

Date of Hearing: June 9, 2026

Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

SB 953 (Niello) – As Amended April 6, 2026

**SUMMARY:** Requires two points to be assessed to the driving record of a person for a violation of gross vehicular manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, and vehicular manslaughter for financial gain, even when the case was dismissed because the defendant completed court-initiated misdemeanor diversion.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Establishes three vehicular manslaughter crimes:
  - a) Defines “gross vehicular manslaughter” as the driving of a vehicle in the commission of an unlawful act, not amounting to a felony, and with gross negligence, or driving a vehicle in the commission of a lawful act which might produce death, in an unlawful manner, and with gross negligence, punishable as an alternate felony-misdemeanor (wobbler), by imprisonment for up to one year in county jail or by two, four, or six years in state prison. (Pen. Code, §§ 192, subd. (c)(1); 193, subd. (c)(1).)
  - b) Defines “vehicular manslaughter with ordinance negligence” as the driving of a vehicle in the commission of an unlawful act, not amounting to a felony, but without gross negligence, or driving a vehicle in the commission of a lawful act which might produce death, in an unlawful manner, but without gross negligence, punishable as a misdemeanor by up to one year in a county jail. (Pen. Code, §§ 192, subd. (c)(2); 193, subd. (c)(2).)
  - c) Defines “vehicular manslaughter for financial gain” as the driving of a vehicle in connection with a violation of knowingly causing or participating in a vehicular collision for the purpose of presenting any false or fraudulent claim, where the collision was knowingly caused for financial gain and proximately resulted in the death of any person, punishable as a felony by four, six, or 10 years in state prison. (Pen. Code, §§ 192, subd. (c)(3); 193, subd. (c)(3).)
- 2) Authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to suspend, revoke, or refuse to issue a driver’s license if a person accumulates a certain number of points on their driving record, as follows:
  - a) Provides that a person whose driving record shows a violation point count of four or more points in 12 months, six or more points in 24 months, or eight or more points in 36 months shall be prima facie presumed to be a negligent operator of a motor vehicle, except as otherwise specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subs. (a) & (b).)

- b) Authorizes the DMV to suspend or revoke the privilege of any person to operate a vehicle upon any grounds that authorizes the refusal to issue a license, including when a person is deemed a negligent operator. (Veh. Code, §§ 13359, 12809, subd. (e).)
  - c) Authorizes the DMV to refuse to issue or renew a driver's license if the DMV determines the applicant is a negligent operator of a vehicle. (Veh. Code, § 12809, subd. (e).)
  - d) Provides that the point count, for purposes of determining if a driver is a negligent operator, is determined as follows:
    - i) Violations that receive one point, including, among others, any traffic conviction involving the safe operation of a vehicle upon the highway, except as specified, and a traffic accident in which the DMV deems the operator responsible. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subds. (f) & (g).)
    - ii) Convictions that receive two points, including, among other convictions:
      - (1) Gross vehicular manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, and vehicular manslaughter for financial gain. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
      - (2) A hit and run resulting in only property damage, or a hit and run resulting in injury or death to another person. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (a).)
      - (3) Driving under the influence (DUI), DUI causing bodily injury to another, or driving a vehicle with a blood alcohol content (BAC) of .05 or more, for a person under the age of 21, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subds. (b) & (d)(2).)
      - (4) Reckless driving. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (c).)
      - (5) Intoxicated vehicular manslaughter, without gross negligence. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
      - (6) Driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 miles per hour. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
      - (7) Driving on a suspended or revoked license, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (e).)
- 3) Establishes Court-Initiated Misdemeanor Diversion, as follows:
- a) Authorizes a judge in the superior court in which a misdemeanor is being prosecuted to, at the judge's discretion, and over the objection of a prosecuting attorney, offer diversion to a defendant. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (a).)
  - b) Authorizes a judge to continue a diverted case for a period not to exceed 24 months and to order the defendant to comply with terms, conditions, or programs that the judge deems appropriate based on the defendant's situation. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (b).)

