

Date of Hearing: June 16, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS

Marc Berman, Chair

SB 1203 (Smallwood-Cuevas) – As Amended May 19, 2026

NOTE: This bill is triple-referred and if passed by this Committee will be re-referred to the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and the Assembly Public Safety Committee.

SENATE VOTE: 25-8

SUBJECT: Security services

SUMMARY: Requires additional training for proprietary private security officers (PSO) and private security guards specific to deescalation and employee rights; increases reporting requirements and fines for specified violations of law; and requires the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) to issue a specific wage order for the security services industry, among other provisions.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS or Bureau) within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to license and regulate the private security industry, private investigators, locksmiths, repossessioners, and alarm companies. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 7512 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the Proprietary Security Services Act, which provides for the BSIS's regulation of proprietary private security employers (PSE) and PSOs. (BPC §§ 7574 *et seq.*)
- 3) Establishes the Private Security Services Act, which provides for the BSIS's regulation of Private Patrol Operators (PPO) and private security guards and security patrolpersons. (BPC §§ 7580 *et seq.*)
- 4) Defines PSE to mean a person who has one or more employees who provide security services for the employer and only for the employer. (BPC § 7574.01(f))
- 5) Defines PSO to mean an unarmed individual who is employed exclusively by any one employer whose primary duty is to provide security services for their employer, whose services are not contracted to any other entity or person, and who meets both of the following criteria:
 - a) Is required to wear a distinctive uniform clearly identifying the individual as a security officer.
 - b) Is likely to interact with the public while performing their duties.

(BPC § 7574.01(g))

- 6) Defines a PPO as a person who agrees to furnish, or furnishes, a watchman, guard, patrolperson, or other person to protect persons or property or to prevent the theft, unlawful taking, loss, embezzlement, misappropriation, or concealment of any goods, wares, merchandise, money, bonds, stocks, notes, documents, papers, or property of any kind; or performs the service of a watchman, guard, patrolperson, or other person, for any of these purposes. (BPC § 7582.1(a))
- 7) Defines a security guard or security officer as an employee of a PPO or an employee of a lawful business or public agency who performs the functions described above on or about the premises owned or controlled by the customer of the PPO or by the guard's employer or in the company of persons being protected. (BPC § 7582.1(e))
- 8) Requires PSOs to complete training in security officer skills within six months from the date upon which registration is issued, or within six months of their employment with a PSE. (BPC § 7574.18(a))
- 9) Requires DCA to develop and establish by regulation a standard course and curriculum, which shall include a minimum number of hours of instruction, for the skills training to promote and protect the safety of persons and the security of property. (BPC § 7474.18(d))
- 10) Authorizes DCA to approve any PSE, organization, or school to teach the security skills training. (BPC § 7474.18(e))
- 11) Requires each PSE to annually provide each registered employee with specifically dedicated review or practice of the security officer skills and requires the BSIS to adopt by regulation the minimum number of hours required for annual review. (BPC § 7474.18(f)(1))
- 12) Authorizes the director of DCA to issue a citation, which may include an order of abatement or an order to pay an administrative fine, for a violation of the Proprietary Security Services Act and establishes the following fines:
 - a) The fine for violating subdivision (a), (b), or (e) of Section 7574.38 shall be \$500 per violation.
 - b) The fine for violating subdivision (c) or (d) of Section 7574.38 shall be \$2,500 per violation.
 - c) The fine for violating subdivision (a) or (c) of Section 7574.39 shall be \$500 per violation.
 - d) The fine for violating subdivision (b) of Section 7574.39 shall be \$1,000.(BPC § 7474.30(c),(d),(e),(f))
- 13) Requires a person registered as a PSE to deliver to the director of DCA a written report describing the circumstances surrounding any physical altercation by a registered PSO with a member of the public while on duty and while acting within the course and scope of their employment within seven business days after the qualifying incident. (BPC § 7574.37(a))

14) States that the report above shall be required only for physical altercations that result in any of the following:

- a) The arrest of a PSO.
- b) The filing of a police report by a member of the public.
- c) A member of the public requiring any type of first aid or other medical attention.
- d) The discharge, suspension, or reprimand of a PSO by their employer.
- e) Any physical use of force or violence on any person while on duty.

(BPC § 7574.37(b))

15) Specifies that the report shall include, but not be limited to, a description of any injuries or damages incurred, the identity of all participants, and whether a police investigation was conducted. (BPC § 7574.37(c))

16) Makes the failure to deliver the report to the director subject to a fine of two \$2,500. (BPC § 7574.37(f))

17) Provides that a PSE shall not do the following:

- a) Fail to properly maintain an accurate and current record of the name, address, commencing date of employment, and position of each PSO, and the date of termination of employment when a PSO is terminated.
- b) Fail to properly maintain an accurate and current record of proof of completion by each PSO of the security skills training.
- c) Fail to certify proof of current and valid registration for each employee who is subject to registration.
- d) Permit any employee to carry a firearm or other deadly weapon, including any electronic control device, stun gun, baton, or any chemical agent, including pepper spray.
- e) Fail to administer to each registered employee of the licensee the annual review or practice training required.

(BPC § 7474.38)

18) Requires each disciplinary review committee to perform the following functions as they pertain to PPO, security guards, firearm qualification cardholders, baton permitholders, firearm training facilities, firearm training instructors, baton training facilities, and baton training instructors, as licensed, permitted, certified, or registered by the BSIS under the Private Security Services Act, and PSOs, as registered by the BSIS under the Proprietary Security Services Act:

- a) Affirm, rescind, or modify all appealed decisions that concern administrative fines assessed by the director of DCA.
- b) Affirm, rescind, or modify all appealed decisions that concern denials, revocations, or suspensions of a license, certificate, or registration except denials, revocations, or suspensions ordered by the director of DCA, as specified.

