

**MAILING ADDRESS:**  
City Hall  
150 City Park Way  
Brentwood, CA 94513  
Phone: 925.516.5400  
Fax: 925.516.5401  
www.brentwoodca.gov

**CITY MANAGER**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5440  
Fax: 925.516.5441

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5405  
Fax: 925.516.5407

**FINANCE AND  
INFORMATION SYSTEMS**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5460  
Fax: 925.516.5401

**HUMAN RESOURCES**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5191  
Fax: 925.516.5446

**PARKS AND RECREATION**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5444  
Fax: 925.516.5445

**POLICE**  
9100 Brentwood Boulevard  
Phone: 925.634.6911  
24 Hr. Dispatch: 925.809.7911  
Fax: 925.809.7799

**PUBLIC WORKS  
Engineering Division**  
150 City Park Way  
Phone: 925.516.5420  
Fax: 925.516.5421

**Operations Division**  
2201 Elkins Way  
Phone: 925.516.6000  
Fax: 925.516.6001

May 17, 2024

The Honorable Steve Glazer  
Member, California State Senate  
1021 O Street, Room 7520  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 1116 (Portantino) Unemployment Insurance: Trade Disputes:  
Eligibility for Benefits.**  
**Notice of OPPOSE** (As Introduced February 13, 2024)

Dear Senator Glazer,

The City of Brentwood must respectfully oppose **SB 1116 (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 and public agencies, it is critical that local agencies have a fiscally solvent UI system in order to continue to deliver public services and provide competitive benefits to our active and retired employees.

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 1116 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 1116 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.

In addition to its considerable costs to employers, SB 1116 will likely further harm the already insolvent UI fund and threaten benefits to unemployed Californians in future recessions. California's UI Fund was exhausted during the COVID-19 pandemic and is projected to owe \$20.8 billion to the federal government by the end of 2024.

This is nearly double the amount of funds that California borrowed the last time its UI funds were exhausted during the 2008 recession. Beginning in 2008, California accumulated more than \$10 billion in debt which was not repaid until 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

*Senate Bill 1116 (Portantino) – Unemployment Insurance: Trade Disputes: Eligibility for Benefits. Notice of Oppose*

*May 17, 2024*

*Page 2 of 2*

years after repaying federal UI from the Great Recession, California cannot afford to further leverage and strain an already burdened system.

This measure will also further erode good faith negotiations at the bargaining table for local government employers. Public employers work hard to engage in good faith bargaining. If SB 1116 were to become law, we anticipate longer lengths of impasse, higher costs associated with protracted Public Employee Relations Broad proceedings and decline in quality of public services.

For these reasons, the City of Brentwood **must oppose** SB 1116 (Portantino).

Sincerely,



Joel R. Bryant  
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Anthony Portantino via Legislative Position Letter Portal  
Committee Members, Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Honorable Diane Burgis, CCC Supervisor: [supervisor\\_burgis@bos.cccounty.us](mailto:supervisor_burgis@bos.cccounty.us)  
Honorable City Council Members, City of Brentwood: [citycouncil@brentwoodca.gov](mailto:citycouncil@brentwoodca.gov)  
Sam Caygill, East Bay Division, League of California Cities: [scaygill@cacities.org](mailto:scaygill@cacities.org)  
League of California Cities: [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org)

