



PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE
Thursday, June 3, 2021
9:30 am – 12:30 pm

Register for this meeting:

[https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJEpfu2uqj8sEtdTBVs6rkJjRTM0G7dHReU](https://zoom.us/join/zoom/register/tJEpfu2uqj8sEtdTBVs6rkJjRTM0G7dHReU)

Immediately after registering, you will receive a link and confirmation email to join the meeting.



AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Introductions**
*Speakers: Chair, Bob Whalen, Councilmember, Clovis
Vice Chair, Pippin Dew, Councilmember, Vallejo*
- II. Public Comment**
- III. General Briefing (Handout)**
- IV. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Briefing** *Informational*
Speaker: Alex MacIraith, ABC Deputy Director of Legislation and Government Affairs
- V. California District Attorneys Association (CDA) Briefing** *Informational*
Speaker: Larry Morse, CDA Legislative Director (Invited)
- VI. Legislative Agenda (Attachment A)** *Action*
 - [SB 277 \(Archuleta\)](#) Fireworks: Dangerous Fireworks: Seizure: Management.
 - [SB 314 \(Wiener\)](#) Alcoholic Beverages.
 - [SB 389 \(Dodd\)](#) Alcoholic Beverages: Retail On-Sale License: Off-Sale Privileges.
- VII. Legislative Update** *Informational*
Speaker: Elisa Arcidiacono, Legislative Representative, Cal Cities
- VIII. [SB 2 \(Bradford\)](#) Discussion (Attachment B)** *Informational*
- IX. Adjourn**

A list of all the Cal Cities Public Safety bills can be found [here](#).

Next Meeting: *Staff will notify committee members after July 24 if the policy committee will be meeting in September.*

Brown Act Reminder: The League of California Cities' Board of Directors has a policy of complying with the spirit of open meeting laws. Generally, off-agenda items may be taken up only if:

- 1. Two-thirds of the policy committee members find a need for immediate action exists and the need to take action came to the attention of the policy committee after the agenda was prepared (Note: If fewer than two-thirds of policy committee members are present, taking up an off-agenda item requires a unanimous vote); or*
- 2. A majority of the policy committee finds an emergency (for example: work stoppage or disaster) exists.*

A majority of a city council may not, consistent with the Brown Act, discuss specific substantive issues among themselves at Cal Cities meetings. Any such discussion is subject to the Brown Act and must occur in a meeting that complies with its requirements.

**Public Safety Policy Committee
Legislative Agenda
June 3, 2021**

Staff: Elisa Arcidiacono, Legislative Representative, (916)-658-8252
Caroline Cirrincione, Legislative Policy Analyst, (916)-658-8250

1. **[SB 277 \(Archuleta\) Fireworks: Dangerous Fireworks: Seizure: Management.](#)**

Overview:

This measure would expand the definition of a dangerous firework to include any firework containing lead and lead compounds and hexachlorobenzene.

Bill Description:

Specifically, this measure would:

- Require any seized dangerous or safe and sane fireworks, as defined, to be managed by the State Fire Marshal;
- Require the State Fire Marshal to consult with relevant federal and state agencies to develop specific protocols and procedures for the safe seizure, storage, repurposing, destruction, or disposal of dangerous fireworks;
- Require state, county, special districts, and local government entities to handle, transport, and store seized fireworks in a manner prescribed by the State Fire Marshal;
- Require commercially viable, federally approved dangerous consumer fireworks or safe and sane fireworks, seized and managed to be available for sale by any California licensed fireworks importer-exporter or wholesaler of fireworks;
- Require the State Fire Marshal to establish and collect an additional fee on permits for dangerous fireworks issued to licensees in an amount necessary to enforce applicable laws for training and education regarding dangerous fireworks; and
- Delete the \$10 fee provision and instead authorize the State Fire Marshal to determine the fee amount.