(BPC § 7581.2)

- 19) Authorizes a PPO, qualified manager of a PPO, security guard, firearm qualification cardholder, baton permitholder, firearm training facility, firearm training instructor, baton training facility, or baton training instructor to request a review by a disciplinary review committee to contest the assessment of an administrative fine or to appeal a denial, revocation, or suspension of a license, certificate, or registration unless the denial, revocation, or suspension is ordered by the director of DCA. (BPC § 7581.3(a))
- 20) Asserts that a person licensed as a PPO shall not do any of the following:
- a) Fail to properly maintain an accurate and current record of all firearms or other deadly weapons that are in the possession of the licensee or of any employee while on duty. Within seven days after a licensee or the licensee's employees discover that a deadly weapon that has been recorded as being in the licensee's possession has been misplaced, lost, or stolen, or is in any other way missing, the licensee or their manager must mail or deliver to any local law enforcement agency that has jurisdiction a written report concerning the incident, as specified. (BPC § 7583.2(a))
 - b) Fail to properly maintain an accurate and current record of the name, address, commencing date of employment, and position of each employee, and the date of termination of employment when an employee is terminated. (BPC § 7583.2(b))
 - c) Fail to properly maintain an accurate and current record of proof of completion by each employee of the licensee of the trainings and for the retention period specified in statute. (BPC § 7583.2(c))
 - d) Fail to certify proof of current and valid registration for each employee who is subject to registration. (BPC § 7583.2(d))
 - e) Permit any employee to carry a firearm or other deadly weapon without first ascertaining that the employee is proficient in the use of each weapon to be carried. (BPC § 7583.2(e))
 - f) Fail to deliver to the director a written report describing the circumstances surrounding the discharge of any firearm, or physical altercation with a member of the public while on duty, by a licensee or any officer, partner, or employee of a licensee while acting within the course and scope of their employment within seven business days after the qualifying incident, except as specified. (BPC § 7583.2(f)(1))
 - i) Specifies that the report above shall be required only for physical altercations that result in any of the following:

- (1) The arrest of a security guard.
 - (2) The filing of a police report by a member of the public.
 - (3) A member of the public requiring any type of first aid or other medical attention.
 - (4) The discharge, suspension, or reprimand of a security guard by their employer.
 - (5) Any physical use of force or violence on any person while on duty.
- (BPC § 7583.2(f)(2))
- ii) Requires the report to include, but not be limited to, a description of any injuries or damages incurred, the identity of all participants, and whether a police investigation was conducted. Any report may be investigated by the director to determine if any disciplinary action is necessary. (BPC § 7583.2(f)(3))
 - g) Fail to notify the Bureau in writing and within 30 days that a manager is no longer connected with the licensee. (BPC § 7583.2(g))
 - h) Fail to administer to each registered employee of the licensee eight hours of specifically dedicated review or practice of security officer skills annually. (BPC § 7583.2(h))
- 21) Requires every PPO and any person employed and compensated by a PPO, other lawful business, or public agency as a security guard or patrolperson, and who in the course of that employment or business carries a firearm, to complete a course of training in the exercise of the power to arrest and the appropriate use of force and a course of training in the carrying and use of firearms, except as specified. The course must meet the standards prescribed by the DCA. (BPC § 7583.5(a))
- 22) Requires each applicant for a security guard registration to complete a course in the exercise of the power to arrest and the appropriate use of force as a condition for the issuance of the registration. The training shall be administered and certified by a single course provider and completed within six months preceding the date of application to BSIS. (BPC § 7583.6(a))
- 23) Requires a security guard registrant to complete 32 hours of security officer skills within six months from the date an initial registration is issued, including 16 of the 32 hours within 30 days from the date of registration. (BPC § 7583.6(b))
- 24) Requires security guard registrants to annually complete eight hours of specifically dedicated review or practice of security officer skills, as specified. (BPC § 7583.6(e))
- 25) Authorizes the security skills training to be administered, tested, and certified by any licensee; any BSIS-certified training facility; or any BSIS-approved organization or school approved by the Bureau so long as the Bureau approves any instructor of an organization or school who will administer the trainings. (BPC § 7583.6(f))
- 26) Requires each licensee to maintain at the principal place of business or branch office a record for each of its registrant employees verifying completion of the training for the duration of

the registrant's employment and to make the records available for inspection by the Bureau upon request. (BPC § 7583.6(g)(2))

- 27) Requires the course of training in the exercise of the power to arrest and the appropriate use of force to be administered, tested, and certified by any licensee or by any organization or school approved by DCA. The course of training is required to be approximately eight hours in length and cover 24 individual topics, including:
- a) Responsibilities and ethics in citizen arrest.
 - b) Relationship between a security guard and a peace officer in making an arrest.
 - c) Limitations on security guard power to arrest.
 - d) Restrictions on searches and seizures.
 - e) Criminal and civil liabilities, including both of the following:
 - i) Personal liability.
 - ii) Employer liability.
 - f) Trespass law.
 - g) Ethics and communications.
 - h) Emergency situation response, including response to medical emergencies.
 - i) Security officer safety.
 - j) The appropriate use of force, including all of the following topics:
 - i) Legal standards for use of force.
 - ii) Duty to intercede.
 - iii) The use of objectively reasonable force.
 - iv) Supervisory responsibilities.
 - v) Use of force review and analysis.
 - vi) Deescalation and interpersonal communication training, including tactical methods that use time, distance, cover, and concealment, to avoid escalating situations that lead to violence.
 - vii) Implicit and explicit bias and cultural competency.
 - viii) Skills, including deescalation techniques, to effectively, safely, and respectfully interact with people with disabilities or behavioral health issues.

- ix) Use of force scenario training, including simulations of low-frequency, high-risk situations and calls for service, shoot-or-don't-shoot situations, and real-time force option decision making.
- x) Mental health and policing, including bias and stigma.
- xi) Active shooter situations.
- k) Any other topic deemed appropriate by the bureau, excluding Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism Awareness, which may be an elective topic only.

