




# 2018 Vote Record

Every year at the close of the legislative session, the Chamber publishes a voting record to give members a sense of their legislators’ voting patterns. Our 2018 state legislators were Senator Henry Stern and Assemblyman Dante Acosta.

Below you will find a sampling of Senator Stern’s and Assemblyman Acosta’s vote record. CalChamber calculated voting records to see which legislators cast business friendly votes.

Assemblyman Acosta supported CalChamber’s position with 80% of his votes. Senator Stern supported CalChamber’s position with 7% of his votes.

In 2019, Simi Valley will be represented by Senator Henry Stern and Assemblywoman Christy Smith.

LEGISLATION	Stern	Acosta	SVCC
			
<b><u>Corporate Governance</u></b>			
<b>SB 826—Board Quotas</b> This bill, no later than the close of the 2019 calendar year, would require a domestic general corporation or foreign corporation that is a publicly held corporation, as defined, whose principal executive offices, according to the corporation’s SEC 10-K form, are located in California to have a minimum of one female, as defined, on its board of directors, as specified. No later than the close of the 2021 calendar year, the bill would increase that required minimum number to 2 female directors if the corporation has 5 directors or to 3 female directors if the corporation has 6 or more directors. The bill would require, on or before specified dates, the Secretary of State to publish various reports on its Internet Web site documenting, among other things, the number of corporations in compliance with these provisions.	Y	No Vote	Oppose
<b><u>Labor &amp; Employment</u></b>			
<b>AB 1870—Statute of Limitations</b> The California Fair Employment and Housing Act makes specified employment and housing practices unlawful, including discriminating against or harassment of employees and tenants, and authorizes a person claiming to be aggrieved to file a complaint with the Department within one year from the date of occurrence. This bill would extend the period to 3 years for complaints alleging discrimination.	Y	Y	Oppose
<b>AB 2770—Defamation Protections</b> This bill would include among those privileged communications complaints of sexual harassment by an employee, without malice, to an employer based on credible evidence and communications between the employer and interested persons regarding a complaint of sexual harassment and would authorize an employer to answer, without malice, whether the employer would rehire an employee and whether or not a decision to not rehire is based on the employer’s determination that the former employee engaged in sexual harassment	Y	Y	Support
<b>SB 1300—Harassment Discrimination</b> The bill, with certain exceptions, would prohibit an employer, in exchange for a raise or bonus, or as a condition of employment of continued employment, from requiring the execution of a release of a claim or right under FEHA or from requiring an employee to sign a nondisparagement agreement or other document that purports to deny the employee the right to disclose information about unlawful acts in the workplace, including, but not limited to, sexual harassment. The bill would provide that an agreement or document in violation of either of those prohibitions is contrary to public policy and unenforceable.	Y	N	Oppose
<b><u>Product Regulation</u></b>			
<b>SB 1249—Limits Consumer Options</b> This bill would make it unlawful for a manufacturer to import for profit, sell, or offer for sale in this state, any cosmetic, as defined, if the cosmetic was developed or manufactured using an animal test that was conducted or contracted by the manufacturer, or any supplier of the manufacturer, on or after January 1, 2020, except as specified. The bill would specify that a violation of its provisions is punishable by an initial fine of \$5,000 and an additional fine of \$1,000 for each day the violation continues, and may be enforced by the district attorney or city attorney in the county or city in which the violation occurred, as specified. The bill would not apply to a cosmetic in its final form or to an ingredient, if the cosmetic or ingredient was sold in California or tested on animals before January 1, 2020, as specified. The bill would authorize cosmetic inventory in violation of the bill’s provisions to be sold for a period of 180 days. The bill would prohibit a county or political subdivision of the state from establishing or continuing any prohibition on or relating to animal tests that is not identical to the prohibitions in the bill and that does not include the exemptions contained in the bill.	Y	Passed Asm after CalChamber removed opposition	Monitor