

Exhibit D

COMMITTEES:
EDUCATION, CHAIR
APPROPRIATIONS
BUDGET
HEALTH
PUBLIC SAFETY
WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE

Assembly California Legislature

STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0045
(916) 319-2045
FAX (916) 319-2145
 DISTRICT OFFICE
106 NORTH AVENUE 56
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042
(323) 258-0450
FAX (323) 258-3807

JOINT LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE

JACKIE GOLDBERG
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, FORTY-FIFTH DISTRICT

AB 205 (Goldberg, Kehoe, Koretz, Laird, Leno, and Senator Kuehl)

The Domestic Partner Rights and Responsibilities Act of 2003

Co-authors: Assemblymembers Chu, Hancock, Levine, Lieber, Longville,
Lowenthal, Nation, Nuñez, Oropeza, Pavley, Steinberg, Wesson, and
Senators Burton, Cedillo, Vasconcellos

Sponsor: California Alliance for Pride and Equality (CAPE)

AB 205 will provide registered domestic partners with a number of significant new rights, benefits, responsibilities, and obligations.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

According to analyses of U.S. Census data, there are well over 400,000 households headed by same-sex partners in California. A significant portion of those couples are raising children together¹. Since the establishment of California's domestic partner registry in 1999, 18,316 same-sex and senior different-sex couples have registered with the state as domestic partners.

Same-sex couples and senior couples in California who are registered as domestic partners are currently granted approximately fifteen separate rights and responsibilities. There remain hundreds of provisions of state law that grant certain privileges or responsibilities to married couples, and treat unmarried couples, even those registered as domestic partners, as legal strangers.

There is simply no good reason to deny those additional rights and duties to registered, committed domestic partners and their children. Granting these rights and responsibilities will further the State's interest in promoting stable and lasting family relationships, and will protect family members from the economic and social consequences of abandonment, separation, the death of loved ones, and other life crises. It will also protect couples, the children they are raising, third parties, and the State from numerous harms and costs.

SUMMARY

AB 205 will significantly expand the rights and responsibilities currently provided to registered domestic partners and their families to include nearly all the legal rights, benefits, responsibilities, duties, and obligations under state law currently available only to married couples. Those legal protections and responsibilities guide couples through nearly every complex legal situation faced by families such as death, divorce, custody disputes, illness, childbirth, and adoption. Those laws regulate such diverse areas as:

- **Financial support** during and after the relationship, and community property ownership protections
- **Protection from threats and crimes** against the families of public officials

¹ Michael S. Wald, The Stanford Institute for Research on Women and Gender, The Stanford Center on Adolescence, "Same-Sex Couples: Marriage, Families, and Children," 1999.

Ap242

LEGISLATIVE INTENT SERVICE (800) 666-1917

- **Child custody**, visitation, and duties of financial support of children
- **Anatomical gifts**, consent to autopsy and disposition of remains, and burial in family cemeteries
- **Bereavement leave**, family care and medical leave, coverage of partners under medical, dental, life, and disability insurance, pension rights, and death benefits for surviving partners of firefighters and police officers
- **Mutual responsibility for debts** to third parties
- **Obligations to make disclosures** regarding family relationships and to take other steps to avoid nepotism, conflicts of interest and self-dealing
- **Joint filing of state income tax returns**, different tax rates, and estate and gift tax exemptions
- **Housing protections**, including access to family student housing, senior citizen housing, and rent control protections
- **Government-regulated benefits**, including workers compensation, public assistance, transfer of licenses upon death, and the ability to apply for absentee ballots for a partner
- **Communication privileges**, including the right not to be forced to testify against a partner
- **Legal claims** dependent upon family status, including claims for victim's compensation

AB 205 will **not** change the method for entering into domestic partnership.

AB 205 will **not** change the basic criteria for registering as domestic partners.

HISTORY OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA

The concept of domestic partnership has been well-established in California for many years. Since **1984**, numerous California cities, beginning with Berkeley, paved the way for the rest of the nation in establishing domestic partner registries.

In **1999**, AB 26 (Migden) was passed, establishing the statewide domestic partner registry and hospital visitation, and granting health benefits to domestic partners of state employees.