- c) Requires the judge, if the defendant has complied with the imposed terms and conditions, to dismiss the action against the defendant at the end of the period of diversion. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (c).)
- d) Authorizes the court, if it finds that the defendant has not complied with the terms and conditions of diversion, to end the diversion and order resumption of the criminal proceedings. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).)
- e) Provides that upon successful completion of the terms, conditions, or programs ordered by the court pursuant to court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, the arrest upon which diversion was imposed shall be deemed to have never occurred, and the defendant may indicate, in response to any question concerning their prior criminal record, that they were not arrested. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a).)
- f) Prohibits a record pertaining to an arrest resulting in successful completion of the terms, conditions, or programs ordered by the court from, without the defendant's consent, being used in any way that could result in the denial of any employment, benefit, license, or certificate. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (a).)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Sponsor:** Author sponsored.
- 2) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "SB 953 is a narrowly tailored bill that requires all vehicular manslaughter convictions to be reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). This requirement applies even when a defendant is granted Misdemeanor Diversion. In such cases, the conviction would still be reported to the DMV and reflected on the individual's driving record as a two-point violation. Misdemeanor Diversion programs are intended to provide rehabilitation for individuals. However, under current law, when a driver receives Misdemeanor Diversion for a vehicular manslaughter conviction, the offense is effectively removed from both their criminal record *and* their driving record. As a result, serious offenses like vehicular manslaughter may never appear on a driver's record, while comparatively minor infractions, such as speeding tickets, do. This creates a significant public safety gap: drivers can commit multiple high-risk or fatal driving offenses without the DMV ever receiving notice, preventing appropriate license suspension or revocation. A speeding ticket should not carry more visible consequences on a driving record than vehicular manslaughter. Two points added to the driving record ensures that drivers are held accountable for dangerous conduct on the road."
- 3) **Court-Initiated Diversion:** Existing law authorizes a judge to divert a misdemeanor defendant, over the objection of the prosecution, except in cases of stalking, domestic violence, and any offense requiring sex offender registration. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95, subds. (a) & (e).) Unlike other existing pre-plea diversion programs, court-initiated diversion contains no statutory requirements for the defendant to satisfy in order to be eligible, except that the defendant cannot have committed one of the crimes that are specifically excluded. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95; 1001.96; 1001.97.) The judge has broad authority to order the defendant to comply with terms, conditions, or programs that the judge deems appropriate

based on the specific situation; however, the case may not be diverted for a period exceeding 24 months. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (b).) Similar to other diversion programs, if the defendant has complied with the imposed terms and conditions, the judge is required to dismiss the action against the defendant at the end of the period of diversion. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (c).) If it appears to the court that the defendant is not complying with the terms and conditions of diversion, after notice to the defendant, the court must hold a hearing to determine whether the criminal proceedings should be reinstated. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).) If the court finds that the defendant has not complied with the applicable terms and conditions, it may end the diversion and order resumption of the criminal proceedings. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).)

Whether or not to divert a misdemeanor defendant is in the trial court's discretion. However, judicial discretion is not without limits. "[A]ll exercises of legal discretion must be grounded in reasoned judgment and guided by legal principles and policies appropriate to the particular matter at issue." (*People v. Russel* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 187, 195 (superseded by statute on other grounds).) A court abuses its discretion when it "exceeds the bounds of reason, all of the circumstances before it being considered." (*Id.* at p. 194) (quoting *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court of San Francisco* (1956) 47 Cal.2d 428, 432.)

- 4) **Driving Record Points and Related Sanctions:** If a driver accumulates four or more points in 12 months, six or more points in 24 months, or eight or more points in 36 months, they shall be prima facie presumed to be a negligent operator (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subs. (a) & (b).) This authorizes the DMV to suspend or revoke the negligent operator's driving privilege or refuse to issue or renew their driver's license. (Veh. Code, §§ 12809, subd. (e), 13359). The DMV may, instead of suspension or revocation, place the person on probation and issue a restricted driver's license. (Veh. Code, §§ 14250, 12812.) Whether a negligent operator's license will be suspended, and for how long, is primarily determined by the DMV, not by statute. In practice, a driver who accumulates the point levels described above will typically be subject to a one-year probationary period that includes a six-month suspension.<sup>1</sup>

If a person is deemed a negligent operator, there are four levels of Negligent Operator Treatment System (NOTS) actions.<sup>2</sup> Level I – if a person receives two points within 12 months, four within 24 months, or six within 36 months, they will receive a warning letter.<sup>3</sup> Level II – if a person receives three or more points within 12 months, five or more within 24 months, or seven or more within 36 months, they will receive a notice of intent to suspend their license.<sup>4</sup> Level III is the point total that establishes a person as a prima facie negligent operator pursuant to Vehicle Code 12810.5. Here, if a person receives four points within 12 months, six within 24 months, or eight within 36 months, that person will receive a one-year probation that includes a six-month license suspension.<sup>5</sup> The action is effective 34 days from the date the order is mailed.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, under Level IV, if a person who is on NOTS probation receives a violation while operating a vehicle or is involved in a collision,

---

<sup>1</sup> DMV, Negligent Operator Actions <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/negligence/negligent-operator-actions/>> [as of Feb. 19, 2026].

