

Date of Hearing: June 30, 2026  
Counsel: Kimberly Horiuchi

## ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

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

**SUMMARY:** Requires annual de-escalation training and basic employee rights for proprietary private security officers and private security guards. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits a private patrol operator (PPO) from providing required de-escalation training, and instead requires an organization that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies to provide it.
- 2) Requires, on or before July 1, 2027, the Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) to set a minimum wage for the property services industry.
- 3) Requires, beginning July 1, 2028, each registered employee, in addition to any annual required training, to annually complete a minimum of eight hours of training dedicated to practicing de-escalation skills through in-person role-plays and interactive training methods administered by an approved organization, as specified.
- 4) Requires an instructor who is a human being, physically present, and in person when presenting the training and be available at all times during the training for student questions.
- 5) Requires the cost of the training be provided by the employer, and training time must be compensated by the PPO if the guard is employed by, or has a pending offer of employment from, the PPO.
- 6) Requires the additional de-escalation training to be administered by an organization, or a person certified by an organization, that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies in their training.
- 7) States an organization that employs evidence-based, trauma-informed techniques and strategies shall be an organization that provides specialized de-escalation training that is based on principles and methods informed by peer-reviewed or clinical research on trauma and includes role-playing and interactive methods.
- 8) Requires the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS) to develop emergency regulations establishing the criteria the bureau shall use to evaluate whether any organization is a qualifying organization, and requires any organization qualified to provide training be identified by July 1, 2028.
- 9) States an PPO, a subsidiary of a PPO, or is a subsidiary of an organization that shares the same parent organization as an PPO is ineligible to provide the training described above.

- 10) Requires any eligible training organization to issue a certificate of completion to a trainee and their employer, if any, upon satisfactory completion of this training.
- 11) Requires an organization seeking approval to offer de-escalation training to complete an application for certification, as specified. This application shall be accompanied by a \$250 application fee, be in a form prescribed by the BSIS chief of the bureau, and shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following information:
  - a) The name, business address, and telephone number of the organization.
  - b) A detailed description of the places, days, and times the course will be offered.
  - c) An estimate of the minimum and maximum class size.
  - d) Location and description of the facilities.
  - e) The name of any instructor who will teach the course, each instructor's months or years of experience in de-escalation training, and each instructor's months or years of experience providing in-person de-escalation training.
  - f) A certification that the applying organization will conduct the training as required by this section, any applicable regulations, and the standard course and curriculum developed, as specified.
- 12) Requires the BSIS chief to issue, upon the DCA's approval a "de-escalation organization certificate" (certificate), which must be posted in a conspicuous place at the facility.
- 13) Authorizes the BSIS chief to refuse to issue or to cancel a previously issued certificate or to assess fines, as specified, for the failure of the organization to conduct trainings in accordance with this bill and any applicable regulations.
- 14) Requires the BSIS to develop and establish by emergency regulation a standard course and curriculum for the de-escalation training. The emergency regulations shall be adopted in accordance with the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.
- 15) Requires, effective July 1, 2028, two of the first 18 hours of the annual 42 hours of training be dedicated to training employees on the notice of employee rights given to current employees regarding topics such as workers' compensation, the right to organize, and immigration-related rights.
- 16) Provides that, upon request, a labor organization that represents security guards of a licensee and is approved by the bureau to be a trainer shall be entitled to provide the two-hour training on the notice of employee rights. Absent such request, this two-hour training may be provided by other entities, as specified.
- 17) Requires the BSIS to approve a labor organization to be a provider of the two-hour training within 30 days of a labor organization's written request to the bureau to be approved as a trainer if the request identifies the names of the trainers to provide the training and certifies that the trainers are qualified to train on the notice of employee rights.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) States homicide is justifiable when committed by peace officers and those acting by their command in their aid and assistance, under either of the following circumstances:
  - a) In obedience to any judgment of a competent court.
  - b) When the homicide results from a peace officer's use of force that is in compliance with existing law. (Pen. Code, § 186, subd. (a), (b).)
- 2) Authorizes a peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (b).)
- 3) States a peace officer is justified in using deadly force upon another person only when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that such force is necessary for either of the following reasons:
  - a) To defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person.
  - b) To apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended. Where feasible, a peace officer shall, prior to the use of force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe the person is aware of those facts. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (c)(1)(a), (b).)
- 4) Prohibits a peace officer from using deadly force against a person based on the danger that person poses to themselves, if an objectively reasonable officer would believe the person does not pose an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the peace officer or to another person. ( Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (c)(2). )
- 5) Defines "proprietary private security officer" 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 is not exempt, as specified, 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. (Bus & Prof., §7574.1, subd. (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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7582.1, subd. (a).)

