

Date of Hearing: July 11, 2023  
Counsel: Andrew Ironside

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY**  
Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Chair

SB 50 (Bradford) – As Amended June 29, 2023

**SUMMARY:** Prohibits peace officers from initiating a traffic stop for specified low-level infractions unless a separate, independent basis for a stop exists, and to authorize local authorities to enforce traffic violations through the use of non-sworn government employees. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits a peace officer from stopping or detaining the operator of a motor vehicle or a bicycle for a low-level infraction unless there is a separate independent basis to initiate the stop, or unless more than one low-level infraction is observed.
- 2) Defines “low-level infraction” as a Vehicle Code violation related to any of the following:
  - a) Registration of a vehicle or vehicle equipment;
  - b) Positioning or number of license plates when at least one plate is clearly displayed;
  - c) Vehicle lighting equipment not illuminating, if the violation is limited to a single brake light, headlight, rear license plate, or running light, or a single bulb in a larger light of the same;
  - d) Vehicle bumper equipment; or,
  - e) Bicycle equipment or operation.
- 3) Provides that “low-level infraction” does not include violations relating to commercial vehicles.
- 4) Authorizes an officer’s agency, if an office does not have grounds to stop or detain the operator of a motor vehicle or bicycle and the officer can identify the owner of the vehicle, to mail a citation to the owner or send a warning letter identifying the violation and instructing the owner to correct the defect or otherwise remedy the violation.
- 5) Provides that a county, city, municipality, or any other local authority is not precluded from enforcing a violation provided in Vehicle Code through government employees who are not peace officers.
- 6) Clarifies that local authorities may adopt rules and regulations by ordinance or resolution regulating traffic by means of government employees, as well as traffic officers.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Provides that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable seizures and searches may not be violated; and a warrant may not issue except on probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons and things to be seized. (U.S. Const., amend. IV; Cal. Const., art. I, § 13.)
- 2) Requires each state and local agency that employs peace officers to annually report to the Attorney General data on all stops conducted by that agency's peace officers for the preceding calendar year. (Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (a)(1).)
- 3) Requires reports on stops submitted to the Attorney General to include, at a minimum, the following information:
  - a) The time, date, and location of the stop;
  - b) The reason for the stop;
  - c) The result of the stop, such as: no action, warning, citation, arrest, etc.;
  - d) If a warning or citation was issued, the warning provided or the violation cited;
  - e) If an arrest was made, the offense charged;
  - f) The perceived race or ethnicity, gender, and approximate age of the person stopped. For motor vehicle stops, this paragraph only applies to the driver unless the officer took actions with regard to the passenger; and,
  - g) Actions taken by the peace officer, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (b)(1)-(7).)
- 4) Provides that law enforcement agencies shall not report personal identifying information of the individuals stopped to the Attorney General, and that all other information in the reports, except for unique identifying information of the officer involved, shall be available to the public. (Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (d).)
- 5) Defines "stop," for the purposes of reports sent by law enforcement agencies to the Attorney General, as any detention by a peace officer of a person, or any peace officer interaction with a person in which the peace officer conducts a search, including a consensual search, of the person's body or property in the person's possession or control. (Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (g)(2).)
- 6) Finds and declares that pedestrians, users of public transportation, and vehicular occupants who have been stopped, searched, interrogated, and subjected to a property seizure by a peace officer for no reason other than the color of their skin, national origin, religion, gender identity or expression, housing status, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability are the victims of discriminatory practices. (Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (d)(4).)
- 7) Creates the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board (RIPA), which, among other duties, is required to conduct and consult available, evidence-based research on intentional and

implicit biases, and law enforcement stop, search, and seizure tactics. (Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (j)(3)(D).)

