



LEAGUE OF
CALIFORNIA
CITIES



August 24, 2023

The Honorable Anthony Portantino
1021 O Street, Suite 7630
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Senate Bill 799 (Portantino) Unemployment Insurance: Trade Disputes: Eligibility for Benefits.
– OPPOSE (As Amended August 22, 2023)**

Dear Senator Portantino,

The undersigned organizations respectfully oppose your Senate Bill 799 (Portantino), which would provide employees who remain on strike for more than two weeks with Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits, thus requiring employers (via UI) to fund ongoing labor disputes. Local government revenues are incredibly restrictive and funding sources are limited; as cost pressures continue to increase for local governments, it is critical that we have a fiscally solvent UI system in order for local agencies to continue to provide services to the public and provide competitive benefits to our active and retired employees. An employer that has never had a labor dispute will still face increased UI costs under this measure.

Under existing law, UI payments are intended to assist employees who, through no fault of their own, are forced to leave their employment. Participating local agencies fund these payments via an Unemployment Insurance Reserve Account (UI Account) with the Employment Development Department (EDD). SB 799 makes a significant change to this approach by providing unemployment to workers who are currently employed, and not seeking other employment, but have chosen as a labor-negotiating tactic to go on strike. In the event of a strike that lasts over two weeks, SB 799 would allow all striking workers to claim UI benefits for up to 26 weeks. In this situation, a local government agency would experience simultaneous claims that would significantly increase UI costs. These costs would impact public employers, such as cities, counties, special districts, and joint powers authorities. It would also impact K-12 schools, as school districts directly pay a portion of employee wages to the State fund through the School Employee Fund, coordinated through their County Office of Education.



In addition to its considerable costs to employers, SB 799 will likely further harm the already insolvent UI fund and threaten benefits to unemployed Californians in future recessions. As recently reported by the US Department of Labor, [California's UI Fund was exhausted during the COVID-19 pandemic, and has an outstanding balance of \\$18.6 billion owed to the Federal government.](#)¹ This is nearly double the amount of funds that California borrowed the last time California's UI funds were exhausted during the 2008 recession. Beginning in 2008, California accumulated more than \$10 billion in debt and which was not repaid until 2018 – a decade later. This UI deficit had significant fiscal effects on employers and the general fund. California's UI insolvency resulted in significant federal tax increases ranging from the hundreds of millions to over \$2 billion per year between 2012-2018. With California's UI Fund becoming insolvent less than two years after repaying federal UI from the Great Recession, California cannot afford to further leverage and strain an already burdened system.

The State Department of Finance has stated that this measure's unsuccessful predecessor Assembly Bill 1066 (Gonzalez, Lorena, 2019), would have resulted in, "... Increased cost pressures on the UI Fund, exacerbating the condition of the Fund and hindering the ability to build a reserve to respond to variations in the economy." With a possible recession looming, and the State prioritizing budget resiliency, it would be counter-productive for the State to increase cost pressures on its UI fund while simultaneously preparing for a recession by bolstering its reserves.

It is also important to note that this measure will further erode good faith negotiations at the bargaining table for local government employers. Local governments work hard to engage in good faith bargaining. If SB 799 were to become law, we anticipate longer lengths of impasse, higher costs associated with protracted Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) proceedings and decline in quality of public services.

For these reasons, we must respectfully oppose your SB 799. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

 <p>Aaron Avery Senior Legislative Representative California Special Districts Association aarona@csda.net</p>	 <p>Kalyn Dean Legislative Advocate California State Association of Counties kdean@counties.org</p>
--	---


¹ <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4442>



Jean Hurst
Legislative Representative
Urban Counties of California
jkh@hbeadvocacy.com




Johnnie Pina
Legislative Representative
League of California Cities
jpina@calcities.org



Alyssa Silhi
California Association of Recreation and Parks
Districts
asilhi@publicpolicygroup.com



Faith Borges
Legislative Representative
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities
fborges@caladvocates.com



Sarah Bridge
Association of California Healthcare Districts
sarahb@strategies360.com



Dorothy Johnson
Legislative Advocate
Association of California School Administrators
djohnson@acsa.org



Sarah Dukett
Policy Advocate
Rural County Representatives of California
sdukett@rcrcnet.org