- 7) Defines a security guard or security officer as an employee of a private patrol operator 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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7582.1, subd. (e).)
- 8) Requires the training course 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, to include, among other topics:
    - i) Legal standards for use of force.
    - ii) Duty to intercede.
    - iii) De-escalation and interpersonal communication training, including tactical methods that use time, distance, cover, and concealment, to avoid escalating situations that lead to violence.
    - iv) Implicit and explicit bias and cultural competency.
    - v) Skills, including de-escalation techniques, to effectively, safely, and respectfully interact with people with disabilities or behavioral health issues.

- vi) Mental health and policing, including bias and stigma. (Bus. & Prof., § 7583.7, subd. (a).)
- 9) Requires an employer, on or before February 1, 2026, and annually thereafter, to provide a stand-alone written notice to each current employee in a manner the employer normally uses to communicate employment-related information. The written notice shall also be provided to each new employee upon hire. The notice shall contain a description of workers' rights in the following areas:
- a) The right to workers' compensation benefits, including disability pay and medical care for work-related injuries or illness, as well as the contact information for the Division of Workers' Compensation.
  - b) The right to notice of inspection by immigration agencies, as specified.
  - c) Protection against unfair immigration-related practices against a person exercising protected rights.
  - d) The right to organize a union or engage in concerted activity in the workplace.
  - e) Constitutional rights when interacting with law enforcement at the workplace, including an employee's right under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures and rights under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution to due process and against self-incrimination. (Lab. Code, § 1553, subd. (b).)
- 10) Requires notice to also contain both of the following:
- a) A description of new legal developments pertaining to laws enforced by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency that the Labor Commissioner (LC) deems material and necessary.
  - b) A list, developed by the LC, of the enforcement agencies that may enforce the underlying rights in the notice. (Lab. Code, § 1553, subd. (b).)
- 11) Provides that it is the continuing duty of 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. Code, § 1173).
- 12) Requires the IWC to conduct a full review of the adequacy of the minimum wage at least once every two years. The IWC may, upon its own motion or upon petition, amend or rescind any order or portion of any order or adopt an order covering any occupation, trade, or industry not covered by an existing order pursuant to this chapter. (Lab. Code, § 1173.)
- 13) Requires the IWC, before adopting any new rules, regulations, or policies, to consult with the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board to determine those areas and subject matters where the respective jurisdictions of the IWC and the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board overlap. In the case of such overlapping jurisdiction, the

Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board shall have exclusive jurisdiction, as specified. (Lab. Code, § 1173.)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Sponsor:** SEIU California
- 2) **Author's Statement:** 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. SB 1203 improves working conditions for security guards by ensuring they are adequately trained and fairly compensated for their responsibilities.”

- 3) **Private Security:** The private security industry in the U.S. dates back to the 19th century, with private citizens performing many duties associated with today’s federal and state law enforcement. Growth in the number of individuals and breadth of activities performed, including guarding railroad shipments, detective work to investigate crimes, tracking down and apprehending criminals, and providing security advice to banks was integral to supporting regulation of the industry.

Regulatory oversight of the private security industry in California began in 1915 with the creation of the Detective Licensing Board under the State Board of Prison Directors, which licensed and regulated private detectives. The Detective Licensing Board went through several iterations pertaining to structure and scope until the early 1990s.