- 8) Prohibits a peace officer from engaging in racial or identity profiling, as defined. (Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subds. (e) & (f).)
- 9) Provides that the provisions of the Vehicle Code are applicable and uniform throughout the state and in all counties and municipalities therein, and a local authority shall not enact or enforce any ordinance or resolution on matters covered by the Vehicle Code, as specified, unless expressly authorized by that code. (Veh. Code, § 21, subd. (a).)
- 10) Provides that a person shall not drive, move, or leave standing upon a highway, or in an off-street public parking facility, any motor vehicle unless it is registered with the DMV and the appropriate fees have been paid, with exceptions. (Veh. Code, § 4000).
- 11) Requires motorists to have their valid driver's license in their immediate possession when driving a motor vehicle, and to present their license for examination upon demand of a peace officer. (Veh. Code, § 12951, subds. (a) & (b).)
- 12) Establishes various requirements regarding the equipment specifications and operation of bicycles, as well as related safety devices. (Veh. Code, §§ 21201 & 21212).
- 13) Establishes various requirements regarding the display of license plates and registration tabs and stickers. (Veh. Code, §§ 5200-5206).
- 14) Establishes various requirements regarding the functionality of vehicle lighting equipment. (Veh. Code, § 24250 et. seq.).
- 15) Requires every passenger vehicle registered in this state to be equipped with a front bumper and rear bumper. (Veh. Code, § 28701.)
- 16) Requires the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to include in the California Driver's Handbook information regarding a person's civil rights during a traffic stop. (Veh. Code, § 1653.6, subd. (a)(4).)
- 17) Makes it unlawful to willfully fail or refuse to comply with a lawful order, signal or direction of a uniformed peace officer or to refuse to submit to a lawful inspection pursuant to the Vehicle Code. (Veh. Code, § 2800, subd. (a).)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "SB 50 will limit law enforcement's ability to stop people for minor, non-safety-related traffic infractions, unless there is an independent, safety-related basis to initiate the stop. It will also provide technical clarification to ensure that localities can explore non-law enforcement approaches to traffic safety. In doing so, SB 50 will help protect Californians of color from unnecessary harms and help ensure that public

dollars dedicated to community safety are used more effectively.”

- 2) **Pretext Stops:** The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides in part that “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.” The United States Supreme Court has held that temporary detention of individuals during the stop of an automobile by the police, even if only for a brief period and for a limited purpose, constitutes a ‘seizure’ of persons within the meaning of this provision. (See *Delaware v. Prouse* (1979) 440 U.S. 648, 653; *United States v. Martinez Fuerte* (1976) 428 U.S. 543, 556; *United States v. Brignoni Ponce* (1975) 422 U.S. 873, 878.) In *Whren v. United States* (1996) 517 U.S. 806, the Court further held that “the temporary detention of a motorist upon probable cause to believe that he has violated the traffic laws does not violate the Fourth Amendment’s prohibition against unreasonable seizures, even if a reasonable officer would not have stopped the motorist absent some additional law enforcement objective.” (*Id.* at pp. , 809-819.) The Court’s decision in *Whren* has given rise to what have been dubbed “pretext stops,” a practice in which a law enforcement officer uses a minor traffic violation as a pretext to stop a vehicle in order to investigate other possible crimes.

Officers stop drivers for low-level offenses such as tinted windows, broken taillights, license plates improperly affixed to vehicles, obstructed windshields or objects hanging from a rearview mirror. (See, e.g., Pen. Code § 26708(a)(2); *People v. Colbert* (2007) Cal.App.4th 1068, 1073 [a stop under § 26708(a)(2) is reasonable when the police officer “explicitly testifie[s] that the air freshener was ‘large enough to obstruct [the driver’s] view through the front windshield’”]; *People v. Guerra* (2002) 2002 WL 31717061 [stopping a driver to see whether a neck chain hanging from a rearview mirror violated the Vehicle Code]; Baker & Bogel-Burroughs, *How a Common Air Freshener Can Result in a High-Stakes Traffic Stop*, N.Y. Times (Apr. 17, 2021) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/17/us/police-air-fresheners.html?referringSource=articleShare>> [“prohibitions against objects hanging from rearview mirrors can extend to fuzzy dice, graduation tassels, and rosaries”].)

- 3) **Racial Disparity in Traffic Stops:** As mentioned above, much of the criticism of pretext stops has centered around their disparate impact on communities of color. In 2020, the Stanford Open Policing Project published an analysis of almost 100 million police traffic stops conducted between 2011 and 2017 by 21 state patrol agencies (including the California Highway Patrol) and 29 municipal police departments nationwide. One of the study’s central findings was that “police stopped and searched black and Hispanic drivers on the basis of less evidence used in stopping white drivers, who are searched less but are more likely to be found with illegal items.” (Pierson et. al, *A large-scale analysis of racial disparities in police stops across the United States*, Nature Human Behavior (July 2020) p. 743 <<https://5harad.com/papers/100M-stops.pdf>> [as of July 3, 2023].) Moreover, these stops based on routine traffic violations often turn violent. A 2021 New York Times investigation found that in the preceding 5 years, police officers had killed at least 400 unarmed drivers and passengers who were not under pursuit for a violent crime, while about 60 officers had died at the hands of motorists who had been pulled over. (Kirkpatrick et. al, *Pulled Over: Why Many Police Traffic Stops Turn Deadly*, The New York Times (Oct. 31, 2021) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/31/us/police-traffic-stops-killings.html>> [as of July 3, 2023].)

The Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) of 2015, expressly prohibits racial and identity

profiling by law enforcement and requires law enforcement agencies to report vehicle stop data to the DOJ. A 2022 analysis conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California of RIPA stop data collected in 2019 California found the following:

[Our] research finds that Black Californians are more than twice as likely to be searched as white Californians, but searches of Black Californians are somewhat less likely to yield contraband or evidence. [...] Black Californians are markedly overrepresented in traffic stops [...] and white drivers are somewhat underrepresented. [...]

The likelihood of being searched during a traffic stop varies across race and ethnicity as well as across agency type. Black drivers stopped by local police and sheriff departments are searched in 20 percent of traffic stops, while the search rates for Latino and white drivers are 13 percent and 6 percent, respectively. [...] While roughly one in ten white drivers stopped by local law enforcement in the late evening are searched for contraband or evidence, about one in four Black drivers and one in five Latino drivers are searched. [...] The higher search rates of Latino and Black drivers in traffic stops made by local law enforcement are not associated with higher rates of discovery of contraband or evidence.

(Lofstrom et. al, *Racial Disparities in Law Enforcement Stops*, Public Policy Institute of California (Oct. 2022) <<https://www.ppic.org/publication/racial-disparities-in-traffic-stops/>> [as of June 26, 2023].)

In January, 2023, the RIPA Board released its sixth annual stop data report of data collected in the 2021 calendar year, which showed that the most commonly reported reason for a stop (86.8%) across all racial/ethnic groups was a traffic violation, and that individuals perceived as Black or Hispanic comprised nearly 58% of the stops reported (against a total population share of 42%), while just under 31% of the stops involved individuals perceived as white (against a total population share of 35%). Additionally, the report found that officers used force against people perceived as Black at 2.2 times the rate of individuals perceived as white. (See RIPA Board, Annual Report 2022 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2022.pdf>> [as of July 3, 2023]; Press Release, *California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board Releases Report on 2021 Police Stop Data*, DOJ (Jan. 3, 2023) <<https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/california-racial-and-identity-profiling-advisory-board-releases-report-2021>> [as of July 3, 2023].)

- 4) **Recent Reforms and Policy Recommendations:** In recent years, several local jurisdictions have advanced reforms related to traffic stops. For instance, in 2018, the Oakland Police Department, long criticized for using traffic violations to stop and search people of color, instituted a policy of declining to initiate traffic stops for low-level infractions. Although the racial breakdown of traffic stops in the first year of the policy resembled that from the year prior, the number of traffic stops involving Black individuals decreased by over eight thousand, representing a 43% drop. (Swan, *To curb racial bias, Oakland police are pulling fewer people over. Will it work?*, S.F. Chronicle (Nov. 15, 2019) <<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/To-curb-racial-bias-Oakland-police-are-pulling-14839567.php>> [as of July 3, 2023].) In nearby Berkeley, the city council in 2020 proposed the creation of a new Berkeley Department of Transportation, which would assume responsibility for the city's traffic enforcement from the police department. (Raguso, *Plans*

*firm up to remove police from traffic stops, but it's a long road ahead*, Berkeleyside, (May 25, 2021) <<https://www.berkeleyside.org/2021/05/25/berkeley-department-of-transportation-civilian-traffic-enforcement>> [as of June 26, 2023].)

In early March 2022, the Los Angeles Police Department enacted a policy to limit the use, duration and scope of pretext stops conducted by its officers. The policy allows officers to make stops for minor equipment violations or other infractions *only* when the officer believes that such a violation significantly interferes with public safety, and requires officers to state the public safety reason for such stops on their body-worn cameras. The policy also prohibits pretext stops *unless* officers are acting upon articulable information in addition to the traffic violation, which may or may not amount to reasonable suspicion, regarding other specified crimes, such as a serious or violent crime, reckless driving, burglary, and others. (Special Order #3, March 9, 2022, LAPD, <[https://lapdonlinestrgeacc.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/lapdonlinemedia/2022/03/3\\_9\\_22\\_SO\\_No.3\\_Policy\\_Limitation\\_on\\_Use\\_of\\_Pretextual\\_Stops\\_Established.pdf](https://lapdonlinestrgeacc.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/lapdonlinemedia/2022/03/3_9_22_SO_No.3_Policy_Limitation_on_Use_of_Pretextual_Stops_Established.pdf)> [as of June 26, 2023].)