(BPC § 7583.7(a))

Requires the majority of the course of training in the exercise of power and arrest and the appropriate use of force to be taught by means of verbal instruction. The instruction may include the use of video presentation. (BPC § 7583.7(b)(1))

- 28) Requires the appropriate use of force portion of the course to be conducted through traditional classroom instruction, which means the instructor is physically present with students in a classroom for a minimum of 50 percent of the course and is available at all times, including during instruction provided through distance learning or remote platforms, to answer students' questions while providing the required training. In this setting, the instructor provides demonstrations and hands-on instruction in order to establish each student's proficiency as to the course content. (BPC § 7583.7(b)(2))
- 29) Requires the DCA to make available a Power to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force Manual, and exempts the development, adoption, amendment, or repeal of the Manual from the Administrative Procedure Act. (BPC § 7583.7(c))
- 30) Authorizes the Bureau to issue a citation to a licensee for violation of BPC §§ 7583.2, 7583.3, 7583.37, 7585.19, 7587.2, or 7587.14 that may contain an assessment of an administrative fine that shall in no event exceed \$2,500. (BPC § 7587.7)
- 31) Authorizes the director of DCA to assess fines for the following acts only as follows:
 - a) Violation of subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of Section 7583.2; \$500 per violation.
 - b) Violation of subdivisions (g) and (h) of Section 7583.2; \$250 per violation.
 - c) Violation of subdivision (f) of Section 7583.2; \$5,000.
 - d) Violation of subdivision (e) of Section 7583.2; \$2,500 per violation, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(BPC § 7587.8)

- 32) Requires on or before February 1, 2026, and annually thereafter, an employer to provide a stand-alone written notice to each current employee, and each new employee upon hire, in a manner the employer normally uses to communicate employment-related information,

whether by personal service, email, or text message, to include a description of specified workers' rights, including the right to organize a union or engage in concerted activity in the workplace. (Labor Code (LAB) § 1553(a))

- 33) Requires the IWC to ascertain the wages paid to all employees in this state, to ascertain the hours and conditions of labor and employment in the various occupations, trades, and industries in which employees are employed in this state, and to investigate the health, safety, and welfare of those employees. (LAB § 1173)
- 34) Sets forth the subjects that shall be taught and the minimum number of hours that shall be allowed towards meeting the required training for PSOs and security guards. (16 CCR § 643(a))

THIS BILL:

- 1) Codifies BSIS regulations requiring PSOs to complete power to arrest and appropriate use of force training as a condition of registration and requiring course providers to issue a certificate of completion to the person upon satisfactory completion of each training.
- 2) Adds 10 hours to the security officer skills training required of PSOs for a total of 42 hours, and specifies that 18 of the 42 hours must be completed within 30 days from the date of registration. The training on the power to arrest and the appropriate use of force, and the security officer skills training, must meet standards and requirements set forth in this bill and existing law.
- 3) Prohibits the DCA from approving any PSE, organization, or school to teach the deescalation training required by this bill.
- 4) Requires PSOs to annually complete a minimum of eight hours of training dedicated to practicing deescalation skills through in-person role-play and interactive training methods administered by an approved organization, as specified, in addition to current annual training.
- 5) Specifies that a church, mosque, shrine, synagogue, temple, or other place of worship is exempt from requiring its PSOs to take deescalation training required by this bill and is only required to ensure that its PSOs take 16 hours of security officer skills training.
- 6) Increases the fine for PSEs violating specified recordkeeping requirements or failing to provide annual review or practice training from \$500 to \$1,000.
- 7) Specifies that a PSE shall not fail to ensure that the security skills training occurs as required, nor fail to compensate employees for training, and makes both failures a violation subject to a \$10,000 fine.
- 8) Adds deescalation organizations to the list of individuals and entities for which each disciplinary review committee must perform specified functions and authorizes a deescalation organization to request a review by a disciplinary review committee.
- 9) Requires PPOs to deliver a written report to the director of DCA describing a physical altercation that results in a security guard requiring first aid or other medical attention. The

report must include the apparent race and gender of the member of the public and whether the security guard involved had received all required training at the time of the incident.

- 10) Requires the Bureau to release an annual report containing specified incident report data by county and comparative analysis with previous years' data.
- 11) Specifies that a PPO shall not fail to ensure that the security skills training for security guards occurs as required, nor fail to compensate employees for training.
- 12) Requires the Bureau to develop and establish by emergency regulations a standard course and curriculum that must include a minimum number of hours of instruction for training individuals on the role of implicit and explicit bias on racial profiling and the use of firearms in commercial, entertainment, government property, urban street, and residential settings.
- 13) Allows the deescalation training required by this bill to be provided by an approved organization that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies, as specified. The deescalation training must be based on principles and methods informed by peer-reviewed or clinical research on trauma and include role-playing and interactive methods. The BSIS must develop emergency regulations establishing the criteria it will use to evaluate whether any organization qualifies. The BSIS must identify qualifying organizations by July 1, 2028. An organization cannot be a licensee.
- 14) Specifies that a person certified by a deescalation organization must be a natural person and cannot provide deescalation training if they are employed by a licensee.
- 15) Requires an organization seeking the BSIS's approval to offer the deescalation training to complete an application containing specified information and pay a \$250 application fee.
- 16) Requires the Bureau chief to issue a "deescalation organization certificate," to a facility upon approval by BSIS. The certificate must be posted in a conspicuous place at the facility.
- 17) Authorizes the Bureau chief to refuse to issue or to cancel a deescalation organization certificate or may assess fines on the grounds that the trainings were not conducted as required.
- 18) Adds 10 hours to the security officer skills training required of security guards for a total of 42 hours, and specifies that 18 of the 42 hours must be completed within 30 days from the date of registration. Specifies that the 42 hours of training must be conducted through traditional classroom instruction, as defined. The time spent attending the training must be compensated by the licensee if the guard is employed by, or has a pending offer of employment from, the licensee. The cost of the training must be provided by the employer of the guard. No part of this training may be completed while a guard is on duty at their post.
- 19) Requires eight hours of security skills training to be dedicated to practicing deescalation skills through in-person role-play and interactive training methods administered by an organization, or a person certified by an organization, that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies. These hours must be compensated by the employer, and the cost of the training must be paid by the employer if the individual has an offer of

employment or is employed by the employer. The deescalation training must be conducted by an instructor who is a human being and physically present, in person, and live with students in a classroom 100 percent of the course and available to answer students' questions while providing the required training. The Bureau must develop and establish by emergency regulation a standard course and curriculum for deescalation training.