In 1993, AB 936 (Rainey, Chapter 1263) was formally renamed the BSIS. The BSIS currently licenses approximately 3,000 PPOs and approximately 313,000 security guards who are employed by the PPOs.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are around 186,000 security guards in California. Eighty percent of the workforce is male, and the majority are either Latino or Black workers.<sup>1</sup> Approximately 22 percent of the workforce is foreign-born.<sup>2</sup>

An April 2026 report by the UC Berkeley Labor Center found that despite a growing private security services industry, the workers remain poorly compensated and nearly half have no access to health insurance through their employer or the employer of a household member. Furthermore, their working conditions are characterized by a higher-than-average number of

---

<sup>1</sup>Hernández, Kassandra and Lopezlira, Enrique, “Demographic and Job Characteristics of the Security Guard Workforce in California,” UC Berkeley Labor Center, April 2026, utilizing American Community Survey data.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

workplace assaults and fatal injuries.<sup>3</sup> The median salary for security guards in California is approximately \$38,371 and a median wage of \$20.09.<sup>4</sup> The median wage for other workers in California is much higher at \$28.16. The median wage for security guards is so low in fact that approximately 44% would qualify as “low wage” workers in California.<sup>5</sup>

Any organization or school that seeks to provide training to guards and officers must be approved by the BSIS (See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7583.6). To obtain approval, an organization or school must submit a letter to BSIS with the name of the organization or school; the location where the training will take place; the location where all training records will be maintained; and the names and resumes for all related instructors.

A PPO that provides the required security guard training to their own employees are not required to obtain approval. A PPO is required to maintain at its principal place of business or branch office a record for each of its registrant employees verifying completion of the Powers to Arrest and Appropriate Use of Force training for the duration of the registrant’s employment. The BSIS may inspect the records of any PPO to ensure compliance.

BSIS requires applicants or employees to attend mandatory training on the power to arrest, appropriate use of force, de-escalation, and explicit and implicit bias training. Applicants must complete the full eight-hour power to arrest and appropriate use of force training in order to qualify for a license. AB 229 (Holden), Chapter 697, Statutes of 2021, increased training requirements for security guard applicants and mandated that fifty percent of the appropriate use of force training be provided through traditional classroom instruction. Extensive regulations implementing AB 229 were adopted by the BSIS, effective December 1, 2023.

A guard or officer must attend training on use of force and powers of arrest within six months prior to applying BSIS for registration as a guard or officer. Training on powers of arrest include responsibilities and ethics in citizen arrest; relationship between a security guard and a peace officer in making an arrest; limitations on security guard power to arrest; restrictions on searches and seizures; criminal and civil liabilities, including personal liability and employer liability; trespass law; ethics and communications; emergency situation response, including response to medical emergencies; and security officer safety.

Use of force training includes the following: legal standards for use of force; duty to intercede; the use of objectively reasonable force; supervisory responsibilities; use of force review and analysis; de-escalation and interpersonal communication training, including tactical methods that use time, distance, cover, and concealment, to avoid escalating situations that lead to violence; implicit and explicit bias and cultural competency; skills, including de-escalation techniques, to effectively, safely, and respectfully interact with people with disabilities or behavioral health issues; 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; mental health and policing, including bias and stigma; and active shooter situations. In order to receive a BSIS-approved security

---

<sup>3</sup> Wiatrowski, William, 2012. “On Guard Against Workplace Hazards,” *Monthly Labor Review* 0(0):3-11.

<sup>4</sup> Hernández, Kassandra and Lopezlira, Enrique, “Demographic and Job Characteristics of the Security Guard Workforce in California,” UC Berkeley Labor Center, April 2026, utilizing American Community Survey data.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

guard training certificate (“Guard card”) for a contracted privacy security company, the applicant must attend 40 hours of training – eight hours to obtain a guard card and 32 hours within the first six months of registration.

- 4) **Use of Force:** Security officers and guards *are not peace officers* and should not be treated as though they perform the same duties. Law enforcement operate under statutory and constitutional guidelines about use of force and the powers of arrest. Use of force, in particular, is a matter of intense constitutional and legislative debate because it implicates so many different constitutional rights. In 1985, the United States Supreme Court decided the case of *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1. In *Garner* the court held:

The use of deadly force to prevent the escape of all felony suspects, whatever the circumstances, is constitutionally unreasonable. It is not better that all felony suspects die than that they escape. Where the suspect poses no immediate threat to the officer and no threat to others, the harm resulting from failing to apprehend him does not justify the use of deadly force to do so. . . . A police officer may not seize an unarmed, non-dangerous suspect by shooting him dead. (*Tenn. v. Garner* (1985) 471 U.S. 1, 11.)