Background:

The genesis of SB 277:

According to the author's office, "for too long, our communities have been plagued by the persistent booms and bangs of illegal, amateur fireworks displays. Local fire and law enforcement agencies have been kept from other duties as they are busy responding nightly to residents' complaints about these illegal aerial displays and celebratory explosives. The relentless disruptions to our neighborhoods and communities are disruptive and unwelcome. It seems no community has been left undisrupted by illegal displays of fireworks. Despite public demands for increased enforcement, increased public education, use of administrative fines, and deploying dedicated illegal fireworks patrols, the volume of illegal aerial items and loud explosives remains at unacceptable levels.

SB 277 seeks to present a solution to getting illegal fireworks off of our streets by better coordinating enforcement efforts between the State Fire Marshal and local entities as well as establishing a fireworks management and repurposing component that will help manage the seizing, storage, transfer, and repurposing of both federally-approved fireworks and California safe and sane fireworks."

Fiscal Impact:

The bill would impose a state-mandated local program; however, it would allow for local jurisdictions to keep 75 percent of all fines and penalties collected, rather than the 35 percent under existing law.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

Cal Cities does not have existing policy on the topics discussed.

Staff Comments:

This bill limits the types of fireworks that can lawfully be purchased and used in the State of California. Fireworks deemed “dangerous” continue to wreak havoc throughout California communities and have often led to increased financial burdens for increased patrol, enforcement, seizure, etc.

Support and Opposition:*Support*

American Promotional Events, Inc., dba TNT Fireworks (Source)
Phantom Fireworks
Numerous individuals

Opposition

None on file at this time.

Staff Recommendation:

Cal Cities Staff recommends a support position on SB 277.

Committee Recommendation:**Board Action:****2. [SB 314 \(Wiener\) Alcoholic Beverages](#). (As Amended 03/13/21)****Bill Summary:**

This measure would provide flexibility in the Alcohol Beverage Control Act (ABC) around catering licenses, and requirements for licensees to share a main common area for business. This would also create an extended timeline for licensees with expanded premises to make their expansion permanent and extend the event application window.

Bill Description:

Specifically, this measure would:

- Authorize ABC, for a period of 365 days from the date when the COVID-19 state of emergency order is lifted, to permit licensees to continue to exercise license privileges in an expanded licensed area authorized pursuant to a COVID-19 temporary catering permit;
- Authorize ABC to extend the time period that the COVID-19 temporary permit is valid beyond the 365 days if the licensee has filed a pending application with the department for the permanent expansion of the premises;
- Authorize an alcohol manufacturer to share a common licensed area with multiple retailers, as specified and subject to all the following conditions:

- A retailer sharing a common licensed area with a manufacturer shall not serve any alcohol beverages that are manufactured, produced, bottled, or sold by the manufacturer. This prohibition shall apply to all licensed premises owned or operated by the retailer anywhere in the state;
- All retailers sharing the common licensed area shall hold the same license type; and
- All licensees holding licenses within the shared common licensed area shall be jointly responsible for compliance with all laws that may subject their license to disciplinary action.
- Increase the number of times, from 24 to 52 in a calendar year, that ABC can issue a caterer's permit for use at any one location; and
- Extend from 30 to 90 days by which a licensee must apply to ABC for an event permit that allows specified licensees, to provide, free of charge, entertainment, food, and distilled spirits, wine, or nonalcoholic beverages to consumers at an invitation-only event.

Background:

The genesis of SB 314:

According to the author's office, "SB 314 will help California's events, restaurants, and bars recover economically from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic by creating more flexibility in how they can serve alcohol, including where they can serve alcohol, how they can share spaces with other businesses, and how frequently a catering permit can be used. The bill also implements a one-year grace period after the emergency order is lifted for businesses to continue expanded outdoor dining operations on their premises that locals have enjoyed throughout the pandemic. Combined with other critical measures, SB 314 will help the hospitality industry bounce back from the devastating impacts of the pandemic, enacting common sense reforms, restructuring outdated laws, and allowing businesses more opportunities to recover. These businesses make up a huge part of the fabric of our communities, and employ so many of our neighbors, so we must do everything in our power to ensure a quick recovery."