In addition to publishing compiled stop data, the RIPA board suggests best practices and provides recommendations to law enforcement agencies and policymakers. Regarding pretextual stops, the RIPA board, in its most recent report, recommended that the Legislature and local law enforcement should examine approaches to:

- Eliminating all pretextual stops and subsequent searches and ensure that a stop or search is based on reasonable suspicion or probable cause;
- Identifying and taking action to limit enforcement of traffic laws and minor offenses that pose a low public safety risk and show significant disparities in the rate of enforcement; and,
- Limiting armed responses to traffic enforcement by allowing for stops only if there is a concern for public safety, and consider amending the Vehicle Code to more broadly move traffic enforcement out of law enforcement's purview (i.e. to a civilian traffic unit).

(RIPA Board, Annual Report 2022 (Jan. 3, 2023) <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/2023-ripa-report-best-practices.pdf>> [as of July 3, 2023].)

In December 2022, the Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code (CRPC) released its annual report, issuing a series of recommendations spanning various topics in criminal law. One recommendation urged the Legislature to “prohibit police officers from stopping people for technical, non-safety-related traffic offenses, including at a minimum offenses related to vehicle or equipment registration, position or number of license plates, lighting equipment, window tints or obstructions, and bicycle equipment and operation.” (Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code, 2022 Annual Report and Recommendations (Dec. 2022) p. 27 <[http://www.clrc.ca.gov/CRPC/Pub/Reports/CRPC\\_AR2022.pdf](http://www.clrc.ca.gov/CRPC/Pub/Reports/CRPC_AR2022.pdf)> [as of July 3, 2023].)

This bill would implement recommendations from both the CRPC and the RIPA board described above.

- 5) **Effect of This Bill:** The California Vehicle Code establishes roughly 1,000 infractions related to a wide array of conduct and vehicle types. (Published by Contra Costa County Superior Court, Traffic Infraction Fixed Penalty Schedule <[https://www.cc-courts.org/fees/docs/2015BailSchedules\\_Traffic.pdf](https://www.cc-courts.org/fees/docs/2015BailSchedules_Traffic.pdf)> [as of July 3, 2023].) This bill would prohibit officers from initiating a vehicle stop for a “low-level infraction,” unless there is a separate, independent basis for the stop, or unless there is more than one low level infraction. This bill would define “low-level infraction” as any violation related to vehicle registration or vehicle equipment, the position or number of license plates, vehicle lighting not illuminating if it is a single light or single bulb, bumper equipment and bicycle equipment or operation. Thus, while the bill does limit the permissible bases for a traffic stop to some degree, there are still hundreds of traffic violations for which an officer could initiate a stop, even as a pretext to investigate other potential crimes. For violations where an officer does not have grounds to stop or detain a motorist or bicyclist, and the officer can identify the owner of the vehicle, this bill would allow the officer to send a citation or fix-it ticket to the motorists home address.

In addition to the traffic-stop-related provisions described above, this bill clarifies that a city, county or other local authority may enforce Vehicle Code violations through the use of government employees who are not sworn peace officers. This change provides firmer legal footing to Berkeley and other local jurisdictions seeking to transfer traffic enforcement responsibility from armed police to unarmed civilians. That is, where such jurisdictions may currently perceive a high risk that such local reforms would be preempted by existing state law, this bill expressly states that such local reforms are not prohibited by the relevant provisions of the Vehicle Code.

- 6) **Argument in Support:** According to the *Prosecutors Alliance of California*, one of the bill’s sponsors, “Law enforcement use minor vehicle equipment and administrative issues—such as a broken taillight, driving without valid registration, or incorrectly displaying a license plate—to conduct an otherwise illegitimate stop and investigation, commonly referred to as a “pretext stop.” The Racial and Identity Profiling Board reports that Black, Latinx, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Californians are **more** likely to be subject to pretextual stops than their white counterparts, even though stops of people of color are **less** likely to result in the discovery of evidence or criminal prosecution than stops of white people. Pretextual stops inflict devastating harm on Californians of color—including dehumanization, economic extraction through fees and fines, physical violence through uses of force, and devaluation of life.