Additionally, the United States Supreme Court decided *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 in 1989. In *Graham* the court held that an objective reasonableness test should be used as the standard to determine whether a law enforcement official used excessive force in the course of making an arrest, or other action. The court stated:

As in other Fourth Amendment contexts... the "reasonableness" inquiry in an excessive force case is an objective one: the question is whether the officers' actions are 'objectively reasonable' in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation...[t]he "reasonableness" of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. (*Graham v. Connor* (1989) 490 U.S. 386, 396.)

Following the decisions in *Graham* and *Garner*, California operated in a reality where the statutes related to police use of force are outdated and unconstitutional. Prior to 2020, existing statute authorized police to use force to arrest, prevent escape, and overcome resistance – without requiring the force to be proportional. It authorized use of deadly force without limiting its use to situations where killing is needed to defend against a threat of death or serious injury. It appeared to authorize law enforcement to kill any person charged with a felony who is fleeing or resisting arrest – whether or not the person posed a danger to the officer or someone else.

In 2019, however, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed AB 392 (S. Weber), Chapter 170, changing the standard for excessive force determinations to be more in line with constitutional law. AB 392 amended Penal Code sections 196 and 835a as follows:

Peace officers are justified in using deadly force upon another person only when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that such force is necessary for either of the following reasons:

- (a) To defend against an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person; or
- (b) To apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended. Where feasible, a peace officer shall, prior to the use of force, make reasonable efforts to identify themselves as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe the person is aware of those facts.

This bill, as it pertains to security guards and officers, increases training for use of force and powers of arrest in an eye toward trauma-informed, evidence-based training modules; requires in-person training that uses role playing and other real life simulations in de-escalation training; and requires security guard and officers to be trained off-duty and compensated for training time.

- 5) **Argument in Support:** According to *SEIU California*, “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 (Appendix 1, Security Job Descriptions).

“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 SB 1203, 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. SB 1203 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.

“For SEIU-USWW members, this bill is about more than training requirements. It is about dignity, safety, and professionalism. No worker should be placed in harm’s way without the preparation needed to respond effectively. And no community should have to rely on undertrained personnel to handle serious public safety situations. California law currently requires that security officers be trained on de-escalation. Yet, existing training requirements on de-escalation fail to ensure that officers have practiced and refined de-escalation skills before being placed in dangerous situations.

“SB 1203 acknowledges that security officers are a critical part of California’s safety infrastructure and ensures they are better equipped to meet that responsibility.”

- 6) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *Allied Universal*, “Without any clearly established need, SB 1203 drastically alters how security training is conducted and who is permitted to conduct it. The bill mandates that an 8-hour evidence-based, trauma-informed de-escalation training be taught by third-party certified organizations rather than licensed security companies, unless a valid collective bargaining agreement is in place. Additionally, the bill entitles labor organizations, upon request, to teach a two-hour training module on workers' rights. Requiring third-party organizations that lack specific expertise in providing comprehensive security officer training is costly and unnecessary. This requirement will create a massive recruitment and hiring bottleneck. By complicating the hiring process and restricting on-the-job training capabilities, the bill will drive prospective guards to seek work elsewhere, directly exacerbating the current shortage of security officers.

“In addition to the very real operational challenges, this bill will create an excessive financial burden on private security employers, which will inevitably lead to job losses. Our industry trade group has estimated the total financial impact of SB 1203 may exceed one billion dollars annually. When broken down mathematically, the new training requirements alone will cost over \$534 million a year. This includes initial training costs of approximately \$207 million, factoring in 360,000 guards in California at an average wage of \$20 per hour taking 50 hours of training in year one (consisting of the newly increased 42 hours of security guard training and the 8-hour "Powers to Arrest" course), plus a 15% payroll tax markup. Furthermore, the bill doubles the mandatory annual refresher training from 8 to 16 hours.