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

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

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

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

regardless of fault, then an additional six-month suspension shall be imposed, and the probation will be extended for one year from the violation of probation.<sup>7</sup>

Certain traffic violations and crimes add points to a person's driving record, which can lead to that person being deemed a negligent operator. More minor offenses, such as a traffic conviction involving the safe operation of a vehicle, a traffic accident in which the DMV deems that person responsible, or failing to properly secure a child in a restraint system, receive one point. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (f), (g) & (h).) More serious traffic offenses, such as convictions for vehicular manslaughter, a hit and run, DUI, reckless driving, intoxicated vehicular manslaughter without gross negligence, and engaging in a speed contest, among others, result in two points. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (a)-(d).)

Negligent operator-based suspensions are administrative in nature, are imposed at the discretion of the DMV, and are distinct from the criminal license suspensions or revocations that can result from a vehicle-related conviction. In practice, many of the offenses that add points to a person's driving record carry separate, and lengthier, criminal license revocation mandates. This is true for the crimes impacted by this bill. Gross vehicular manslaughter and vehicular manslaughter for financial gain each add two points to a person's driving record. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).) They also result in a three-year criminal license revocation, irrespective of the number of points on the defendant's record. (Veh. Code, § 13351, subd. (a).) Vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, a misdemeanor, similarly results in two points being added to the defendant's driving record. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).) But instead of a three-year license revocation, it receives up to a six- or 12-month license suspension, as specified, at the discretion of the DMV. (Veh. Code, §§ 13361, subd. (c); 13556, subd. (a).)

- 5) **Effect of this Bill:** Almost all of the offenses that add points to a person's record, including the vehicular manslaughter crimes at issue in this bill, require a criminal conviction. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), & (h).) Accordingly, a person who is arrested and charged for an offense that would ordinarily add points to their driving record, if convicted, but who avoids a conviction for the offense by completing court-initiated diversion, typically will not receive those points on their driving record.

This bill requires, where a person is charged with the specific crimes of gross vehicular manslaughter, vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, or vehicular manslaughter for financial gain, and that person's case is subsequently dismissed because the defendant completed court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, the DMV to nonetheless assess two points to their driving record. This is the same number of points that the person would receive if they had been convicted of those crimes. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).) Under this bill, if a person is arrested and charged for vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, a misdemeanor, and completes diversion 12 months later, this bill would require the DMV to add two points to that person's driving record in the same manner as if they had been convicted. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)

The scope of this bill may be limited. Some of the vehicular manslaughter charges this bill applies to are not eligible for court-initiated diversion. Court-initiated diversion is confined to

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

misdemeanors. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (a).) Vehicular manslaughter for financial gain is a felony and therefore not eligible for court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. (Pen. Code, § 193, subd. (c)(3).) Gross vehicular manslaughter is a wobbler, meaning it can be charged as a felony or a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 193, subd. (c)(1).) A felony gross vehicular manslaughter case will not receive misdemeanor diversion. In practice, this bill will largely only affect individuals who complete court-initiated diversion for the crime of vehicular manslaughter with ordinary negligence, a misdemeanor, and the crime of gross vehicular manslaughter if that offense is charged as, or reduced to, a misdemeanor.

Notably, this bill requires points to be assessed to a person's driving record even if the person was not adjudicated guilty of vehicular manslaughter before being granted diversion; court-initiated diversion does not require that the defendant enter a guilty plea. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95; 1001.96; 1001.97.) This is largely inconsistent with the existing basis for the DMV to add points to a person's record, which generally requires a determination of culpability. The primary way this is established is through a *conviction*. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subds. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), & (h).) Almost every offense triggering driving record points requires a criminal conviction. (*Ibid.*) The primary exception to this is for "a traffic accident in which the operator is deemed by the [DMV] to be responsible," which results in one point. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (g).) But even this requires a determination that the person was responsible for the accident. Moreover, this bill requires the same number of driving record points for a person found to be guilty of vehicular manslaughter beyond a reasonable doubt, as for a person charged with vehicular manslaughter, who is never adjudicated guilty and whose case is ultimately dismissed. The Legislature may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to assess the same number of points for defendants with different levels of culpability.

