SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2021-2022 Regular Session

AB 2383 (Jones-Sawyer)
Version: March 28, 2022
Hearing Date: June 28, 2022
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
TSG

SUBJECT

Rental housing unlawful housing practices: applications: criminal history information

DIGEST

This bill requires residential landlords to follow specified tenant screening procedures designed to ensure compliance with fair housing laws as they relate to consideration of criminal history information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Having a criminal history can make it extremely difficult to obtain rental housing. Lack of stable housing is one of the major causes of criminal recidivism. This feedback loop means that, instead of being able to reintegrate into society productively, too many Californians with criminal histories wind up stuck going back and forth between homelessness and incarceration. This bill seeks to break up that dynamic. The bill would require landlords to conduct their initial screening of tenant applications without taking criminal history into account, and if the landlord later intends to deny the applicant on the basis of criminal history, the landlord would have to give the applicant a short window to correct errors or provide mitigating information first. The bill also limits what parts of a criminal history can be the basis for rejecting a tenant, including prohibiting a landlord from considering anything over seven years old.

The bill is sponsored by the Anti-Recidivism Coalition, the Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership, and the Young Women's Freedom Center. Support comes from some anti-recidivism advocacy groups who argue the bill is essential to breaking cycles of incarceration and homelessness. Opposition comes from rental property owners' associations who feel the bill restricts landlord's ability to consider rental history too much and other anti-recidivism advocates who believe just the opposite. The bill passed out off of the Assembly Floor by a vote of 43-20. If the bill passes out of this Committee, it will next be heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

1) Declares that it is the policy of the State of California to promote fairness and equality and to combat discrimination. (Gov. Code § 11139.8.)

2) Provides, pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act, that all persons within the jurisdiction of the state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sexual orientation, citizenship, primary language, or immigration status are, they are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever. (Civ. Code § 51(b).)

3) Declares it to be against public policy to practice discrimination in housing accommodations on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, or genetic information; and declares further that every person has a civil right to seek, obtain, or hold housing without facing discrimination based on these protected classes. (Gov. Code §§ 12920, 12921(b).)

4) Declares it unlawful, pursuant to the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), for the owner of any housing accommodation to inquire about; make known any preference or limitation as to; discriminate against; or harass, a person based on the person's race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, veteran or military status, or genetic information. (Gov. Code § 12955(a)-(c).)

5) Establishes the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) with the powers and duties to, among other things, receive, investigate, conciliate, mediate, and/or prosecute complaints relating to housing discrimination. (Gov. Code §§ 12901, 12930.)

6) Defines "criminal history information" under FEHA as any record that contains individually identifiable information and describes an individual's criminal history or contacts with a law enforcement agency. Includes information describing an individual's arrests; information that an individual has been charged; information that an individual has been questioned, apprehended, taken into custody or detained, or held for investigation by a law enforcement, police, military, or prosecutorial agency; records from any jurisdiction; and records that are not

prepared strictly for law enforcement purposes, such as investigative consumer reports. (2 C.C.R. § 12264.)

7) Establishes that a practice has a discriminatory effect in housing if it actually or predictably results in a disparate impact on a group of individuals, or else creates, increases, reinforces, or perpetuates segregated housing patterns, based on membership in a protected class. (2 C.C.R. § 12060(b).)

8) Prohibits a housing provider from seeking information about, considering, or using criminal history information if the information has a discriminatory effect against protected classes, unless a legally sufficient justification applies. (2 C.C.R. § 12265.)

9) Sets forth that a business establishment may show a legally sufficient justification by establishing that the practice is necessary to achieve substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory business interests; that the practice carries out the identified business interest, including consideration of the nature and severity of the crime, and the time that has passed since criminal conduct occurred; and that there is no feasible alternative that would equally or better accomplish the identified business interest with a less discriminatory effect. (2 C.C.R. §§ 12062(a), 12266(a),(b).)

10) Provides that, in determining whether a feasible alternative practice with a less discriminatory effect exists, the courts must consider factors that include whether the practice allows an individual to present mitigating information; whether the practice requires consideration of the factual accuracy of the criminal history information and of mitigating information; and whether the practice delays considering criminal history information until after other qualifications are verified. (2 C.C.R. § 12266(d).)