“These practices have also failed to meaningfully improve safety. A 2022 study found that Sheriff’s deputies in Los Angeles and Riverside counties spent nearly 9 out of every 10 hours on stops initiated by officers rather than responding to calls for help. Amongst those officer-initiated stops, approximately 80 percent were for traffic violations.

“SB 50 will implement the recommendations of the Committee on Revision of the Penal Code and the Racial and Identity Profiling Board, limiting police power to stop people for minor, technical violations of the Vehicle Code. SB 50 will also ensure that communities that wish to move forward with alternative enforcement strategies for traffic laws have the legal authority to do so. SB 50 is a long over due reform to address the harms of racial profiling and promote equal treatment under law.”

- 7) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *California District Attorneys Association*, “This bill prohibits peace officers from detaining the operator of a motor vehicle or bicycle for a low-level infraction unless a separate independent basis for the stop exists. Doing so jeopardizes public safety, undermines the rule of law, and reduces accountability for low level infractions.

“Most importantly, this bill’s prohibition on detaining drivers for low level infractions deprives peace officers of a very effective investigative tool that is often used by law enforcement to gather information needed in an ongoing criminal investigation, apprehend a suspect who is wanted for having committed an unrelated criminal violation, or to investigate an unrelated offense.

“Consider the political terrorist who paid individuals to shoot up the homes his political opponents. The plot was only uncovered after a vehicle stop for an expired registration revealed the driver had an active felony warrant. A search of the vehicle revealed 800 fentanyl tablets which lead to a phone with texts detailing the location of the victims and a gun that was ballistically linked to the shootings. [citation omitted]

“Pretextual stops are also employed by peace officers to investigate the transportation for sale of fentanyl. Information alerting law enforcement to controlled substances in vehicles oftentimes come from confidential sources who law enforcement need to protect. The source of information will be ‘walled’ off from peace officers who will only be told that if a vehicle violates a traffic infraction, pull the vehicle over and investigate for drugs and guns. The traffic infraction is a ‘pretext’ to investigate another crime without jeopardizing the confidential informant’s safety. This technique is used routinely and effectively. Recently in San Diego, for example, a broken taillight on a boat trailer yielded 20,000 fentanyl pills and 1000 pounds of methamphetamine. That stop and others like it would not be permitted if SB 50 became law.

“Research has found that increased traffic enforcement is associated with decreases in traffic crashes and injuries from accidents. Jordan B. Woods, *Traffic Without the Police*, 73 *Stanford Law Review* 1471, 1536 (2021). The low-level infractions defined by SB 50 are, in fact, designed to enhance public safety and notify drivers that their vehicles are out of compliance with traffic safety laws. Pursuant to SB 50, a low-level infraction includes violations related to: 1) vehicle registration requirements; 2) the positioning or number of license plates; 3) vehicle lighting equipment; 4) vehicle bumper requirements; and 5) bicycle equipment or operation. Simply put, a broken headlight, brake light, or windshield obstruction is a driving hazard and can be the cause of an accident. A missing bumper could be the reason that a non-lethal accident becomes fatal.

“Prohibiting a peace officer from detaining and notifying a driver of a hazardous condition ensures that the unsafe vehicle will be driving on the road for a longer time before it is brought into compliance. Mailing the owner of the vehicle a notice of violation, as SB 50 contemplates, does not address the violation with the urgency that is warranted when public safety is at issue.

“Moreover, mailing the owner of the vehicle a notice of the violation creates an additional burden for law enforcement that will likely result in decreased enforcement. This anticipated lack of enforcement will create ambiguity for drivers regarding what the rules of the road



actually are, and blur the line between what is lawful and unlawful. Without fear of enforcement, drivers will be less likely to bring their vehicles into compliance with registration requirements and traffic safety laws which, in turn, will make those regulations ineffectual and the roads less safe.

“Not only will SB 50 result in decreased enforcement, if law enforcement does choose to enforce via a mailed notice of violation, it will make it more difficult to hold offenders accountable. Claims that a citation was never received, and the number of warrants being issued for failing to appear, would be significant. Additionally, prohibiting detention would make it more difficult to gather evidence to substantiate the offense. Pursuant to Vehicle Code § 40001, it is unlawful for the owner to cause or permit the operation of an offending vehicle to be driven on the highway. Without being able to identify the driver (to see if they are the owner), or to speak with the driver (to verify the owner authorized the use), the owner can simply deny that they permitted the operation of the vehicle. This, in turn, would make low level infractions more difficult to prove.”