- 6) **Practical Concerns:** This bill contains a single provision requiring two driving points to be assessed to a person for a violation of vehicular manslaughter, in which the case was dismissed through court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. However, this bill contains no mechanism for the DMV to receive successful diversion outcome information. It is unclear how such points would ultimately be assessed. Negligent operator points are assessed by the DMV.<sup>8</sup> If a person is charged with misdemeanor vehicular manslaughter, and that charge is dismissed one year later after they complete court-initiated diversion, it is unclear how the DMV will be made aware of this outcome for purposes of assessing points to that person's driving record. As previously noted, most offenses that require points to be assessed to a person's driving record require a conviction, and for such convictions, the Vehicle Code already establishes a process whereby courts send conviction-related information to the DMV. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subds. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), & (h).) Specifically, upon conviction for a violation of the Vehicle Code or a violation of any other statute relating to the safe operation of vehicles, among others, judicial clerks are required to send an abstract of the record of the court covering the case in which the person was convicted to the DMV within five days after conviction. (Veh. Code, § 1803, subd. (a)(1).) Requiring points to be assessed to a person's driving record upon the completion of court-initiated diversion may require additional judicial and DMV procedures in order to be effective in practice.

---

<sup>8</sup> State of California DMV, *Negligence* <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/negligence/>> [As of June 2, 2026].

This bill's lack of information surrounding how the DMV would be notified of diversion outcomes and how the person's culpability for the offense would be determined in the absence of a conviction may also raise due process issues. The addition of two driving record points can establish a driver as a prima facie negligent operator, which can result in a license suspension.<sup>9</sup> (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subds. (a) & (b).) However, "[a] driver's license cannot be suspended without due process of law." (*Cinquegrani v. Department of Motor Vehicles* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 741, 750.) A person whose license was suspended without a hearing based on the mandated addition of two points pursuant to this bill, where the person's culpability for the alleged crime for which they were granted diversion was never determined, could seek to challenge the legality of that suspension.

- 7) **Inconsistency With the Benefits of Diversion:** This bill may be inconsistent with the function and purpose of completing court-initiated diversion; that "the arrest...shall be deemed *to have never occurred*." (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a) (emphasis added).) Upon successful completion of court-initiated diversion, the defendant may indicate, in response to any question concerning their prior criminal record, that they were not arrested. (*Ibid.*)

Further, existing law prohibits a record pertaining to an arrest resulting in successful completion of court-initiated misdemeanor diversion from, without the defendant's consent, being used in any way that could result in the denial of any employment, benefit, license, or certificate. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (a).) The only exemption to this prohibition is for peace officer applications. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a) & (b).) The term "license" as used in Penal Code section 1001.97 is not defined. This was likely intended to extend the record-clearing benefits of diversion to employment-related licenses, such as professional licenses.<sup>10</sup> However, a plain reading of the statute broadly prohibits, where a person successfully completes diversion, the underlying arrest from being used in *any way* that could result in the denial of a license. Adding points to a person's driving record after they complete diversion, which could contribute to that person receiving a DMV-imposed license suspension, could reasonably be interpreted to be using that underlying arrest in a way that results in a denial of a license.

Requiring points to be added to a person's driving record, even after completing diversion, creates another exemption to the strict record-clearing benefits associated with court-initiated diversion.

- 8) **Argument in Support:** According to the *California District Attorneys Association*, "SB 953... would amend Section 12810 of the California Vehicle Code to ensure that drivers who commit vehicular manslaughter suffer a two-point penalty on their license, even if they participate in a misdemeanor diversion program.

"According to an ongoing CalMatters investigation, over the past decade nearly 40,000 people have died and more than 2 million have been injured on California roads. Since 2010,

---

<sup>9</sup> DMV, *Negligent Operator Actions* <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/negligence/negligent-operator-actions/>> [as of Feb. 19, 2026].

<sup>10</sup> The author's statement of the enacting statute emphasizes that diversion "allow[s] a person to avoid the lifelong collateral consequences associated with a criminal record when they are seeking employment or housing." See AB 3234 (Ting), Senate Floor Analysis <[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201920200AB3234#](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB3234#)> [As of Feb. 19, 2025].

California has seen more than a 60% increase in traffic fatalities. Impaired driving, distracted driving, chronic speeders, and overall recklessness behind the wheel have all contributed to this disturbing increase in traffic fatalities and accidents. SB 953 helps reverse this trend by ensuring that violators who kill behind the wheel do not have their driving slate wiped clean.