11) Defines mitigating information as credible information about the individual that suggests that the individual is not likely to pose a demonstrable risk to the achievement of the identified interest, including whether the individual was young at the time of the conduct; how long ago the conduct happened; good tenant history; evidence of rehabilitation efforts; and whether the conduct arose because of disability or domestic violence. (2 C.C.R. § 12266(e).)

12) Prohibits seeking information about, consideration of, or use of criminal history information if doing so would constitute intentional discrimination against protected classes, including cases where selective use of the information is demonstrated to be a pretext for unequal treatment. (2 C.C.R. §§ 12265(b), 12267.)

13) Prohibits written or oral statements regarding criminal history information (such as advertisements or applications) if they constitute discriminatory statements against protected classes. (2 C.C.R. §§ 12265(c), 12268(a).)

14) Allows for advertising a lawful screening policy and providing individuals a copy of a lawful screening policy. (2 C.C.R. § 12268(b).)

15) Declares that DFEH regulations on the use of criminal records in housing do not exempt persons from complying with local laws or ordinances, provided that such local laws or ordinances do not violate FEHA or implementing regulations. (2 C.C.R. § 12271.)

This bill:

1) Declares that it is the intent of the Legislature to provide the formerly incarcerated an opportunity to receive a thorough and fair vetting when seeking housing. Declares that nothing in this act is intended to compel, or otherwise require, a landlord or property owner to provide housing to any individual.

2) Defines "criminal history information" as any record that contains individually identifiable information and describes any aspect of an individual's criminal history or contacts with any law enforcement agency, including records from any jurisdiction and records that are not prepared strictly for law enforcement purposes, such as investigative consumer reports.

3) Establishes that it is an unlawful practice for the owner of a rental housing accommodation, or another individual or business establishment, to inquire about, or to require an applicant to disclose, or to otherwise seek, consider, use, or take adverse action on, criminal history information before a decision is made to rent or lease a rental housing accommodation ("initial application assessment phase.")

4) Provides that, following a successful initial application assessment phase, the owner of a rental housing accommodation may request a criminal background check and consider an applicant's criminal history information.

5) Mandates that, if the owner of a rental housing accommodation is considering denying an application based in whole or in part on an applicant's criminal history information, they must provide the applicant with a specified notice and a written statement listing the reasons for the possible denial within five days of receiving the criminal history information before making a final decision. Mandates that, if an applicant's criminal history check is the basis for a possible denial, the written statement described above must list all convictions and additional specified information.

6) Provides that, if within three days of receiving the above information, an applicant provides evidence demonstrating the inaccuracy of items within the criminal history information or evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors, the owner must reconsider their decision and delay the denial for no longer than five

days after receipt of the information. Mandates that if the owner chooses to deny the application after considering the mitigating information, the owner must notify the applicant in writing.

7) Provides that "evidence of rehabilitation or other mitigating factors" includes all of the following:
   a) satisfactory compliance with the terms and conditions of parole or probation, mandatory supervision, or Post Release Community Supervision, not including a persons' inability to pay fines, fees, and restitution due to indigence;
   b) evidence of maintaining steady employment, particularly related to a person's post-conviction employment;
   c) employer recommendations;
   d) educational attainment or training since conviction;
   e) completion of, or participation in, rehabilitative treatment;
   f) letters of recommendation from specified community members who have observed the person since their conviction;
   g) a person's familial relationship with a person who may be currently residing in the housing accommodation;
   h) the age of the person at the time of the conviction;
   i) explanation of preceding coercive conditions that contributed to the conviction;
   j) the amount of time that has passed since the date of conviction; and
   k) evidence that the individual has maintained a good tenant history.

