

June 11, 2026

The Honorable Thomas J. Umberg

Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee

1021 O Street, Suite 3240  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: AB 1967 (Zbur) – Juveniles – CONCERNS AND REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS**

Dear Chair Umberg and Members of the Committee:

California Family Council, representing thousands of California families and more than 2,000 churches, writes to express concerns with AB 1967 and to respectfully request two amendments. We do not oppose the bill's central purpose. Former foster youth between 18 and 21 whose guardians have died or stopped supporting them should not be locked out of extended foster care by a technicality. The bill's reforms to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 388.1 address a real problem, and we take no issue with them.

Our concerns lie with the amendments to Sections 329 and 331, which govern minor-initiated dependency proceedings. As amended, the bill would allow a minor or a minor's attorney to submit an affidavit alleging parental abuse or neglect by mail, facsimile, or email; require the social worker to assess the custodial parents' home whenever the minor is residing in a residential facility; and impose a 14-day deadline on the juvenile court to review a social worker's decision not to file a petition.

Each change may be reasonable on its own. Together they accelerate state proceedings concerning a family without adding a single corresponding protection for parents. The bill is silent on whether parents must even be notified that their home is the subject of a mandated safety assessment, or that a court is conducting a 14-day review that could end in an order to commence dependency proceedings. When the state moves faster, due process must keep pace.

We are also concerned about how these streamlined procedures will interact with the undefined boundaries of "serious emotional damage" under Section 300(c). Counties differ widely in how they apply that standard, and nothing in current law forecloses the theory that a parent's faith-informed decision not to affirm a minor's stated gender identity is itself emotional harm. AB 1967 does not say that, and we do not claim it does. But it builds a faster procedural track on which such claims could travel. The Legislature should close that door now rather than leave it to county-by-county interpretation.

We therefore respectfully request two amendments:

1. A clarifying provision in Section 329 stating that a parent's religious beliefs, or a parent's good-faith decisions regarding a minor's social or medical gender transition, do not by themselves constitute abuse or neglect for purposes of a safety assessment or substitute care provider safety assessment.
2. A requirement that custodial parents receive notice that their home is being assessed and an opportunity to be heard before the juvenile court completes the review required by Section



331.

These amendments would not slow help to any abused child. Genuine abuse and neglect remain fully actionable under Section 300. The amendments simply confirm that faith and lawful parenting decisions are not evidence of harm, and that parents are heard before a court acts on allegations against them.

Thank you for your consideration. Unless the bill is amended as described, we ask that California Family Council be recorded with a CONCERNS position. Please contact me at (949) 244-2080 or [gregb@californiafamily.org](mailto:gregb@californiafamily.org) with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Greg Burt", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Greg Burt  
Vice President  
California Family Council