In **2001**, AB 25 (Migden) granted approximately twelve new rights and benefits to domestic partners, including the right to sue for wrongful death, to use employee sick leave to care for an ill partner or partner's child, to make medical decisions on behalf of an incapacitated partner, to receive unemployment benefits if forced to relocate because of a partner's job, and to use stepparent adoption procedures to adopt a partner's child. Also, SB 1049 (Speier) granted San Mateo County the ability to offer death benefits to surviving domestic partners of county employees.

In **2002**, AB 2216 (Keeley) granted the right to automatic inheritance of a specified portion of a partner's separate property if a partner dies without a will. AB 2777 (Nation) permitted three more counties to offer death benefits to surviving domestic partners, and SB 1575 (Sher) included domestic partners among the family members exempted from the current prohibition on receiving from a will that one helped to draft. Also, SB 1661 (Kuehl) granted 6 weeks of paid family leave to employees to care for a sick spouse or domestic partner.

In other words, registered domestic partners in California are currently granted a small but significant base of benefits and rights. There is no legitimate reason to deny them access to the hundreds of other rights, and more importantly, *responsibilities*, that are currently granted only to married couples.

OTHER STATES AND COUNTRIES

Vermont currently has the broadest protections for same-sex couples, through its system of civil unions, enacted in 2000. Vermont also has a system called "reciprocal beneficiaries", in which two blood



Ro 243

relatives may receive approximately ten rights and benefits, including the right to hospital visitation and health care coverage.

Hawaii allows any two adults who are legally prohibited from marrying to enter into a relationship called "reciprocal beneficiaries," which grants a limited range of rights and benefits.

A number of states, including **Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington,** and the **District of Columbia,** confer a range of limited benefits on domestic partners.

The legislatures of at least seven other states, including **Connecticut, Colorado, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Nevada, Rhode Island,** and **Washington** are currently considering or have recently considered same-sex marriage, civil union, or domestic partnership bills.

The Netherlands is the only country in the world that permits same-sex couples to marry. However, many countries across the world, including **Belgium, Canada, Finland, Hungary, Norway, South Africa** and **Switzerland** have established or are in the process of establishing systems of "registered partnerships" for same-sex couples that grant them a significant level of benefits and responsibilities. Nations with systems similar to the one proposed in AB 205 include **Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, Portugal, and Sweden.**

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Studies done in Vermont and Connecticut² demonstrate that granting significant new rights and responsibilities to same-sex partners would most likely have either a neutral fiscal impact or result in a cost savings to the state. Fortunately, in California, the current domestic partner rights and benefits already available cover most of the items, such as the costs of setting up the new system, creating forms, and providing unemployment insurance to partners relocating, that would result in costs to other states.

Likely cost savings or revenue increases would come from:

- Increased income tax revenue from partners filing jointly and paying the "marriage penalty"
- Decreased welfare payments to individuals whose partners' income would now be considered household income
- Decreased healthcare costs from MediCal as more individuals are covered through their domestic partners by private health plans
- Registration fees paid to the Secretary of State's office

Likely cost increases or revenue decreases would come from:

- Decreased estate tax and gift tax revenue
- Revision of certain forms by state agencies and county clerks

The studies from Vermont and Connecticut demonstrate clearly that we can expect the savings to outweigh the costs. The responsibilities and rights that would be added through AB 205 will for the most part help domestic partners to rely on each other more, as they act and are treated as a financial unit, thereby reducing their reliance on the state. In this time of budget crisis, it is more clear than ever that we cannot afford the costs of discrimination.

² University of Massachusetts Economics Professor M.V. Lee Badgett, "The Fiscal Impact on Vermont of Allowing Same-Sex Couples to Marry," October 1998; Report of the Vermont Civil Union Review Commission, January 2001; Connecticut General Assembly Office of Fiscal Analysis report on the fiscal impact of civil unions, October 4, 2002.



APR 2011

AB 205 AND PROPOSITION 22

AB 205 does not conflict with Prop. 22 (The "Knight Initiative"), which was passed by California's voters in March 2000. That initiative stated that California would only recognize as valid out-of-state marriages that were between a man and a woman. It said nothing about the rights of same-sex domestic partners within California – in fact, proponents of Prop. 22 made it clear to Californians that the initiative would *not* interfere with the rights of domestic partners or prevent future laws that did not alter the definition of marriage. In a March 6, 2000 interview with Paula Zahn on Fox television, "Yes on 22" spokesman Robert Glazier stated clearly, "Proposition 22 was so narrowly defined with just 14 words, not just for simplicity's sake, but for the legal impact. **It will not affect domestic partnership rights.**"

Domestic partnership will clearly remain a distinct institution from marriage:

- Domestic partnership will continue to be entered into and, for many people, exited in a different way than marriage
- Domestic partner rights may not be recognized outside California
- The federal government will not recognize domestic partners for the 1,049 federal rights and benefits associated with marriage
- Domestic partnership is a separate, established institution in California, with a distinct history and social meaning from marriage

WHAT DO CALIFORNIANS THINK ABOUT DOMESTIC PARTNER RIGHTS?