- 20) Requires the Bureau to develop emergency regulations establishing the criteria the Bureau shall use to evaluate whether any organization is a qualifying organization. Organizations qualified to provide this training shall be identified by July 1, 2028. An organization wishing to offer the deescalation training must complete an application for certification as a deescalation training organization and pay a \$250 application fee.
- 21) Requires two of the first 18 hours of security skills training to be dedicated to training on employee rights.
- 22) Adds eight hours of annual dedicated review or practice of security skills, for a total of 16 hours, and requires at least eight of these hours to be dedicated to practicing deescalation skills through in-person role-play and interactive training methods administered by an organization, or a person certified by an organization, approved by the BSIS. This annual training must be compensated by any employer for whom the guard works, or from whom the guard has a pending offer of employment.
- 23) Prohibits the deescalation skills trainings from being administered, tested, and certified by any licensee, BSIS-certified training facility, or BSIS-approved organization or school.
- 24) Authorizes a labor union that represents the security guards of a licensee and is approved by the BSIS to provide the two-hour labor rights training, upon request to the Bureau. Absent such a request, this training may be provided by any licensee to their applicants for employment and direct employees, BSIS-certified training facilities, or any BSIS-approved organization or school.
- 25) Requires, if the BSIS or DCA adopts, modifies, or seeks to rescind a rule or regulation pertaining to training or the Power to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force Manual, to convene a training advisory committee to recommend requirements and share their experience in the security industry. The committee must be composed of representatives of the DCA and the BSIS as well as representatives from a recognized or certified collective bargaining agent that represents security workers, security employers, labor-management groups in the security industry, security officers, worker centers, and other related subject matter experts.
- 26) Increases the maximum fine that may be issued for various violations of the Private Security Services Act from \$2,500 to \$10,000 per violation.
- 27) Requires the IWC, on or before July 1, 2027, to convene regional hearings to perform their mandated duties for the "property services industry," as defined.

- 28) Requires the IWC to issue a wage order specific to employees employed in the property services industry by June 30, 2028, and meet every two years, to evaluate the adequacy of the minimum wage.
- 29) Includes findings and declarations.
- 30) Makes additional technical, nonsubstantive, and conforming changes.
- 31) Except as otherwise specified, delays implementation until July 1, 2028.

FISCAL EFFECT: According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- The Bureau reports significant costs, ranging in the millions of dollars, for the expansion of its responsibilities to develop standards for power to arrest and use of force curricula, and to ensure licensee compliance with CBAs (Private Security Services Fund). The Bureau's estimate accounts for additional personnel to handle various functions, such as reviewing applications, developing a standard guidebook, and approving schools and unlicensed persons seeking to provide training. The Bureau will also need staff resources to research and approve labor organizations as training providers within 30 days of an organization's request to provide employee rights training.
- Unknown, potentially significant fiscal impact, likely ranging from the high hundreds of thousands to low millions of dollars for the Industrial Welfare Commission (Commission) to convene and issue a wage order for the property services industry. Staff notes that the Commission has remained non-operational since 2004. Although the Budget Act of 2023 initially allocated \$3 million to restart the Commission, this funding was subsequently repealed. To the extent the Commission requires resources comparable to those proposed in 2023, General Fund costs may range into the millions of dollars.

COMMENTS:

Purpose. This bill is sponsored by *SEIU California*. According to the author:

Security guards are relied upon by communities, local businesses, property managers, nonprofits, and local governments to help keep people safe. They are often the first to respond during emergencies and high-stress situations and must act quickly to protect those around them. Communities increasingly rely on security guards as essential workers, and the scope of their work has significantly expanded. However, their wages, working conditions, and training standards have not kept pace with the importance of their role or the risks of the profession. [This bill] improves working conditions for security guards by ensuring they are adequately trained and fairly compensated for their responsibilities.

Background.

Security Guard Workforce. According to an April 2026 factsheet on the demographic and job characteristics of the security guard workforce in California by the UC Berkeley Labor Center, the security guard workforce is predominantly male and relatively young, with a median age of

35, although nearly 20% are over the age of 55.¹ A majority of employees are people of color, and foreign-born workers account for roughly one-fifth of the workforce. The majority have some education beyond high school. Nearly four in five security guards work full-time. Similarly, about four in five security guards earn below the MIT Living Wage for their region.² In 2024, the security services sector in California had a turnover rate of 91.6 percent compared to 95.1 percent in 2019 and 82.5 percent in 2014.

BSIS. The BSIS licenses and regulates the alarm, locksmith, private investigator, private security services, and repossession industries through the administration and enforcement of six practice acts, including the Proprietary Security Services Act, which regulates PSEs and PSOs. A PSE is a person who employs PSOs. They cannot subcontract their security services. PSOs are employees of a PSO who are required to wear a distinctive uniform that clearly identifies them as security officers and who are likely to interact with the public in the course of their duties. They cannot provide security services for any other entity or person, and they are not authorized to carry a firearm, nor any other weapon, such as a baton, chemical weapons, or stun guns. The Bureau also regulates PPOs and security guards through the Private Security Services Act. A PPO is a company that protects people or property or prevents theft. Security guards are employed by licensed PPOs or PSEs and contracted out to protect people or property or prevent theft. A security guard is not authorized to contract themselves out for private security services unless they also hold a PPO license.