8) Prohibits the owner of a rental housing accommodation from seeking, considering, or using the following information as part of the application process:
   a) a previous arrest that did not result in a conviction;
   b) participation in, or completion of, a diversion or a deferral of judgment program;
   c) a conviction that has been judicially dismissed, expunged, voided, invalidated, or otherwise rendered inoperative;
   d) a determination or adjudication in the juvenile justice system or other specified information;
   e) information pertaining to an offense other than a felony or misdemeanor;
   f) a conviction that is not directly related to substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory purposes. Requires consideration of the nature and severity of the crime and the amount of time that has passed since the criminal conduct occurred; or
   g) information pertaining to a conviction that occurred more than seven years before the date of the application for rental housing accommodations.

9) Requires the owner of a rental housing accommodation who uses criminal records as part of their screening criteria to provide a specified notice to applicants in the application for tenancy, setting forth the process whereby an applicant may dispute criminal record information that is the basis for a denial. Exempts from this

requirement an owner who is otherwise required by state or federal law to consider criminal history information prior to the final part of the rental application process.

10) Exempts specified housing accommodations from the provisions of this bill.

11) Specifies that this bill does not diminish other applicable laws related to consideration of criminal history information in housing.

12) Specifies that, if the provisions above conflict with any other law or regulation, the policy which provides greater protections to applicants shall control.

13) Expands the procedure for the prevention and elimination of discrimination in housing under the Fair Employment and Housing Act to include alleged violations of the protections specified in this bill.

14) Specifies various dispute resolution and litigation timelines for the Department of Fair Employment and Housing to use when considering alleged violations of the protections specified in this bill.

COMMENTS

1. The link between recidivism and housing stability

There is strong evidence of a link between housing instability and recidivism. As expressed by the proponents of this bill, safe and reliable shelter is foundational to people's ability to lead productive lives. If people exiting the criminal justice system are unable to obtain stable housing, they are far more likely to reoffend. The result is a revolving cycle of homelessness and incarceration. And, because people of color are disproportionately caught up in the criminal justice system, they also get caught up disproportionately in this cycle of housing instability and recidivism.

2. How this bill proposes to disrupt the link between criminal history and housing instability

This bill establishes a tenant screening process that all landlords would be required to follow. The details of that process are set forth under the heading "This Bill," above. In summary fashion, the process can be described as follows.

Landlords may solicit rental applications from tenants, but may not initially screen those applications for criminal history. If an applicant meets the landlord's other criteria for acceptance, then the landlord may proceed to perform a criminal background check on the tenant. The bill places restrictions on what aspects of an applicant's criminal history information the landlord can consider. If the landlord decides that the landlord is going to reject an applicant based on criminal history, the landlord has five days to

inform the applicant what aspect of the applicant's criminal history gave rise to the rejection and what the business rationale for the rejection is. The applicant then has three days to present any mitigating evidence to the landlord, which could include proof that the criminal history information in question is erroneous or might consist of reasons why, in spite of the criminal history, the applicant will make a good tenant anyway. The landlord must consider this mitigating information, but is under no legal obligation to change their mind about the underlying chance. The bill thus gives applicants with criminal history what is sometimes described as a fair chance at obtaining housing, certainly not a guarantee of it.

3. Giving procedural structure to existing fair housing law as it relates to consideration of criminal history

In evaluating the policy merits of this bill, it is crucial to understand that most of the substantive provisions in the bill – what kinds of criminal history information a landlord can consider; how far back the landlord can look; that the landlord should not reject an applicant based on criminal history unless there is a business rationale for the decision, etc. – are not actually new law. They derive from existing fair housing law as most recently expressed in regulations promulgated by the California Fair Employment and Housing Council. (*See* 2 C.C.R. §§ 12264 *et seq*.) Some of the most pertinent of those regulations, as they relate to this bill, are set forth under "Existing Law," above.

The real work of the bill is in establishing tenant screening procedures that breathe life into these substantive requirements. For example, the regulations say, in effect, that a landlord is at greater risk of being found in violation of fair housing law if the landlord does not consider mitigating information from the applicant before rejecting that applicant. But the regulations do not provide any particular timelines or procedures for when and how this has to happen. This bill does.