“SB 953 rightly recognizes that the devastation of a fatal accident warrants increased vigilance by the DMV for those convicted of vehicular manslaughter. By ensuring that violators cannot simply have their driving record wiped clean, SB 953 better reflects the severity of the crime, will help accelerate license suspensions for those who pose a real and present danger on the road, and will make our roads safer.”

- 9) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *ACLU California Action*, “Current law allows a judge to offer a defendant diversion in misdemeanor vehicular manslaughter cases when the judge determines that diversion is appropriate. If the bill is passed, people who complete a diversion program would, nonetheless, be assessed points on their license. The Legislature should not increase DMV costs, increase court costs, and burden families to pursue an approach that undermines a proven way to improve public safety outcomes.

“Diversion is an “exit ramp” to the criminal legal system – which “minimize[s] people’s exposure to the criminal legal system.” Pretrial diversion programs allow people charged with crimes to complete a rehabilitation program in lieu of prosecution. Upon successful completion of the program, the judge dismisses their case. Under California Penal Code section 1001.95, judges have the discretion to offer diversion to people charged with most misdemeanors. Diversion is a crucial criminal justice tool: it can clear court calendars and reduce jail and prison overcrowding. Diversion also advances public safety – research shows that diversion programs cut recidivism by half. SB 953 will require funding for increased crosstalk between DMV and courts while undermining these benefits, straining an already overburdened criminal legal system and diminishing public safety.

“Moreover, receiving points on a driving record can have devastating consequences for Californians and their families. Numerous studies have found a direct correlation between driving and employment. A task force report to the Governor of New Jersey cited research finding that following a license suspension, 42% of people lost their jobs as a result of the suspension. Of those who lost their jobs, 45% could not find another job, and this effect was most pronounced for seniors and low-income people...”

10) **Related Legislation:**

- a) AB 1662 (Wilson) would provide that if a defendant's case is dismissed because they completed misdemeanor diversion and the case involved a violation that ordinarily requires points to be added to the defendant's driving record, the DMV must assess points on the defendant's driving record. AB 1662 has been referred to the Senate Public Safety Committee.
- b) AB 1685 (Lackey) would increase the number of points that must be added to a person’s driving record, from one to three, for the crime of gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, as specified. AB 1685 has been referred to the Senate Public Safety

Committee.

**11) Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 1282 (Smallwood-Cuevas), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have authorized a county that opts to create a diversion or deferred entry of judgment program for theft offenses to have their program conducted by a county department providing pretrial or health care services or a nonprofit contract agency, and expanded the court-initiated misdemeanor diversion program to felonies, except those specified. SB 1282 failed passage on the Senate Floor.
- b) AB 74 (Muratsuchi), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have added the proposed crime of knowingly attending, participating, or aiding and abetting the commission of a vehicle sideshow or street takeover to the list of convictions that require two points to be added to the defendant's driving record. The hearing on AB 74 in the Assembly Transportation Committee was canceled at the request of the author.
- c) AB 282 (Lackey), of the 2021-2022 Legislative Session, would have excluded DUI and other offenses relating to reckless operation of a vehicle from court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. AB 282 failed passage in the Senate Public Safety Committee.
- d) SB 421 (Bradford), of the 2021-2022 Legislative Session, would have established a pretrial diversion scheme with specific conditions for misdemeanor DUI violations. SB 421 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- e) AB 3234 (Ting), Chapter 334, Statutes of 2020, created a court-initiated misdemeanor diversion program.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah  
Arcadia Police Officers' Association  
Auto Club of Southern California (AAA)  
Brea Police Association  
Burbank Police Officers' Association  
California Association of Highway Patrolmen  
California Association of School Police Chiefs  
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals  
California District Attorneys Association  
California Narcotic Officers' Association  
California Reserve Peace Officers Association  
California State Sheriffs' Association  
Claremont Police Officers Association  
Corona Police Officers Association  
Culver City Police Officers' Association  
Fullerton Police Officers' Association  
Los Angeles School Police Management Association

Los Angeles School Police Officers Association  
Murrieta Police Officers' Association  
Newport Beach Police Association  
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association  
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)  
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association  
Pomona Police Officers' Association  
Riverside Police Officers Association  
Riverside Sheriffs' Association  
Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment (SAFE)  
San Francisco Bay Area Families for Safe Streets  
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE) (ORG)  
Streets for All (UNREG)  
Walk San Francisco Foundation

**Opposition**

ACLU California Action  
Friends Committee on Legislation of California  
Justice2jobs Coalition  
LA Defensa  
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.

**Analysis Prepared by:** Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744