There are significantly more PPOs and security guards than PSE and PSO. Security guards make up most of the Bureau's licensee population. Private security is one of the largest regulated professions in California; licensing data from Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 indicates that the number of security guards is second only to that of registered nurses. In FY 2023-24, there were more than 310,000 active registered security guards and more than 7,800 PSOs. That year, the Bureau's total licensee population grew more than 20 percent. In the current FY, the BSIS has approved more than 80,000 applications across all professions it regulates.

The BSIS has an advisory committee comprising seven industry members and six public members who provide insight and perspective on the industries regulated by the Bureau, conduct outreach, and advise on legislation and regulations affecting those industries. Members include one representative from the alarm, locksmith, private investigator, proprietary security services, private security services, and repossession industries and one owner of a BSIS training facility. Representatives from SEIU United Services Workers West and Huntington Hospital currently serve as two public members. The other public member positions are vacant. The committee meets two to four times per year, and membership is voluntary.

The Bureau has four Disciplinary Review Committees (DRCs): Alarm Company Operator DRC, Collateral Recovery DRC, Private Investigator DRC, and Private Security Services DRCs (Northern California and Southern California). DRCs consider appeals from applicants and

¹ UC Berkeley Labor Center, *Demographic and Job Characteristics of the Security Guard Workforce in California* (Apr. 23, 2026), https://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/demographic-and-job-characteristics-of-the-security-guard-workforce-in-california/?utm_source=chatgpt.com.

² The MIT Living Wage estimates the hourly wage required for a full-time worker to cover basic living costs. It is \$30.48 per hour statewide for a household with one adult and no children.

licensees regarding the Bureau's denials, suspensions, and revocations, as well as the assessment of administrative fines. DRCs consist of five members appointed by the Governor, with three members actively engaged in the industry for which the DRC oversees and two public members.

As a special fund agency, the Bureau receives no General Fund support, relying solely on fees set by statute and collected through licensing and renewal fees. The Private Security Services (PSS) Fund is not continuously appropriated. Until FY 2019/20, the Bureau oversaw two funds – the PSS Fund and the Private Investigator (PI) Fund. SB 609 (Glazer), Chapter 377, Statutes of 2019, combined the PI Fund with the PSS Fund and raised application and licensure fees for private investigators consistent with findings of the fee audit. Combining funds has eliminated the significant workload associated with administering two separate funds and allowed the Bureau to redirect staff to address workload spikes without cross-funding concerns. Effective October 1, 2025, the Bureau increased licensing fees by 10 percent to alleviate a structural imbalance and help ensure the Bureau has sufficient funds to carry out its consumer protection mandate and to continue its daily operations.³

Sunset Review. Each year, the Assembly Committee on Business and Professions and the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development hold joint sunset review oversight hearings to review the licensing entities under the DCA. The sunset review process provides an opportunity for the Legislature, DCA, boards and bureaus, and stakeholders to discuss the performance of the licensing entity and make recommendations for improvements.

Issue #4 of the [committee background paper](#) prepared prior to the Bureau's sunset hearing asked whether the current security guard training requirements were rigorous enough to effectively reduce inappropriate use of force and protect the public from unnecessary violent incidents involving security guards. At the time, the Bureau reported that an increasing number of security guards were applying for firearm and baton permits, which it took to mean greater demand for security guards to be proactive in preventive measures, rather than merely observing and reporting. Given the Bureau's belief that more armed security guards would increase the likelihood of a public safety incident, the Bureau proposed increasing security guard training from 40 to 80 hours to include additional training on security guard conduct and misconduct, civil and criminal liability, appropriate use-of-force methods, and in-depth deescalation techniques. The Bureau also noted the lack of specific training requirements or licensing requirements for chemical agents (pepper spray), kinetic energy weapons (rubber bullets or bean bags), or electronic control devices (stun guns or tasers), which are involved in numerous incidents reported to the Bureau. The Bureau reported that the absence of training standards and licensing requirements for these additional weapons limits the Bureau's enforcement options and its ability to take action against a security company for misuse or abuse of these weapons. The committee background paper identified several bills that had recently modified the registration requirements for security guards, as well as firearm and baton permit requirements, that were intended to improve public safety and in the process of being implemented. No additional changes to security guard training were included in the sunset bill, SB 1454 (Ashby), Chapter 484, Statutes of 2024.

³ Bureau of Security & Investigative Services, California Department of Consumer Affairs, *Initial Statement of Reasons: Fees* (Nov. 19, 2024), https://www.bsis.ca.gov/about_us/laws/bsis_fees_isor.pdf.

This bill proposes to substantially amend the Proprietary Security Services Act and the Private Security Services Act, including training requirements.

Training. Prior to registration as a PSO or security guard, an applicant must complete an eight-hour course in the exercise of powers to arrest and the appropriate use of force. Once registered, they must complete an additional 32 hours of security skills training within six months. Sixteen hours must be completed within 30 days. These trainings cover a wide range of important topics, such as the legal standards for use of force, deescalation tactics, implicit and explicit bias, active shooter situations, trespass law, criminal liability, and much more. The training may be provided by an employer to its own applicants and employees, a BSIS-certified training facility, or a BSIS-approved organization or school. Consistent with Bureau regulations and an existing statutory requirement for security guards, this bill would require PSOs to complete power-to-arrest and appropriate use-of-force training prior to registering with the BSIS.

Additionally, this bill would require an additional eight hours of in-person deescalation training to be completed within six months of registration. The deescalation training would have to be provided by an organization or person certified by an organization that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies and is approved by the Bureau. The BSIS would be required to establish a standard course and curriculum for the training. This bill would also require PSOs and security guards to complete two hours of labor-rights training within 30 days of registration, which may be provided by an employer, a BSIS-certified training facility, a BSIS-approved organization or school, or, upon request, a union. Moreover, this bill would require that security skills training be conducted through traditional classroom instruction, meaning the instructor must be physically present with students in the classroom for at least 50 percent of the course, and prohibits this training from being completed while a guard is on duty. Lastly, the employer would be required to pay for the training and compensate employees and applicants with a pending offer of employment for the time required to complete the training.