Similarly, while the regulations tell landlords they may violate fair housing law if they automatically rule out all applicants with a criminal history, the regulations do not prevent the landlord from immediately obtaining the applicant's criminal history information at the beginning of the process. As a result, the landlord's awareness of the various applicants' criminal history (or the absence of it) is likely to influence the landlord's evaluation of the applicants from the outset. The tenant screening procedures proposed in this bill are designed to prevent that from happening.

In some ways, the proposed approach is akin to the structure that California has adopted in the context of employment. (*See* AB 1008, McCarty, Ch. 789, Stats. 2017.) That law prohibits employers from inquiring about a job applicant's criminal history until after making a conditional job offer, limits the types of criminal history information that employers can consider, requires employers to have and state a nexus between the criminal history information and business purpose justifying rescission of a

job offer, and requires employers to give applicants time to present mitigating evidence in response.

4. Principal opposition concerns from the landlord perspective

Several regional rental housing associations and the California Association of Realtors all oppose this bill, at least in its current form. While they generally seem to acknowledge that state and federal fair housing law already restrict how much a landlord can take an applicant's criminal history into consideration, these opponents believe the bill goes beyond those requirements in at least one detail. These opponents agree that fair housing law prohibits landlords from taking criminal history that is more than seven years old into account, but they disagree with the author about when that seven year clock should begin to run. The bill starts the seven year clock at the time of the conviction. The landlord-side opponents of the bill believe the clock should start at the time of release.

As a legal matter, it may be that further elucidation about this point is needed from the courts or California's Fair Employment and Housing Council, which develops and promulgates the relevant regulations. The current regulations on this point state that the lookback period begins as of "disposition, release or parole" but then go on to add that "a court may consider shorter look-back periods in its determination of whether there is a feasible alternative practice," that a landlord is required to use. (2 C.C.R. § 12269(b).) Moreover, a recent federal Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision interpreting the body of law in question ruled that the lookback period begins at the "date of entry" rather than at the "date of disposition." (*Moran v. Screening Pros, LLC* (9th Cir. 2019) 943 F.3d 1175, 1182.) That ruling calls the validity of the current Fair Employment and Housing Council regulations into question.

Given this state of legal flux, it is perhaps best if the look back period permissible under this bill is tied to whatever the Fair Employment and Housing Council regulations say, so that the bill does not wind up inadvertently diverging from fair housing law. The author proposes to offer an amendment in Committee that would reflect this approach. Pursuant to that approach, the applicable look back period under the bill would, for now, be seven years from the date of "disposition, release, or parole."

Another of the landlord opponents' main criticisms of the bill is that it could potentially put other tenants at greater risk of harm by preventing landlords from screening people out based on criminal history. As expressed by the California Rental Housing Association:

> Removing our ability to ask an applicant about their criminal conviction record up front diminishes our ability to properly vet our applicants. This will ultimately threaten the quality of life and safety of other residents in our communities. AB 2383 also removes

> assurances for existing residents that the backgrounds of their neighbors have been properly vetted. Also, consider the hundreds of thousands of renters who have agreed to have their records scanned as a part of the application process because they knew their record was clean. Many residents take comfort knowing that their new neighbors, and future neighbors, are held to the same expectation that they were. They should have the right to expect the same level of assessment from their neighbors. This bill also threatens the safety of our employees. If a housing provider must ask for details pertaining to criminal records that come up in the secondary search, applicants may feel intimidated, challenged, or defensive. This could lead to contentious interactions that may threaten our employee's safety.

In assessing this concern, it is important to bear in mind that, under the bill, landlords are still perfectly free to vet applicants based on their criminal history and to reject an applicant based on that criminal history where that rejection can be justified by business purposes, including resident safety concerns. What the bill would not permit is the immediate and automatic rejection of applicants simply because their criminal history information discloses some interaction with the criminal justice system. Instead, if the applicant is qualified to rent in every other respect, landlords would have to thoughtfully consider whether the criminal history information in question does, in fact, raise legitimate business concerns for the landlord or not. This neither forces the landlord to rent to someone with a criminal history nor guarantees someone with a criminal history that their application to rent will be approved.