Californians overwhelmingly support laws that recognize relationships between same-sex couples. One statewide poll from June 2002 showed that **55%** of California voters support allowing gays and lesbians to form civil unions recognized by law³.

Another statewide poll from May 2000 showed that:

67% of respondents believed that gays and lesbians are capable of forming the same kind of long term and loving relationships as heterosexuals.

62% favored requiring that when a legal union of a same-sex couple dissolves, they go through divorce court just like married couples

59% favored granting partner benefits such as health insurance or social security benefits to same-sex partners

58% favored allowing gay or lesbian couples to file joint tax returns

68% favored requiring gays and lesbians who form legal domestic partnership agreements to be responsible for the financial support of one another⁴

Advocacy organizations that collaborated on the drafting of this bill include CAPE, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, National Center for Lesbian Rights, and ACLU.

For more information, please contact CAPE at (916) 554-7681 or visit www.calcape.org or contact Assemblymember Goldberg's office at (916) 319-2045

Send letters of support to:

Assemblymember Jackie Goldberg, State Capitol, Room 2003, Sacramento, CA 95814

³ Decision Research poll for Californians for Civil Marriage, June 6-8, 2002, of 500 registered voters in California

⁴ Decision Research poll for Horizons Foundation/Human Rights Campaign, May 2000, of 1200 registered voters in California



Approved

COMMITTEES:
APPROPRIATIONS
BUDGET
HEALTH
PUBLIC SAFETY
WATER, PARKS AND WILDLIFE

Chair, SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHALLENGES
FACING DUAL LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES
BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE #2
JOINT COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A
MASTER PLAN FOR EDUCATION
JOINT LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Assembly California Legislature

JACKIE GOLDBERG
ASSEMBLYMEMBER, FORTY-FIFTH DISTRICT
CHAIR, ASSEMBLY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0045
(916) 319-2045
FAX (916) 319-2145
 DISTRICT OFFICE
106 NORTH AVENUE 56
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042
(323) 258-0450
FAX (323) 258-3807

AB 205 (Goldberg, Kehoe, Koretz, Laird, Leno, and Senator Kuehl)

The Domestic Partner Rights and Responsibilities Act of 2003

Co-authors: Assemblymembers Berg, Bermudez, Chan, Chu, Diaz, Dymally, Firebaugh, Frommer, Hancock, Levine, Lieber, Longville, Lowenthal, Nation, Nuñez, Oropeza, Pavley, Simitian, Steinberg, Vargas, Wesson, Yee, and Senators Burton, Cedillo, Vasconcellos

AB 205 will provide registered domestic partners with a number of significant new rights, benefits, responsibilities, and obligations.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

According to the 2000 Census data, there are almost 100,000 households headed by same-sex partners in California¹. Many of these couples are raising children together. Since the establishment of California's domestic partner registry in 1999, 20,279 same-sex and senior different-sex couples have registered with the state as domestic partners.

Same-sex couples and senior couples in California who are registered as domestic partners are currently granted approximately fifteen separate rights and responsibilities. There remain hundreds of provisions of state law that grant certain privileges or responsibilities to married couples, and treat unmarried couples, even those registered as domestic partners, as legal strangers.

There is simply no good reason to deny those additional rights and duties to registered, committed domestic partners and their children. Granting these rights and responsibilities will further the state's interest in promoting stable and lasting family relationships, and will protect family members from the economic and social consequences of abandonment, separation, the death of loved ones, and other life crises. It will also protect couples, the children they are raising, third parties, and the state from numerous harms and costs.

SUMMARY

AB 205 will significantly expand the rights and responsibilities currently provided to registered domestic partners and their families to include nearly all the legal rights, benefits, responsibilities, duties, and obligations under state law currently available only to spouses. Those legal protections and responsibilities guide couples through nearly every complex legal situation faced by families such as death, divorce, custody disputes, illness, childbirth, and adoption. Those laws regulate such diverse areas as:

- **Financial support** during and after the relationship, and community property ownership protections
- **Protection from threats and crimes** against the families of public officials

¹ Researchers believe this is an undercount.