“Notably, 8 of these 16 annual hours must now be dedicated to in-person, role-play de-escalation training administered by a certified third-party organization using trauma-informed techniques. Calculated at an overtime rate of \$30 per hour plus payroll taxes, this refresher training adds roughly \$198.7 million. Finally, relying on third-party training instructors at an estimated cost of \$300 per employee would contribute another \$108 million in costs.

“In addition to the costly training mandates, the bill reconstitutes the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) to review and increase wages specifically in the property services industry, mandating a specific wage order by June 30, 2028. Establishing a separate minimum wage for security service workers makes no sense to us; we compete for employees with lots of different industries in California. Why is our industry being set apart? This could drive very significant cost increases.

“A \$1.00 per hour wage increase across 360,000 licensed officers working 2,080 hours a year would add an estimated \$750 million in costs to private security employers, and that cost

would eventually be passed on to businesses and local governments in California. Faced with these sharply escalating expenses, clients will likely turn to automated non-human resources—such as cameras, fencing, and artificial intelligence—to replace human security officers, effectively making SB 1203 a job killer.

“These financial and operational pressures will result in increased costs, heighten public safety risks and likely give rise to unregulated operators. California currently faces high rates of retail theft and property crime. By making lawful, regulated security services significantly more expensive, struggling retail operators may be forced to forgo professional security services entirely. Furthermore, the intense cost pressures will incentivize unethical, unregulated providers to skip licensing requirements and operate under alternative titles like “Event Staff” or “Ushers”. This proliferation of underground, unregulated personnel will jeopardize public safety during a time of heightened risk. This is especially concerning given the additional security needs for upcoming global events in California, including the 2026 FIFA World Cup, Super Bowl LXI, and the LA 2028 Summer Olympics.”

- 7) **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 the Assembly Business & Professions Committee.
- 8) **Prior Legislation:**
  - a) AB 2515 (Holden), Chapter 287, Statutes of 2022, required, among other things, PSOs and private security operators 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.
  - b) AB 229 (Holden), Chapter 697, Statutes of 2021, required, among other things, 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.
  - c) AB 392 (Weber), Chapter 170, Statutes of 2019, provided, among other things, that any peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a public offense may use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance.
  - d) 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.
  - e) 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.

**Support**

Seiu California (Sponsor)  
California Federation of Labor Unions, Afl-cio

**Opposition**

Ace Secured Alliance  
Aegis Security and Investigations INC.  
Aegs Eagle Guard Services  
Allied Universal  
Alpha DES Security  
Americal Patrol, INC  
Armed Guard Private Security INC  
Armorous Private Security  
Associa Desert Resort Management  
Black Box Security INC  
Blue Knight Security and Patrol, INC.  
Boma California  
California Association of Licensed Security Agencies, Guards & Associates  
California Business Properties Association  
California Chamber of Commerce  
Capitol Business Alliance  
Centurion Security Services, INC.  
Cooke and Associates, INC.  
County of Kern  
Cox Security Group  
Crew Protection Enterprises INC.  
Custom Protective Services  
Customized Guard Services and Systems  
Diligence Security Group  
Excell Security, INC.  
Global Security Concepts, INC  
Guardian Security Agency  
Hawk Security Group  
High Rock Security  
Intercept Security  
John 316 Private Security  
Law Security and Investigations, INC  
Lead STAR Security, INC  
Lions 4 Security  
Metro Security Services  
Militum in Terra Security, INC  
Mint Security, INC  
Mountain Valley Protective Services  
Naiop California  
Nobility Security and Maritime Solutions

North State Security  
Odyssey Unlimited Security  
Ontel Security Services INC  
Orion Protection Services Group  
Pac Protection Service  
Palamerican Security  
Plaza Protection  
Practical Defense Systems  
Praetorian USA  
Principal Interest  
Proguard Security Services  
Prosegur Security  
Resilient Protective Services and Silvercreek Academy  
Restoration Security INC  
Scorpion Security Services  
Sdm Security Services, INC  
Securitas  
Security Management and Consulting International INC.  
Six Maritime, INC  
Southwest Patrol, INC  
Svt Gruppe INC  
The Gadite Group INC  
Triple Threat Solutions  
Vision Security Consultants INC  
Western Area Security Services  
Woodside Patrol

**Analysis Prepared by:** Kimberly Horiuchi / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744