In addition to initial training, PSOs and security guards are required to complete eight hours of training annually. This bill would double that requirement by mandating an additional eight hours of deescalation training each year. This bill would also require employers to compensate employees and applicants with a pending offer of employment for the time required to complete the training.

Before a security guard can carry a firearm or baton, they must obtain a Firearms Permit or Baton Permit from the Bureau. In addition to numerous qualifying criteria, applicants for a Firearms Permit training must complete a course of firearms training at a Bureau-approved firearms training facility from a Bureau-approved instructor. The BSIS is required to develop a Firearms Training Manual, which is required to include the following subjects: The moral and legal aspects of firearms usage; firearms nomenclature and maintenance; weapon handling and shooting fundamentals; emergency procedures; prequalification range training, including the firing of practice rounds; and the appropriate use of force, among others. This bill would require BSIS to develop a standard course and curriculum on the role of implicit and explicit bias on racial profiling and the use of firearms in commercial, entertainment, government property, urban street, and residential settings.

This bill would require the BSIS to convene a training advisory committee whenever it adopts, modifies, or seeks to rescind a rule or regulation related to security guard training or the

Bureau's Power to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force Training Manual. Moreover, this bill would require that the advisory committee be composed of representatives of the DCA and Bureau as well as representatives from a union that represents security workers, security employers, labor-management groups in the security industry, security officers, worker centers, and other related subject matter experts.

Violations and Fines. Currently, an employer's failure to administer annual training is subject to a \$500 fine under the Proprietary Security Services Act and \$250 under the Private Security Services Act. This bill would amend the Proprietary Security Services Act to make an employer's failure to ensure that security skills training and annual deescalation training occur as required, or failure to compensate and pay for training, a violation subject to a \$10,000 fine. This bill would also increase the fine for violations of two recordkeeping requirements in the Proprietary Security Services Act from \$500 to \$1,000. Additionally, this bill would increase the maximum fine for numerous specified violations of the Private Security Services Act from \$2,500 to \$10,000.

Reporting. Under existing law, a PPO is required to provide a written report describing the circumstances surrounding the discharge of a firearm, or a physical altercation with a member of the public that results in various outcomes, such as the arrest of a security guard or a member of the public requiring first aid or other medical attention. This bill would require a PPO to report any physical altercation with a member of the public that results in a security officer needing first aid or other medical attention. The report would have to include the apparent race and gender of the member of the public, as well as whether the security guard involved had received all required training at the time of the incident.

This bill would also require BSIS to publish an annual report containing a county-level breakdown on the number of reports received from PPOs and a comparison of the current year's data to previous years.

Security Guard Wages. This bill also requires IWC to convene five regional hearings throughout the state and issue a wage order specific to employees in the property services industry by June 30, 2028. This bill is triple-referred to the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee and the Assembly Public Safety Committee so that those committees may evaluate the provisions of this bill within their jurisdiction.

Current Related Legislation. SB 1148 (Niello) would authorize a security guard applicant to complete all training prior to registration with BSIS. SB 1128 is pending in this committee.

Prior Related Legislation. SB 652 (Richardson), Chapter 94, Statutes of 2025, clarified that the required power-to-arrest and appropriate-use-of-force training courses for security guard applicants must be administered and certified by a single course provider and completed within six months of applying for registration, and clarified that PPOs shall only administer and certify training to their applicants for employment and direct employees.

SB 1454 (Ashby), Chapter 484, Statutes of 2024, extended the sunset date for the BSIS until January 1, 2029, and made additional technical changes, statutory improvements, and policy reforms in response to issues raised during the BSIS's sunset review oversight process.

AB 229 (Holden), Chapter 697, Statutes of 2021, required that various licensees regulated by the BSIS complete a course of training in the exercise of the appropriate use of force to be issued a license or a firearms permit; mandates that the training be conducted through traditional classroom instruction, as specified; required PPOs to report within seven business days any incidents involving physical altercation with a member of the public requiring any type of first aid or other medical attention, and any physical use of force or violence on any person while on duty; increased the fines for failing to report incidents to \$5,000; requires private security guard registrants to maintain certificates of training completion until they expire or are cancelled; and prohibited a person required to be registered as a security guard from carrying or using a firearm or baton unless they are an employee of a PPO, the state, or a political subdivision of the state.

AB 2515 (Holden), Chapter 287, Statutes of 2022, as it relates to this bill, required PSOs and PSEs to deliver to BSIS a written report describing any physical altercation including, but not limited, to injuries or damages incurred, the identity of all participants, and whether a police investigation was conducted with a member of the public while on duty within seven business days after the incident, except as specified; made failure to report subject to a \$2,500 fine per violation; prohibited PSOs and PSEs from doing specified acts and established accompanying fines; and exempted the Power to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force Manual from the Administrative Procedures Act.

SB 609 (Glazer), Chapter 377, Statutes of 2019, extended the sunset for the BSIS to January 1, 2024, and as it relates to this bill, required an applicant for a security guard registration to complete a course in the exercise of the power to arrest as a condition of registration as a security guard rather than prior to being assigned to a duty location; required a course provider to issue a certificate to the person upon satisfactory completion the training; authorized training to be provided by any licensee or any BSIS-certified training facility; and required the BSIS to develop a standard course and curriculum for required skills trainings instead of DCA and removed the requirement to do so in consultation with consumers, labor organizations, and subject matter experts.

AB 2880 (Chavez), Chapter 886, Statutes of 2002, as it relates to this bill, increased the power to arrest training from three hours to eight hours, and specified additional topics required to be included in the training; required registered security guards to complete 32 hours of training within 90 days of registration and 16 of the 32 hours to be completed within 30 days of registration; required DCA to develop a standard course and curriculum for security skills training; authorizes licensees or DCA-approved organizations to provide the security officer skills training; and required PPOs to annually provide employees with eight hours of specifically dedicated review or practice of security skills.