5029



- **Child custody**, visitation, and duties of financial support of children
- **Anatomical gifts**, consent to autopsy and disposition of remains, and burial in family cemeteries
- **Bereavement leave**, family care and medical leave, coverage of partners under medical, dental, life, and disability insurance, pension rights, and death benefits for surviving partners of firefighters and police officers
- **Mutual responsibility for debts** to third parties
- **Obligations to make disclosures** regarding family relationships and to take other steps to avoid nepotism, conflicts of interest and self-dealing
- **Housing protections**, including access to family student housing, senior citizen housing, and rent control protections
- **Government-regulated benefits**, including workers compensation, public assistance, transfer of licenses upon death, and the ability to apply for absentee ballots for a partner
- **Communication privileges**, including the right not to be forced to testify against a partner
- **Legal claims** dependent upon family status, including claims for victim's compensation

AB 205 will **not** change the method for entering into domestic partnership.

AB 205 will **not** change the basic criteria for registering as domestic partners.

HISTORY OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA

The concept of domestic partnership has been well-established in California for many years. Since **1984**, numerous California cities, beginning with Berkeley, paved the way for the rest of the nation in establishing domestic partner registries.

In **1999**, AB 26 (Migden) was passed, establishing the statewide domestic partner registry and hospital visitation, and granting health benefits to domestic partners of state employees.

In **2001**, AB 25 (Migden) granted approximately twelve new rights and benefits to domestic partners, including the right to sue for wrongful death, to use employee sick leave to care for an ill partner or partner's child, to make medical decisions on behalf of an incapacitated partner, to receive unemployment benefits if forced to relocate because of a partner's job, and to use stepparent adoption procedures to adopt a partner's child. Also, SB 1049 (Speier) granted San Mateo County the ability to offer death benefits to surviving domestic partners of county employees.

In **2002**, AB 2216 (Keeley) granted the right to automatic inheritance of a specified portion of a partner's separate property if a partner dies without a will. AB 2777 (Nation) permitted three more counties to offer death benefits to surviving domestic partners, and SB 1575 (Sher) included domestic partners among the family members exempted from the current prohibition on receiving from a will that one helped to draft. Also, SB 1661 (Kuehl) granted 6 weeks of paid family leave to employees to care for a sick spouse or domestic partner.

In other words, registered domestic partners in California are currently granted a small but significant base of benefits and rights. There is no legitimate reason to deny them access to the hundreds of other rights, and more importantly, *responsibilities*, that are currently granted only to married couples.

OTHER STATES AND COUNTRIES

Vermont currently has the broadest protections for same-sex couples, through its system of civil unions, enacted in 2000. Vermont also has a system called "reciprocal beneficiaries", in which two blood relatives may receive approximately ten rights and benefits, including the right to hospital visitation and health care coverage.



SP30

Hawaii allows any two adults who are legally prohibited from marrying to enter into a relationship called "reciprocal beneficiaries," which grants a limited range of rights and benefits.

A number of states, including **Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington,** and the **District of Columbia,** confer a range of limited benefits on domestic partners.

The legislatures of at least seven other states, including **Connecticut, Colorado, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Nevada, Rhode Island,** and **Washington** are currently considering or have recently considered same-sex marriage, civil union, or domestic partnership bills.

The Netherlands is the only country in the world that permits same-sex couples to marry. However, many countries across the world, including **Belgium, Canada, Finland, Hungary, Norway, South Africa** and **Switzerland** have established or are in the process of establishing systems of "registered partnerships" for same-sex couples that grant them a significant level of benefits and responsibilities. Nations with systems similar to the one proposed in AB 205 include **Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, Portugal, and Sweden.**

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

A study conducted by the UCLA's Williams Project and the University of Massachusetts' Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies estimates that AB 205 will result in a net gain of at least \$8.1 to \$10.6 million each year by the state². The majority of savings come from the bill's impact on public benefit programs such as CalWORKS, Medi-Cal, SSI/SSP, Food Stamps/California Food Assistance Program, and Healthy Families. Currently, the income of a domestic partner is not included in calculating program eligibility. Under AB 205, income of domestic partners will be included in calculating program eligibility, which will result in fewer individuals being qualified for public benefit programs.

