

June 29, 2026

The Honorable Dawn Addis
1021 O Street, Suite 4120
Sacramento, CA 95814
dawn.addis@asm.ca.gov



Dear Assemblywoman Addis:

On behalf of tens of thousands of constituents, allied organizations, and more than 2,000 churches across California, California Family Council strongly **opposes** AB 2691.

California Family Council does not oppose the principle behind this legislation. Barring individuals convicted of felony sexual assault and human trafficking from holding public office is a sound, protective policy that we would ordinarily welcome. However, the June 24, 2026 amendment fundamentally undermines the bill's stated purpose by carving out specific felony sex crimes whose victims are children, and we cannot support that result.

The Amendment Creates an Indefensible Double Standard

The June 24 amendment explicitly exempts convictions under Penal Code sections 286(b), 287(b), and 289(h) and (i) from the bill's new disqualification categories.¹ These are not minor offenses. They are felony sodomy, oral copulation, and sexual penetration committed against minors. Under the bill as amended, a person convicted of felony sexual assault against an adult would be barred from public office, while a person convicted of these same categories of acts against a child would not be. No principled policy rationale justifies that distinction. The Senate Committee analysis itself does not offer one.¹

California already conditions candidacy on the absence of felony corruption convictions, a framework upheld as constitutionally permissible.² Expanding disqualification to serious sex offenses is a logical extension of that framework, and courts have consistently recognized that states hold broad authority to set candidate qualifications for state and local offices. The constitutional structure of this bill is sound. The moral structure of its amendment is not.

Other States Hold a Higher Standard

The committee's own analysis notes that Utah permanently bars individuals convicted of grievous sexual assault against a child from serving on any school board.¹ Florida revokes the right to hold office upon felony conviction and requires individuals convicted of felony sexual offenses to petition the governor personally for rights restoration.¹ Both states treat crimes against children as among the most serious disqualifying offenses. California's amended bill moves in the opposite direction, exempting child-victim felony sex crimes while disqualifying the same category of offense committed against adults. This places California below the floor set by peer states on child protection.

The Practical Stakes Are Serious

The offices covered by this bill include school boards, city councils, county boards of supervisors, and the state legislature itself. An individual convicted of felony sexual penetration of a minor under Penal Code section 289(h) or (i) would, under this bill's amended language, remain legally eligible to seek a seat on a local school board or in the California State Assembly. Supporters of the bill, including Child USA, have correctly observed that individuals who

commit crimes of sexual violence and exploitation "demonstrate a willingness to misuse authority in ways that fundamentally undermine public safety."¹ That concern applies with greater force, not lesser, when the victims are children.

Voters deserve to know that every candidate for public office meets a baseline standard of not having been convicted of a serious felony sex offense against a child. The bill as amended withholds that assurance precisely where it is most needed.

We also note that the bill passed the Assembly Floor 67 to 0 before the June 24 amendment was introduced.¹ That unanimous vote reflected the bill's original, uncompromised premise. The amendment was not part of the consensus that earned that vote, and the Senate committee should not treat that prior vote as an endorsement of the exemptions now before it.

California Family Council is prepared to become a strong supporter of this bill if the exemptions for Penal Code sections 286(b), 287(b), and 289(h) and (i) are removed. We respectfully urge Assemblywoman Addis to accept that amendment before the June 30 hearing, or to support the bill's defeat in its current form. Children who are victims of the offenses named in those code sections deserve the same protection under California election law as every other victim of felony sexual assault.

For these reasons, California Family Council respectfully **opposes** AB 2691.

Respectfully,



Greg Burt
Vice President
California Family Council

References

¹ California Senate Committee on Elections and Constitutional Amendments, "Bill Analysis: AB 2691 (Addis)," Hearing Date June 30, 2026, Version June 24, 2026. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB2691

² California AB 2410 (Fuentes), Chapter 160, Statutes of 2012, expanding felony disqualification for public corruption offenses to candidacy as well as office-holding. <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>