Fiscal Impact:

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, unknown fiscal impact to ABC associated administrative and licensing workload to process additional catering authorizations and to convert temporary catering authorizations to permanent premises expansions. Additionally, unknown increases in fee revenue to be deposited in the Alcohol Beverage Control Fund may offset administrative and licensing workload.

This measure could potentially provide increased sales tax revenues as well as additional job opportunities for local jurisdictions.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

Cal Cities does not have existing policy on the topics discussed.

Staff Comments:

This bill aims to codify standards for flexible dining and alcohol consumption that have been in place throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. These standards have helped many businesses stay solvent during the pandemic and supported local tax revenues (e.g. sales tax) from direct and indirect consumer activity. ABC still maintains the authority to revoke licenses of bad actors in the community and would still be required to consult with local jurisdictions as it relates to licensing.

Support and Opposition:*Support*

California Downtown Association
California Travel Association
Central City Association
City and County of San Francisco
City of Alameda
City of Desert Springs
City of Indian Wells
City of La Quinta
City of Menifee
City of Murrieta
City of Palm Springs
Diaego
Independent Hospitality Coalition
Marin Council of Chambers
Mill Valley Chamber of Commerce & Visitor Center
Napa Valley Vintners
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce
Southwest California Legislative Council
Tiburon Peninsula Chamber of Commerce
Westside Council of Chambers of Commerce

Opposition

Alcohol Justice
California Alcohol Policy Alliance
California Beer and Beverage Distributors
California Council on Alcohol Problems
Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of California, Inc.

Committee Recommendation:**Board Action:****3. [SB 389 \(Dodd\)](#) Alcoholic Beverages. Retail On-Sale License. Off-Sale Privileges. (As Amended 04/21/21)****Bill Summary:**

This measure would authorize the holder of a retail on-sale license or a licensed beer manufacturer that operates a bona fide eating place to exercise additional off-sale rights and privileges, authorizing the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-sale consumption if the beverages are in manufacturer prepackaged containers.

Bill Description:

Specifically, this measure would:

- Authorize the holder of a retail on-sale license or a licensed beer manufacturer that operates a bona fide eating place to sell the alcoholic beverages for off-sale

consumption for which their license permits on-sale consumption provided the beverages are in manufacturer prepackaged containers;

- Authorize the holder of a retail on-sale license to sell the alcoholic beverages for off-sale consumption for which their license permits on-sale consumption, except beer, when the beverages are not in manufacturer prepackaged containers if the following conditions are met:
 - The alcoholic beverages are packaged in a container with a secure lid or cap sealed in a manner designed to prevent consumption without removal of the lid or cap by breaking the seal;
 - Wine is sold only in single-serve containers; and
 - The container is clearly and conspicuously labeled or otherwise identified as containing an alcoholic beverage.
- Require any licensee who sells alcoholic beverages for off-sale consumption to “post” the warning sign in a manner that notifies consumers of restrictions regarding open container law.

Background:

The genesis of SB 389:

The author argues that the ability to include alcoholic drinks with to-go meals has been helpful for many restaurants during the pandemic. This bill expands on this new authority by allowing all on-sale retailers the ability to sell alcoholic beverages without the need to serve a meal as part of that order. According to the author, this not only provides certainty for restaurants but will continue to provide much-needed jobs.

Fiscal Impact:

This measure could potentially provide increased sales tax revenues as well as additional job opportunities for local jurisdictions. A survey by the National Restaurant Association found 78 percent of restaurant owners who began selling take-out alcohol rehired laid off employees compared to 62 percent overall.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

Cal Cities does not have existing policy on the topics discussed.

Staff Comments:

This bill aims to codify standards for flexible dining and alcohol consumption that have been in place throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Allowing the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to impose new conditions on existing licenses would require statutory changes to be amended into this measure as it is not contemplated under existing law. We will ensure this includes interaction points with local jurisdictions prior to decisions being made regarding individual licenses.

