligibility.

I strongly support the author's goal of expanding eligible college student participation in the CalFresh program and applaud the author for her commitment to this issue. However, as drafted, this bill contains significant policy and implementation challenges with respect to the required data-sharing agreements. I encourage the author to work with CDSS on a more implementable solution that reduces both privacy risks and the complexity of creating new data-sharing systems across multiple agencies.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 761 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

45

S.B. No. 764—Weber Pierson et al.
An act relating to children's health.
Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 764 without my signature.

This bill requires all chain restaurants that sell children's meals to offer at least one healthy option for children and provide training to their employees on nutritional standards.

My administration has championed multiple efforts to ensure that children in California are not only fed, but also receive more nutritious meals. From the California Universal Meal Program, to the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer (SUN Bucks) program, to the Farm to School Program, we are at the forefront of increasing nutritious, local foods in meals for children.

However, this bill regulates restaurants in a way that is unnecessary and overly burdensome. Parents understand their children's needs and how to determine appropriate meals for them when eating at restaurants.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 764 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

46

S.B. No. 771—Stern et al.

An act relating to social media platforms.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 771 without my signature.

This bill seeks to hold social media platforms liable for algorithms that relay content violating specified California civil rights laws to their users.

I support the author's goal of ensuring that our nation-leading civil rights laws apply equally both online and offline. I likewise share the author's concern about the growth of discriminatory threats, violence, and coercive harassment online. I am concerned, however, that this bill is premature. Our first step should be to determine if, and to what extent, existing civil rights laws are sufficient to address violations perpetrated through algorithms. To the extent our laws prove inadequate, they should be bolstered at that time.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 771 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

47

S.B. No. 783—Rubio et al.

An act relating to outdoor advertising.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 783 without my signature.

This bill would re-extend the sunset for the redevelopment agency project area exemption to the Outdoor Advertising Act until January 1, 2029.

As a former mayor, I have seen firsthand how outdoor advertising displays generate revenue and visibility for local economies and businesses. Yet extending the redevelopment agency exemption under the Outdoor Advertising Act simply continues a pattern of short-term fixes that avoid addressing the underlying issue. For more than a decade, this area of law has been managed through temporary extensions rather than a comprehensive solution.

There are over 40 former redevelopment agency legacy displays throughout California. A lasting resolution should address them directly - whether through targeted statutory changes to the Act, administrative adjustments, or simply bringing the displays into compliance with existing law. That approach is far more durable and legally sound than repeated exemptions, which only create uncertainty, increase risk, and jeopardize critical funding that supports thousands of jobs at the state and local level.

I encourage the Legislature and stakeholders to work with my Administration on a durable solution that provides stability while balancing economic benefits with the state's fiscal and regulatory responsibilities.

For this reason, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 783 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

48

S.B. No. 787—McNerney et al.

An act relating to energy.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 787 without my signature.

This bill would require the California Energy Commission (CEC) to designate a person to serve as the Senior Counselor on Industrial Policy and Clean Energy Development in order to convene working groups focused on specific issues, including batteries, offshore wind, building decarbonization, workforce development, heat pumps, and affordability. This bill would also require the CEC to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with various agencies on equitable clean energy supply chains and require the Senior Counselor to present an annual report to the CEC, presenting findings and recommendations on strategies and activities undertaken pursuant to the MOU.

Transitioning to a low-carbon, clean energy economy requires active coordination and collaboration among multiple state agencies to effectively implement key policies that shape and influence this transition. This is why there is deliberate and constant engagement among all state agencies involved in this transition, through collaborative decision-making and interagency working groups, among other joint efforts.

While laudable, this bill would create a position whose responsibilities would duplicate, conflict with, and overlap with existing positions and coordinating structures throughout my Administration. The role of creating robust supply chains, enabling the deployment of clean energy and low-carbon, advanced technologies, and developing the 21st-century workforce to support these efforts is not reserved for one position alone. It requires the whole of state government and dozens of dedicated public servants to implement.

In furtherance of these efforts, I am directing the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development, in coordination with the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the California Energy Commission and other relevant agencies, to work with stakeholders to develop and provide my office with recommendations on additional administrative strategies and enhancements to state agency coordinating structures that could better align my Administration's efforts with the state's decarbonization and clean energy deployment policy goals and objectives.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 787 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

SENATE SUPPLEMENTAL FILE
GOVERNOR'S VETOES—Continued

49

S.B. No. 791—Cortese et al.

An act relating to vehicles.

Vote required: 27

To the Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill 791 without my signature.

This bill authorizes car dealers to increase the document processing fee they can charge a customer from \$85 to 1 percent of the total price of the vehicle, up to \$260, until January 1, 2031.

At a time when Californians are already struggling with the high cost of living, this bill would raise the document processing fee to three times the current \$85 cap - far beyond what an inflation adjustment would justify. With no new state requirements and increasingly streamlined DMV processes, consumers could be charged hundreds more for only minutes of data entry.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom

2025

Oct. 13—Shall Senate Bill 791 become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? (Must be considered pursuant to Joint Rule 58.5.)