Finally, from the viewpoint of the landlord opponents of the bill, it unnecessarily complicates and delays the tenant screening process. That the procedures are more involved and that they would often result in at least a short delay in the tenant screening process is indisputable. From a policy standpoint, the question is whether the benefits of disrupting the housing instability and recidivism link make this short delay worthwhile. It may also be worth emphasizing again that these procedures largely ensure that landlords follow existing fair housing law. In other words, they are probably not much different from the procedures that a landlords' attorney might suggest for cautious clients who want to be certain that their tenant screening practices are beyond reproach from a fair housing standpoint.

5. Principal opposition concerns from the anti-recidivism perspective

The bill also faces opposition from some anti-recidivism and affordable housing advocates who believe that it does not do enough to open up housing opportunities for people with criminal history. In particular, these groups argue for two key changes to the bill.

First, they believe that a landlord should not be able to conduct a criminal background check until a conditional offer has been made to rent to the tenant. Absent this step, these opponents assert, the landlord can simply abandon the application during the process of reviewing the criminal history information. Moreover, these opponent point out that requiring the landlord to make a conditional offer before conducting a criminal background check would aid in enforcement of the law because it would isolate the stage of the process in which the landlord is only considering criminal history information. Absent a conditional offer, these opponents argue, it will be exceedingly difficult for anyone to prove whether the landlord rejected the applicant based on criminal history or because the applicant did not meet some other element of the landlords screening criteria.

In assessing this argument, it may be helpful to consider that the bill in print requires landlords who intend to consider criminal history information to provide applicants with certain notices at various stages in the tenant screening process. The first of these, to be given at the beginning of the process, starts out by informing the applicant that:

> This property will run a criminal background check as the final part of the application process. You are not required, and the owner cannot require you, to disclose criminal history information *until your application has met all of the property's other screening requirements*. If your application may be rejected based on your criminal history information, the owner will provide you with written notice about the possible rejection. [Emphasis added.]

As a result, even though the applicant will not have a conditional offer in hand when the landlord undertakes the criminal history screening, the applicant will have an indication that the applicant has met all of the landlord's other criteria.

Second, this set of opponents to the bill argue that tenants facing a denial of rental housing on the basis of their criminal history should be given more time to present mitigating information. Whether the applicant must correct erroneous information in the criminal history screening report or must gather evidence of rehabilitation and personal evolution, the process is going to take time. In some instances, these opponents point out, it could take weeks to get necessary documents from law enforcement or the corrections system. At a minimum, they say, housing applicants should have seven business days to put together their response.

While there is no doubt that it will take time to put together mitigation evidence, the longer the application process drags out, the longer the unit remains vacant, not only depriving the landlord of revenue, but also preventing other tenants from moving in. Moreover, except for circumstances in which the criminal history is completely erroneous, the housing applicant should have at least some idea of what is likely to turn up on the criminal history report. After being rejected once, the applicant would

certainly be on notice for the next time. Given that, applicants hoping to overcome any issues in their criminal history will begin preparing their mitigating evidence in advance of a rejection. When the necessity and likelihood of advance preparation is taken into account, the three day period provided by the bill seems more reasonable.

6. Proposed amendments

In order to address the issues set forth in the Comments, above, the author proposes to incorporate amendments into the bill that would:

- revise the starting point for the look back period for criminal history information so that it is pegged to whatever the current Fair Employment and Housing Council regulation is on the subject. Right now, that regulatory standard is the date of "disposition, release, or parole."

7. Arguments in support of the bill

According to the author:

> This bill addresses the pressing need to decrease the number of homeless people who are formerly incarcerated. This issue carries greater urgency as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the housing crisis in California. Articles report that "crime-free housing" policies are increasing, specifically targeting Black and Latino residents with criminal histories. It is time California put an end to policies that aim to reduce access to housing for families and individuals seeking a second chance, especially when stable housing is a factor known to reduce recidivism.

As sponsor of the bill, the Anti-Recidivism Coalition writes:

> Housing is a foundational need for those navigating reentry. It is the first step to finding stability and a significant factor in determining the success of one's reentry. Without housing stability, all of the other pillars of a full and healthy life – family unification, education, employment, etc. – are at risk, if not completely unattainable. The ripples of housing discrimination spread across our communities, from children of formerly incarcerated being without stable housing to the safety of the California public at large, and contributes to our state's overwhelming houselessness crisis.