Support and Opposition:

Support

83 Proof

Alchemist Bar & Lounge

Athletic Club Oakland

Azucar Lounge

Blackbird

California Chamber of Commerce

California Craft Brewers Association

California Music & Culture Association

California Restaurant Association
Diageo
Distilled Spirits Council of the United States
Dogpatch Saloon
El Rio
Elda Agave, LLC
ELIXIR Saloon
Future Bars Group
Lord George
Madrone Art Bar
Mario & John's Tavern
Pop's Bar
Red Window Bar
Royale SF
S&T Revelry Holdings Inc.
San Francisco Athletic Club
San Jose Downtown Association
SF Bar Owner Alliance
Smuggler's Cove
Southside Spirit House
Southwest California Legislative Council
The Bar on Dolores
The Little Shamrock
The Page
The Sea Star
Tony Nik's Café
Wine Institute
Zeki's Bar

Opposition

Alcohol Justice
California Alcohol Policy Alliance

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

SB 2 (Bradford) Peace Officers. Certification. Civil Rights. (As Amended 05/20/21)**Bill Summary:**

This measure would establish new standards and processes to investigate and determine peace officer fitness, and to certify and decertify such officers. It also would establish a new standard for establishing liability, eliminate the application of certain governmental immunities, and allow wrongful death actions under the Tom Bane Civil Rights Act (Bane Act).

Bill Description:

Specifically, this measure would:

- Eliminate certain immunity provisions for peace officers and custodial officers, or public entities employing peace officers or custodial officers sued under the Bane Act;
- Authorize, *in certain circumstances*, specified persons to bring an action under the Bane Act for the death of a person;
- Disqualify a person from being employed as a peace officer if that person has been convicted of, or has been adjudicated in an administrative, military, or civil judicial process as having committed a violation of certain specified crimes against public justice, including the falsification of records, bribery, or perjury;
- Disqualify any person who has been certified as a peace officer by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and has surrendered that certification or had that certification revoked by the commission, or has been denied certification;
- Disqualify any person previously employed in law enforcement in any state or United States territory or by the federal government, whose name is listed in the national decertification index or who engaged in serious misconduct that would have resulted in their certification being revoked in this state;
- Require a law enforcement agency employing certain peace officers to employ only individuals with a current, valid certification or pending certification;
- Grant POST the power to investigate and determine the fitness of any person to serve as a peace officer in the state;
- Direct POST to issue or deny certification, which includes a basic certificate or proof of eligibility, to a peace officer in accordance with specified criteria;
- Require POST to issue a proof of eligibility or basic certificate, as specified, to certain persons employed as a peace officer on January 1, 2022, who do not otherwise possess a certificate;
- Require a proof of eligibility or basic certificate to be renewed at least every two years and would require POST to assess a fee for the application and renewal of the certificate or proof of eligibility, as well as an annual certification fee;
- Require the fees to be deposited into the Peace Officer Certification Fund, created by the bill, and would continuously appropriate those funds to POST for the administration of the certification program;
- Declare certificates or proof of eligibility awarded by POST to be property of POST and would authorize POST to revoke a proof of eligibility or certificate on specified grounds, including the use of excessive force, sexual assault, making a false arrest, or participating in a law enforcement gang;
- Create the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division within POST to investigate and prosecute proceedings to take action against a peace officer's certification;
- Require the division to review and investigate grounds for decertification and make findings as to whether grounds for action against an officer's certification exist;