AB 2928 (Koretz) of 2002 would have prohibited employers of security guards from deducting the fees and costs associated with obtaining licenses, background clearances, and training from the wages of security guards, and required employers to pay guards at their regular rate of pay for all time spent obtaining required job-related training or re-training, except for those with a collective bargaining agreement that addresses these topics. *AB 2928 was gutted and amended into a bill on another subject entirely and its authorship changed.*

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

As the sponsor of this bill, *SEIU California* writes in support:

Security officers are on the front lines of public safety every day. Across California, they protect people and property in high-rise buildings, hospitals, airports, stadiums, warehouses, and other critical infrastructure. Increasingly, they are called upon to respond to complex and high-risk situations, including de-escalating conflicts, addressing behavioral health crises, and serving as the first point of contact in emergencies. Security officer duties often include responding to incidents and critical situations, apprehending or expelling persons engaged in suspicious or criminal acts, restraining or removing trespassers, protecting people from physical attack, preventing inappropriate occurrences, confronting and detaining violators, implementing conflict management techniques to resolve issues, and de-escalating conflicts [...]

However, the reality is that many security officers are being asked to perform these duties without the training, support, or compensation necessary to safely do their jobs. As outlined in [this bill], current training standards are insufficient to prepare officers for the dangerous and unpredictable situations they routinely face. At the same time, a shortage of law enforcement personnel has increased reliance on security officers to fill critical public safety gaps, often placing them in precarious positions without adequate preparation.

This disconnect puts both workers and the public at risk.

Security officers deserve the tools to protect themselves and the communities they serve. [This bill] takes an important step forward by strengthening training standards, requiring meaningful, in-person de-escalation training, ensuring workers are paid for required training, and improving oversight of wages and working conditions. These reforms recognize the evolving role of security officers and begin to align expectations with reality.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:

The *California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates* writes:

While we support the sentiment and continuing need to ensure security officers are well-trained, [This bill] will immediately make it more expensive and more difficult to employ security guards, resulting in an even greater shortage and delayed deployment of the exact individuals the bill seeks as necessary to provide protection to California citizens and visitors, especially in light of the upcoming world-wide events coming to California (e.g., 2026 FIFA World Cup in Inglewood and Santa Clara, Super Bowl LXI in Inglewood, LA 2028 Summer Olympics, etc.). [This bill] will eliminate jobs making companies that seek to automate security functions more competitive thereby displacing the very people the bill intends to help. Cameras, computer screens, fences, and lighting will replace human security officers with the result of less support for our law enforcement officers. [This bill] is a job killer.

[This bill] will increase unregulated and untrained security personnel at events throughout California jeopardizing public safety at a time of heightened risk. Unregulated activity is a

significant problem in the security industry today and has been a primary focus for CALSAGA and the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS). [This bill's] wage pressure on current lawful operators and those on the fringe will no doubt amplify and incentivize less than ethical providers to skip the licensing training requirements altogether. The bill will make the regulated companies uncompetitive in a marketplace that will be overrun by those calling themselves EVENT STAFF OR USHERS. The Department of Consumer Affairs and BSIS do not currently have the budget or resources to regulate this important issue. In essence, SB 1203 will start a race to the bottom due to its costly provisions. That is, underground and unregulated security operators will proliferate.

California still suffers from retail significant theft and property crimes. If retail operators cannot afford to retain contract security providers, they are likely to go without, thereby increasing safety risks. By imposing a billion dollars in new annual costs to these struggling business, [this bill] makes California more expensive and is antithetical to the stated goal of the legislation.

Finally, as we have seen across the nation, when the cost of retaining employees or providing human services escalates, those who would typically acquire such services (such as CALSAGA member clients) will turn to nonhuman resources (cameras, artificial intelligence, etc.). We believe that on this one point alone we occupy some common ground as we understand and support the desire to keep Californians working.

POLICY ISSUES:

Deescalation Training. This bill would require PSOs and security guards to complete an additional eight hours of training dedicated solely to deescalation, both at the outset of initial registration and annually thereafter. As currently drafted, it is unclear whether the annual training would be duplicative of the initial training or include new content.

Currently, required training may be provided by an employer, a BSIS-certified training facility, or a BSIS-approved organization or school, resulting in nearly 5,000 potential trainers. In contrast, this bill would require deescalation training to be provided by organizations that meet specified qualifications, including the use of evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies. Additionally, the training must be based on principles and methods informed by peer-reviewed or clinical research on trauma. It is unclear how many organizations, if any, would presently qualify for the Bureau's approval and whether they could ultimately provide deescalation training at the scale required by this bill. There are currently more than 350,000 security guards, and the BSIS receives between 15,000 and 18,000 applications per month. Moreover, a bottleneck of security guards awaiting training would unfairly jeopardize compliance with this bill, while the bill simultaneously imposes a \$10,000 fine on employers who fail to ensure that training occurs as required. In doing so, this bill would make employers liable for training they have no control over. To address concerns regarding the readiness of the third-party organizations to provide deescalation training, the author may wish to consider delaying the prohibition on employers providing this training until the Bureau completes a regional market analysis.

Employee-Rights Training. This bill would require PSOs and security guards to complete two hours of training on employee rights within 30 days of registration and authorize a labor union to

provide this training, upon request to BSIS. It is unclear whether this training is necessary in addition to a new law, the *Workplace Know Your Rights Act*, which took effect on January 1, 2026, and requires employers to provide a yearly written notice to workers by February 1 explaining key rights under California's labor laws.⁴ The notice must include information explaining workers' rights related to retaliation, workers' compensation, protections against unfair immigration-related practices, the right to organize or act together with co-workers, emergency contact notification, and interactions with law enforcement at the workplace.