8. Arguments in opposition to the bill

In opposition to the bill, a coalition of advocates for affordable housing and formerly incarcerated individuals writes:

> We recommend [amendments] to make clear that landlords cannot consider a criminal history until after a conditional housing offer is extended, they have the consent of the applicant, and provide the applicant with the opportunity to provide mitigating information. Without providing sufficient time for applicants to assemble evidence of rehabilitation or to prove an inaccuracy on the background check report, AB 2383 lacks procedural justice. Applicants would be given a false sense of hope that this process would actually provide them a chance to demonstrate they are good and reliable tenants.

In further opposition to the bill, the California Association of Realtors writes:

> AB 2383 upends existing law by only allowing housing providers to consider criminal history information up to seven years from the date of conviction. […] Additionally, when criminal history information is used as the basis for possible denial, AB 2383 requires a housing provider to provide a written statement to the rental housing applicant that includes copious amounts of information relating to EACH conviction, including the applicable law providing the basis for conviction. Most housing providers are not lawyers so they will have no practical way of providing all of this detailed information.

SUPPORT

Anti-Recidivism Coalition (sponsor)
Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership (sponsor)
Young Women's Freedom Center (sponsor)
Abundant Housing LA
African American Wellness Center for Children and Families
California Community Builders
Kitchens for Good
LINC Housing
San Diego Second Chance

OPPOSITION

A New Way of Life
Affordable Housing Management Association – Northern California and Hawaii

Affordable Housing Management Association – Pacific South West
All of Us or None
Apartment Association of Orange County
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency
California Association of Realtors
California Rental Housing Association
Communities United For Restorative Youth Justice
East Bay Rental Housing Association
Homies Unidos
Inland Empire Fair Chance Coalition
Just Cities
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
National Housing Law Project
Orange County Apartment Association
Root & Rebound
Rubicon Programs
Southern California Rental Housing Association
Starting Over, Inc.
TechEquity Collaborative

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 1335 (Eggman, 2022) prohibits a landlord from using a person's credit history as part of the application process for a rental accommodation in instances involving a government rent subsidy unless the landlord offers the applicant the option to provide alternative evidence of financial responsibility and ability to pay. SB 1335 is currently pending consideration before the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.

AB 2559 (Ward, 2022) would codify a process whereby applicants for a rental property may generate reusable tenant screening reports and landlords may accept reusable screening reports. AB 2559 is currently pending consideration before the Senate Judiciary Committee and will be heard on the same day as this bill.

Prior Legislation:

AB 1241 (Jones-Sawyer, 2021) would have prohibited landlords from asking about criminal history until after the initial application and assessment. After that, landlords would have been able to request a background check, and upon receiving the information, would have had five days to notify an applicant in writing about potential reasons for denial. The bill would also have provided applicants the right to contest the accuracy of the findings presented by the landlord and limited the criminal history

lookback period to 7 years. AB 1241 died in the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.

AB 53 (Jones-Sawyer, 2019) would have made it an unlawful practice for the owner of a rental housing accommodation to inquire about an applicant's criminal history during the initial application assessment. The bill would have given a prospective tenant 2 days to provide the owner evidence demonstrating the inaccuracy of the applicant's criminal record. This bill also would have prohibited an owner from denying housing to an individual based on specified circumstances. AB 53 was held in Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee.

AB 1008, McCarty, Ch. 789, Stats. 2017) prohibited employers from inquiring about a job applicant's criminal history until after making a conditional job offer, limited the types of criminal history information that employers could consider, required employers to have and state a nexus between the criminal history information and business purpose justifying rescission of a job offer, and required employers to give applicants time to present mitigating evidence in response.

AB 396 (Jones-Sawyer, 2015) would have prohibited the owner of a rental housing accommodation from conducting a criminal background check during the initial application period. The bill passed the Assembly Housing Committee, and was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 43, Noes 20)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 4)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 7, Noes 3)
Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 2)

****