Similar studies done in Vermont and Connecticut³ demonstrate that granting significant new rights and responsibilities to same-sex partners have either a neutral fiscal impact or result in cost savings. In California, the current domestic partner rights and benefits already available cover most of the items, such as the costs of setting up the new system, creating forms, and providing unemployment insurance to partners relocating, that would result in costs to other states.

The responsibilities and rights that would be added through AB 205 will for the most part help domestic partners to rely on each other more, as they act and are treated as a financial unit, thereby reducing their reliance on the state. In this time of budget crisis, it is more clear than ever that we cannot afford the costs of discrimination.

Aside from state savings, the responsibilities imposed by the bill will assist private financial institutions in recovering debts. Currently, banks and other creditors are unable to recover their losses created by one person by holding that person's domestic partner responsible for his/her debts. Under AB 205, registered domestic partners will be responsible for each other's debts and other financial obligations.

AB 205 AND PROPOSITION 22

AB 205 does not conflict with Prop. 22 (The "Knight Initiative"), which was passed by California's voters in March 2000. A March 2003 Legislative Counsel opinion found that "following the enactment

² M.V. Lee Badgett, Ph.D and R. Bradley Sears, J.D., Equal Rights, Fiscal Responsibility: The Impact of AB 205 on California's Budget," May 2003.

³ University of Massachusetts Economics Professor M.V. Lee Badgett, "The Fiscal Impact on Vermont of Allowing Same-Sex Couples to Marry," October 1998; Report of the Vermont Civil Union Review Commission, January 2001; Connecticut General Assembly Office of Fiscal Analysis report on the fiscal impact of civil unions, October 4, 2002.



of AB 205, the definition of marriage under California law would be unchanged. Same-sex partners in California would not be allowed to marry but would only be authorized, as they are today, to enter into a domestic partnership.⁴ The Knight initiative stated that California would only recognize as valid out-of-state marriages that were between a man and a woman. It said nothing about the rights of same-sex domestic partners within California – in fact, proponents of Prop. 22 made it clear to Californians that the initiative would *not* interfere with the rights of domestic partners or prevent future laws that did not alter the definition of marriage. In a March 6, 2000 interview with Paula Zahn on Fox television, “Yes on 22” spokesman Robert Glazier stated clearly, “Proposition 22 was so narrowly defined with just 14 words, not just for simplicity’s sake, but for the legal impact. **It will not affect domestic partnership rights.**”

Domestic partnership will clearly remain a distinct institution from marriage:

- Domestic partnership will continue to be entered into and, for many people, exited in a different way than marriage
- Domestic partner rights may not be recognized outside California
- The federal government will not recognize domestic partners for the 1,049 federal rights and benefits associated with marriage
- Domestic partnership is a separate, established institution in California, with a distinct history and social meaning from marriage

WHAT DO CALIFORNIANS THINK ABOUT DOMESTIC PARTNER RIGHTS?

Californians overwhelmingly support laws that recognize relationships between same-sex couples. One statewide poll from June 2002 showed that **55%** of California voters support allowing gays and lesbians to form civil unions recognized by law⁵.

Another statewide poll from May 2000 showed that:

- 67%** of respondents believed that gays and lesbians are capable of forming the same kind of long term and loving relationships as heterosexuals.
- 62%** favored requiring that when a legal union of a same-sex couple dissolves, they go through divorce court just like married couples
- 59%** favored granting partner benefits such as health insurance or social security benefits to same-sex partners
- 58%** favored allowing gay or lesbian couples to file joint tax returns
- 68%** favored requiring gays and lesbians who form legal domestic partnership agreements to be responsible for the financial support of one another⁶

This bill is sponsored by Equality California. Other advocacy organizations that collaborated on the drafting of this bill include Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, National Center for Lesbian Rights, and ACLU.

For more information, please contact EQCA at (916) 554-7681 or visit www.eqca.org or contact Assemblymember Goldberg’s office at (916) 319-2045

**Send letters of support to:
Assemblymember Jackie Goldberg, State Capitol, Room 2003, Sacramento, CA 95814**

⁴ Legislative Counsel of California, "Domestic Partners: Initiative Amendment," March 2003.

⁵ Decision Research poll for Californians for Civil Marriage, June 6-8, 2002, of 500 registered voters in California

⁶ Decision Research poll for Horizons Foundation/Human Rights Campaign, May 2000, of 1200 registered voters in California



5032