Mandated Costs for Employers. This bill would significantly increase costs for employers by requiring them to pay for security guards' security skills training and to compensate employees for the time required to complete the initial and annual security skills training. The California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates states in their opposition letter to this bill that "the additional cost of the training requirements alone will exceed \$350 million a year." Moreover, the private security industry has indicated that some of the additional costs will be passed on to the businesses and government entities that contract with these security companies. They have also stated that companies will hire fewer guards and instead rely on technology, fencing, lighting, and unregulated "event staff or ushers."

Fines. Under the Proprietary Security Services Act, this bill would impose a \$10,000 fine on PSEs that fail to compensate employees for training or ensure training occurs as required. For example, if an employer does not compensate 50 employees for training, whether intentionally or not, that PSE could be fined \$500,000. In contrast, failure to provide the annual training required by law today is punishable by a \$500 fine. This bill would increase that fine to \$1,000.

Within the Private Security Services Act, this bill would increase from \$2,500 to \$10,000 the maximum fine that can be imposed upon a PPO for numerous violations, ranging from what a PPO, security guard, and training instructors are prohibited from doing to making a false statement on an application and failure to notify the BSIS within 30 days of any change of residence or business address. As such, the punishment may not fit the crime in every instance. The author may wish to establish new fines specific to failure of a PPO to compensate employees for training or ensure training occurs as required.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES:

Incongruent Changes to the Proprietary Security Services Act and the Private Security Services Act. This bill makes numerous changes to one act or the other, when arguably both should be amended for consistency within the profession. Regarding fines, this bill increases fines for specified recordkeeping violations or failing to provide annual training committed by PSEs, but not PPOs. The author may wish to amend BPC § 7587.8 also for fairness. Similarly, this bill would establish a \$10,000 fine for PSEs that fail to compensate employees for training and to ensure security skills training occurs as required. In contrast, this bill increases the maximum fine for numerous violations committed by PPOs to \$10,000. The author may wish to tailor the fine to the specific violations: failure to compensate employees for training and to ensure training occurs as required. Additionally, this bill would make it a violation for a PPO to fail to

⁴ California Department of Industrial Relations, *New California Law Requires Annual Workplace Rights Notice*, News Release No. 2026-14 (Jan. 30, 2026), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-14.html>.

compensate employees for any annual training, whereas this bill would only make it a violation for a PSE to fail to compensate employees for annual *deescalation* training. In contrast, this bill would make it a violation for PSEs to fail to compensate employees for power to arrest and appropriate use of force training, but not for PPOs. The author may wish to clarify these provisions for consistency and fairness.

Regarding reporting, this bill would require PPOs to report to BSIS when physical altercations with a member of the public result in a security guard requiring first aid or other medical attention but would not impose the same requirement on PSEs. The author may wish to amend BPC § 7574.37 for consistency.

Regarding compensation for and payment of training, this bill would require PSEs to compensate employees for power to arrest and appropriate use of force training, but not PPOs. The author may wish to apply the same requirement to both for fairness. Moreover, unlike the Private Security Services Act (BPC § 7583.6(b)(1) and (3)), no provision in the Proprietary Security Services Act explicitly requires any training to be compensated or paid for by a PSE. Although the Proprietary Security Services Act cross-references the training requirements in the Private Security Services Act, it may be clearer to include the same requirements in both acts.

Training Advisory Committee. This bill requires the BSIS to convene a training advisory committee composed of representatives from various backgrounds in the private security industry whenever the BSIS adopts, modifies, or seeks to rescind a rule or regulation related to training or the Power to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force Manual. Since its creation, the BSIS has updated the Manual several times each year to correct grammatical errors and make technical changes. This bill makes no exception for grammatical or technical changes. Moreover, this requirement is at odds with the current law, which exempts the development, adoption, amendment, or repeal of the manual from the Administrative Procedures Act.

Emergency Regulations. This bill erroneously tasks the DCA with promulgating emergency regulations. The author may wish to consider amending this bill to instead require the BSIS to promulgate regulations.

Exemption for PSOs Employed by Religious Institutions. This bill requires a place of worship to ensure its PSOs complete just 16 hours of security officer training. Although the likely intent is to exempt them from the deescalation training required by this bill, as currently drafted, it may unintentionally halve the required amount of security skills training for PSOs employed by a religious institution.

Drafting Errors. This bill includes erroneous cross-references to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of BPC § 7583.7, which does not exist.

General Need for Greater Clarity. It is unclear whether the author intends to require employers to pay for all security skills training, or only the eight hours of deescalation training. As amended by this bill, BPC § 7583.6(b)(1) would state that PSOs and security guards must complete 42 hours of security skills training, including eight hours of deescalation training. After describing the deescalation training in some detail, the bill states that the time spent attending the training shall be compensated and paid for by the employer. Subdivision (3) describes the deescalation

training in greater detail and restates that it must be compensated by the employer. The author may wish to clarify which training employers would be required to pay for.

As amended by this bill, subdivision (a) of BPC § 7574.18 codifies a specific number of hours required for the security skills training, whereas subdivision (d), which this bill does not amend, instructs DCA to pick the number of hours of instruction by regulation.

REGISTERED SUPPORT:

SEIU California (*Sponsor*)
California Federation of Labor Unions

REGISTERED OPPOSITION:

Allied Universal
Americal Patrol
Armed Guard Private Security
Armorous Security
Blue Knight Security and Patrol
California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates
California Chamber of Commerce
Centurion Security Services
Cooke and Associates
Capitol Business Alliance (unless amended)
County of Kern
Customized Guard Services and Systems
Diligence Security Group
Excell Security
John 316 Private Security
Law Security and Investigations
Lead STAR Security
Militum in Terra Security
Mint Security INC
Mountain Valley Protective Services
Proguard Security Services
Scorpion Security Services
Securitas
Southwest Patrol
SVT Protective Services
Triple Threat Solutions
Woodside Patrol

Analysis Prepared by: Kaitlin Curry / B. & P. / (916) 319-3301