

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Senator María Elena Durazo, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 1622  
**Author:** Blanca Rubio  
**Version:** 1/22/26

**Hearing Date:** 7/1/26  
**Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Vargas

## ***ELECTRIFIED SECURITY FENCES***

*Repeals the sunset date on the requirement that cities and counties allow use of electrified security fences.*

### **Background**

The California Constitution allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” It is from this fundamental power (commonly called the police power) that cities and counties derive their authority to regulate behavior to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the public—including land use authority.

***Electric fences.*** Electrified fences work by sending high voltage pulses of electricity at regular intervals through conductive materials in the fence like metal wires. While traditionally used in the agricultural context to contain livestock, electrified fences are being increasingly used in the commercial context as a product to protect businesses’ properties and equipment. Such systems typically trigger an alarm if disturbed and may be combined with cameras or other surveillance systems. Although the use of electrified fences for commercial purposes has been increasing, local jurisdictions have at times approached such fences in different ways to ensure the safety of the fences and that they are not located in areas that may place residents at risk.

While electrified fences usually use high voltage, they ordinarily do not cause significant harm to a person because the duration of the shock is very brief. However, in different conditions, such as when more conductive materials like water are present, the risks of receiving a substantial current and being harmed increase. Shocks closer to the heart or to people with pacemakers pose greater risks.

Prior to 2015, the only statutes regulating electric fences were provisions of the Food and Agriculture Code, relating to agricultural electrified fences. Reportedly, this resulted in hesitancy and delays on the part of local jurisdictions when companies applied to install electrified fences on industrial or commercial properties. However, in 2015, the Legislature enacted SB 582 (Hall, 2015) to authorize and regulate the use of electrified fences on commercial, manufacturing, or industrial property with local control. SB 582 also provided a variety of limitations and requirements, including that:

- The property is not located in a residential zone;
- The fence meets certain international standards;
- The fence has prominent warning signs on both sides of the fence; and
- The fence meets certain height restrictions and is located behind a perimeter fence.

AB 358 (Flora, 2021) further clarified the limits and contours of local control while also specifying any prohibition of an agricultural electrified fence under the Food and Agricultural Code does not apply to an electrified security fence for industrial or manufacturing purposes.

**AB 2371 (Juan Carrillo, 2024).** AB 2371 disallowed a city or county from prohibiting the installation or operation of, or requiring a permit other than an alarm system for certain electric fences. However, a city or county can require an administrative permit from the State Fire Marshal or chief building official confirming the fence meets the requirements if the electrical fence shares or borders a residential property or within 300 feet of a public park, childcare facility, recreation center, community center, or school facility. To qualify, the electric fence must:

- Be used to protect and secure manufacturing or industrial property, or property zoned under another designation, but legally authorized to be used for a commercial purpose that stores, parks, services, sells, or rents vehicles, vessels, equipment, materials, freight, or utility infrastructure within an outdoor lot or yard, provided that the secured area does not include any existing residential or hospitality uses;
- Include a device to let first responders deactivate the electrified security fence;
- Be powered by an electrical energizer driven by solar-charged batteries of no more than 12 volts of direct current; and
- Meet other requirements in existing law for electric fences, including that the property the fence is installed on is not in a residential zone.

AB 2371 also provides it does not alter the authority of a jurisdiction to adopt and enforce an ordinance relating to non-electrified perimeter fences or walls as legally authorized.

Since the enactment of AB 2371, AMAROK, LLC, a private company that installs electric security fences, reports that more than 800 additional businesses have implemented this security technology, with installations occurring in an average of 19 days. Based on these reported outcomes, AMAROK wants the Legislature to repeal the January 1, 2028, sunset date.

### **Proposed Law**

Assembly Bill 1622 repeals the January 1, 2028, sunset date that AB 2371 established.

