

CONSENT

Bill No: AB 1622
Author: Blanca Rubio (D) and Carrillo (D)
Introduced: 1/22/26
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 13-0, 6/23/26

AYES: Umberg, Niello, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern,
Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 7-0, 7/1/26

AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Ashby, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26 (Consent) - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Electrified security fences

SOURCE: AMAROK LLC
Bay Area Council
The Family Business Association

DIGEST: This bill removes the January 1, 2028 sunset for provisions that prohibit local cities, counties, and cities and counties from prohibiting the installation and operation of an electrified security fence on specified industrial, manufacturing, or commercial property, or from requiring a permit or approval for such fences, except as specified, when the fence is compliant with various requirements for electrified security fences.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Defines, for purposes of the below-described provisions, “electrified security fence” to mean any fence, other than an electrified fence as defined in Food and Agriculture Code section 17151, that:

- a) is powered by an electrical energizer, driven by solar-charged batteries of no more than 12 volts of direct current that has an impulse repetition rate that does not exceed 1 hertz, and an impulse duration that does not exceed 10 milliseconds; and
 - b) is 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. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 835(a).)
- 2) Permits an owner of real property to install and operate an electrified security fence on their property, if:
- a) the property is not located in a residential zone and falls within the description of property described in (1)(b), above;
 - b) the electrified security fence meets the standards and specifications of the International Electrotechnical Commission for electric security fence energizers in “International Standard IEC 60335, Part 2-76: 2018;”
 - c) the electrified security fence is identified by prominently placed warning signs that are legible from both sides of the fence, and the warning signs:
 - i. are placed at each gate and access point, and at intervals along the fence not to exceed 30 feet;
 - ii. are adjacent to any other signs relating to chemical, radiological, or biological hazards; and
 - iii. are marked with a written warning or a commonly recognized symbol for shock, a written warning or a commonly recognized symbol to warn people with pacemakers, and a written warning or commonly recognized symbol about the danger of touching the electrified security fence in wet conditions;
 - d) the height of the electrified fence does not exceed 10 feet or 2 feet higher than an existing nonelectrified perimeter fence or wall, whichever is greater, and the fence is located behind a nonelectrified perimeter fence or wall that is not less than five feet tall; and

- e) the electrified security fence includes a device that enables first responders to deactivate the electrified security fence in response to an emergency, if utilized by a city, county, or city and county. (Civ. Code § 835(b).)
- 3) Permits an electrified security fence to interface with a monitored alarm device in a manner that enables the alarm system to transmit a signal intended to summon the business, a monitoring service, or both the business and a monitoring service, in response to an intrusion or burglary. (Civ. Code § 835(c).)
- 4) Prohibits an owner of real property that is not the type of property described in (1)(a), above, from installing and operating an electrified security fence where a local ordinance prohibits the installation or operation of an electrified security fence, and permits a local ordinance to prohibit the installation and operation of an electrified security fence that does not comply with the requirements described in (1) through (3), above. Specifies that a local ordinance that prohibits or regulates only the installation or operation of an electrified fence as defined by the Food and Agricultural Code shall not be construed to apply to an electrified security fence, as defined in the above-described provisions. (Civ. Code § 835(d).)
- 5) Prohibits a city, county, or city and county ordinance, regulation, or code from prohibiting the installation and operation of an electrified security fence that meets the requirements of (1) through (3), above, and that is used to protect and secure real property described in (1)(b), above, nor require a permit or approval that is in addition to an alarm system permit issued by the city, county, or city and county. (Civ. Code § 835(d)(2).)
- 6) Permits a city, county, or city and county to require an administrative permit confirming the fence meets the requirements of this section if it is on a property abutting a property in residential use, or within 300 feet of a public park, childcare facility, recreation center, community center, or school facility. (*Id.*)
- 7) Specifies that nothing in the above described provisions shall be construed to alter the authority of a jurisdiction to adopt and enforce an ordinance relating to nonelectrified perimeter fences or walls as legally authorized, if applicable. (Civ. Code § 835(e).)
- 8) Repeals the amendments made to Civil Code section 835 by AB 2371 (Carrillo, Ch. 235, Stats. 2024) on January 1, 2028. (Civ. Code § 835(f).)

- 9) Defines “electrified fence” for purposes of the Food and Agriculture Code to mean any fence and appurtenant devices, including, but not limited to, fences and devices used in animal control, and including, but not limited to, a fence consisting of a single strand of wire supported by posts or other fixtures, which has an electrical charge or is connected to a source of electrical current, and which is so designed or placed that a person or animal coming into contact with the conductive element of the fence receives an electrical shock. Clarifies that an electrified fence, for its provisions, does not include an electrified security fence as described in Section 835 of the Civil Code. (Food and Agriculture Code § 17151.)

This bill removes the sunset provisions described in (8), above, thereby making the provisions described in (1) through (7) permanent.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: No Local: No

SUPPORT: (Verified 7/21/2026)

ARAMOK, LLC (co-source)
Bay Area Council (co-source)
Family Business Association of California (co-source)
Alfred Louie INC Bakersfield
Anaheim Chamber of Commerce
Arcadia Chair Company
Bolthouse Fresh Foods
Bragg Companies
Brandt Ag Products
Bravo Concrete Services INC
Cal Fire Local 2881
California Chamber of Commerce
California Fuels and Convenience Alliance
California Manufacturers and Technology Association
California Trucking Association
CFR CLASSIC LLC
Cleansleeves.com
Copart Inc.
Crystal Geyser Water Company
David Knott Inc.
E-recycling of California
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
Long Beach Chamber of Commerce
nGROUP Performance Partners
North Bakersfield Toyota
OK Tire and Automotive Tire Pros
Peace Officers Research Association of California
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
Titan Worldwide
Vestis
Waste Management
West Ventura County Business Alliance
Yolo Food Bank

OPPOSITION: (Verified 7/21/2026)

None received

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the Family Business Association, Bay Area Council, and AMAROK, LLC, the sponsors of this bill:

AB 1622 would repeal the January 1, 2028, sunset date clause put into law as part of the revisions to Civil Code Section 835 made by AB 2371 (Carrillo and Flora, 2024), which was enacted as an urgency bill on September 14, 2024. AB 2371 made modest but critical reforms to the local government permitting protocol governing electrified security fence alarm systems. These reforms have

made a substantial difference for businesses statewide that store valuable assets outdoors and are targets for criminal activity such as theft, vandalism, arson, and threats to employee safety.

Prior to the enactment of AB 2371, businesses confronted a disparate and unpredictable array of requirements and delays by local governments in obtaining a permit to install an electrified security fence alarm system, forcing businesses in numerous jurisdictions to wait up to five years for issuance of the permit. AB 2371 harmonized the criteria and permitting for local governments such that, as of January 31, 2026, more than 800 businesses have benefited under the updated law, enabling these businesses to install these security systems on average in 19 days.

The implementation of AB 2371 has been highly successful, without issues or concerns by local governments. However, AB 2371 included a sunset clause of January 1, 2028. In light of the success of the permitting reforms established by AB 2371, AB 1622 would repeal the sunset date, providing both businesses and local governments with the certainty needed to ensure employers can access the tools necessary to protect employees and remain operational.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 64-0, 4/9/26

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Bains, Berman, Boerner, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Hadwick, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Rivas

NO VOTE RECORDED: Addis, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Bonta, Bryan, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Haney, Kalra, Ortega, Celeste Rodriguez, Schultz, Zbur

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
8/3/26 17:24:31

**** END ****