- 8) **Related Legislation:** AB 93 (Bryan), would prohibit peace officers from conducting searches of a vehicle, person or their effects based solely on a person’s consent, and specifies that consent to conduct a search is not a lawful justification for a search. AB 93 failed passage on the Assembly Floor.
- 9) **Prior Legislation:**
- a) SB 1389 (Bradford), of the 2021-2022 Legislative Session, was substantially similar to this bill. SB 1389 (Bradford, 2022), died on the Senate floor inactive file.
  - b) AB 2537 (Gipson), Chapter 332, Statutes of 2022, requires driver education courses to include a video on proper conduct by peace officers and individuals during a traffic stop.
  - c) AB 2773 (Holden), Chapter 805, Statutes of 2022, requires a peace officer making a traffic or pedestrian stop to state the reason for the stop before asking any questions.
  - d) AB 2918 (Holden), Chapter 723, Statutes of 2018, requires the DMV to include within its Handbook a section on a person’s civil rights during a traffic stop.
  - e) AB 2133 (Torrico), of the 2005-2006 Legislative Session, would have prohibited consent searches in connection with traffic stops. AB 2133 was not heard in this Committee at the request of the author.

## **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

### **Support**

California Faculty Association (Co-Sponsor)  
Aapi Equity Alliance  
ACLU California Action  
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus  
Berkeley; City of

California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice  
California Association of Local Conservation Corps  
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
California Federation of Teachers Afl-cio  
California for Safety and Justice  
California Immigrant Policy Center  
California Native Vote Project  
California Public Defenders Association  
California Public Defenders Association (CPDA)  
California-hawaii State Conference of The NAACP  
Californians for Safety and Justice  
Californians United for A Responsible Budget  
Center for Policing Equity  
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice  
Charles Houston Bar Association  
Children's Defense Fund - CA  
Church State Council  
City of Berkeley  
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA)  
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)  
Consumers for Auto Reliability & Safety  
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors  
County of Sonoma  
Democrats of Rossmoor  
Disability Rights California  
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights  
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC) Fiscally Sponsored by Community Partners  
Equality California  
Fair Chance Project  
Fresh Lifelines for Youth  
Fresno Barrios Unidos  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
Indivisible CA Statestrong  
Indivisible Yolo  
Initiate Justice (UNREG)  
Initiate Justice Action  
LA Defensa  
Law Enforcement Action Partnership  
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of The San Francisco Bay Area  
League of Women Voters of California  
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children  
Los Angeles County  
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter  
Norcal Resist  
Oakland Privacy  
Pacific Juvenile Defender Center  
Peace and Freedom Party of California  
People for The American Way  
Policylink (UNREG)

Prosecutors Alliance California  
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)  
San Francisco Public Defender  
Secure Justice  
Seiu California  
Showing Up for Racial Justice North County San Diego  
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition  
Smart Justice California  
State of California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board  
Streets are For Everyone (SAFE)  
Team Justice  
Techequity Collaborative  
University of San Francisco School of Law | Racial Justice Clinic  
Voices for Progress  
Voices for Progress Education Fund  
Walk Bike Berkeley

### **Opposition**

Arcadia Police Officers' Association  
Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs (ALADS)  
Burbank Police Officers' Association  
California Association of Highway Patrolmen  
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals  
California Contract Cities Association  
California District Attorneys Association  
California Peace Officers Association  
California Police Chiefs Association  
California State Sheriffs' Association  
Claremont Police Officers Association  
Corona Police Officers Association  
Culver City Police Officers' Association  
Deputy Sheriffs' Association of Monterey County  
Fullerton Police Officers' Association  
Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association  
Los Angeles Police Protective League  
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association  
Monterey County District Attorney's Office - ODA - Salinas, CA  
Murrieta Police Officers' Association  
Newport Beach Police Association  
Orange County Sheriff's Department  
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association  
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)  
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association  
Pomona Police Officers' Association  
Riverside County Sheriff's Office  
Riverside Police Officers Association  
Riverside Sheriffs' Association  
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

San Diegans Against Crime  
San Diego Deputy District Attorneys Association  
Santa Ana Police Officers Association  
Upland Police Officers Association  
Visalia; City of

**Analysis Prepared by:** Andrew Ironside / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744