### **Comments**

1. **Purpose of the bill.** According to the author, “Prior to the enactment of AB 2371 (Carrillo and Flora, 2024), which was approved unanimously by the Legislature and signed by Governor Newsom on September 14, 2024 as an urgency bill, commercial property owners statewide had faced escalating incidences of trespass and criminal activity such as theft, vandalism and threats to employee health and safety, which, in some cases, resulted in the closure of businesses and loss of jobs. And for almost a decade prior to AB 2371, more than 1,000 installations of electrified security fence systems were permitted and safely securing commercial properties statewide without issue. However, in 2024 there were more than 400 businesses statewide, in permitting limbo for an average of 372 days, desperately seeking approval from their local governments to permit them to install this proven safe and effective technology to secure their property and protect their employees. This security technology was also being utilized by public

agencies such as school districts and state public safety agencies to secure their assets from theft and vandalism.

“Since its passage, AB 2371 resolved the disparity and associated delays in the permitting of electrified security fence installations and, as a result, more than 800 additional businesses have benefited by being able to implement this security technology in average of 19 days.

“AB 1622 simply repeals the sunset date on a statute that achieves its goals without presenting any implementation difficulties.”

2. Premature. When the Legislature considered AB 2371, the California State Association of Counties and the California League of Cities raised concerns that AB 2371 could be interpreted to require local jurisdictions to allow electrified security fences in all circumstances, potentially creating risks where such fences are located near residential or hospitality facilities. In response, AB 2371 was amended to address those concerns and included a sunset provision to allow the Legislature an opportunity to review the implementation and effects of the policy. AB 1622 repeals that sunset provision after only approximately one year and a half of implementation of AB 2371. The short review period limits the amount of data that the Legislature has to review AB 2371’s outcomes. The Committee may wish to consider whether the benefits of repealing the sunset early outweigh the lost potential for evaluating the state’s electrified fence policies in the future.

3. Charter city. The California Constitution allows cities that adopt charters to control their own “municipal affairs.” In all other matters, charter cities must follow the general, statewide laws. However, the Constitution does not define “municipal affairs,” leaving it to the courts to determine whether a topic is a municipal affair or an issue of statewide concern. AB 1622 specifies that it applies to all cities, including charter cities. To support this assertion, the bill includes a legislative finding that it addresses a matter of statewide concern to allow for uniformity of standards in the permitting of electrified security fences that meet the criteria of an alarm system.

4. Incoming! The Senate Rules Committee has ordered a double referral of AB 1622: first to the Committee on Judiciary, which approved AB 1622 at its June 23<sup>rd</sup> hearing on a vote of 13-0, and second to the Committee on Local Government.

### Assembly Actions

Assembly Local Government Committee:	10-0
Assembly Floor:	64-0

### Support and Opposition (6/26/26)

Support: Amarok LLC (Co-Sponsor)  
 Bay Area Council (Co-Sponsor)  
 Family Business Association of California (Co-Sponsor)  
 Alfred Louis INC  
 Anaheim Chamber of Commerce  
 Arcadia Chair Company  
 Bolthouse Fresh Foods  
 Bragg Companies

Brandt Ag Products  
Bravo Concrete Services INC  
Cal Fire Local 2881  
California Alarm Association  
California Chamber of Commerce  
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance  
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
California Manufacturers and Technology Association  
California Retailers Association  
California Trucking Association  
Cfr Classic LLC  
Cleansleeves.com  
Copart INC.  
Crystal Geyser Water Company  
David Knott INC  
E-recycling of California  
Electronic Security Association  
Fleet Yards INC  
Franco Logistics  
Gachina Landscape Management  
Gary Scelzi Motorsports  
Gdn Southwest LLC  
Golden State Fasteners and Supply Company  
Golden State Logistics  
Green Trucking LLC  
Keepsafe Storall  
Lewis & Tibbits INC  
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce  
National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB)  
Ngroup Performance Partners  
North Bakersfield Toyota  
Ok Tire and Automotive Tire Pros  
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)  
Pomona Chamber of Commerce  
Quantum Freight LLC  
Regent Cold Storage  
Republic Services  
Sacramento Truck Center  
Self Storage Association  
Service West  
Stotz Equipment Montclair  
Sworx Bottling  
The Greater West Covina Business Association  
Titan Worldwide  
United Chamber Advocacy Network Ucan  
Vestis  
West Ventura County Business Alliance  
Wm (waste Management)  
Yolo Food Bank

Opposition: None Submitted

-- END --