- Require the division to notify the officer subject to decertification of their findings and allow the officer to request review;
- Create the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board with nine members to be appointed as specified;
- Require the board to hold public meetings to review the findings after an investigation made by the division and to make a recommendation to POST;
- Require POST to adopt the board's recommendation if supported by clear and convincing evidence and, if action is to be taken against an officer's certification, return the determination to the division to commence formal proceedings consistent with the Administrative Procedure Act;
- Require POST to notify the employing agency and the district attorney of the county in which the officer is employed of this determination;
- Make all records related to the revocation of a peace officer's certification public and would require that records of an investigation be retained for 30 years;
- Require an agency employing peace officers to report to POST the employment, appointment, or separation from employment of a peace officer, any complaint, charge, allegation, or investigation into the conduct of a peace officer that could render the officer subject to revocation, findings by civil oversight entities, and civil judgements that could affect the officer's certification;
- Require, in case of a separation from employment or appointment, each agency to execute an affidavit-of-separation form adopted by the commission describing the reason for separation;
- Require the affidavit to be signed under penalty of perjury;
- Require the board to report annually on the activities of the division, board, and POST, relating to the certification program, including the number of applications for certification, the events reported, the number of investigations conducted, and the number of certificates surrendered or revoked.

Background:

Police Reform in the Legislature:

In response to George Floyd's death and the civil unrest that ensued across the nation, it became clear that public safety and police reform policy, in particular, would be a major priority of the Legislature this year.

As such, Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon announced the formation of a Select Committee on Police Reform and appointed committee members. The committee will continue California's leadership in police reform and seek measures to ensure public safety. Broad topics for the committee include law enforcement hiring and training, as well as options for increasing accountability of agencies and officers to reduce public safety risks.

The genesis of SB 2:

The author argues that "there have been numerous stories of bad-acting officers committing misconduct and not facing any serious consequences. These officers remain on the force after pleading down to a lesser crime, if prosecuted and convicted at all. Other times, these problematic officers resign or are fired from their employer only to get rehired at another law enforcement agency and continue to commit serious acts of misconduct. California does not have a uniform, statewide mechanism to hold law enforcement officers accountable. Allowing the police to police themselves has proven to be dangerous and leads to added distrust between communities of color and law enforcement. Law enforcement officers are entrusted

with great powers to carry a firearm, stop and search, use force, and arrest; to balance this, they must be held to a higher standard of accountability.

Fiscal Impact:

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST): POST reports one-time costs of \$650,000 and ongoing costs ranging between \$28.3 million and \$37.2 million annually. In large part, costs are associated with increased personnel required for investigations, complaint intake, data collection, information reporting, certification processing, and administrative functions (ranging from \$19 million to \$26 million annually); facility expansion of its current location and obtaining additional office space in the Bay Area and southern California (estimated at about \$5.75 million annually); travel requirements for staff (estimated between \$3 million and \$5 million annually); equipment costs (at about \$350,000 annually); and costs related to the Advisory Board (of about \$145,000 annually). Personnel estimates by POST are based on the number of investigations a year, and costs likely would rise if markedly more investigations are required.

Ongoing costs, either wholly or to a large extent, would be offset by fees that POST would be able to charge to administer the mandates in this bill. For example, presuming about 100,000 peace officers in the state would be subject to the certification scheme that would be established by SB 2, the annual certification fee alone, set at the statutory cap of \$250, would generate about \$25 million. While the payment of fees ultimately would be the responsibility of each peace officer, as a practical matter, they likely would be covered by their employing agency. Consequently, the fees likely would be added state costs for state entities that employ peace officers who would be subject to the certification requirement of this bill. While POST would be able to charge fees for certifications that it issues starting on January 1, 2022, it is likely that POST would, at least initially, need to use its existing operating budget or receive a General Fund appropriation to begin its work under this measure before it is able to collect fee revenue. (General Fund, fees)

Other state entities: Costs would vary, from minor and absorbable (for those agencies that employ a small number of peace officers) to tens of thousands of dollars each year (e.g., the Department of Insurance) to the low hundreds of thousands of dollars annually (e.g., the University of California with approximately 470 peace officers).

Loss of immunity: Unknown, potentially major costs in the millions of dollars annually across state departments to the extent that the elimination of immunity for state employers under the Bane Act would lead to additional and/or higher awards of damages and settlements by state departments and entities that employ peace officers or custodial officers than otherwise would happen under existing law.

Information reporting by local agencies: Unknown, potentially major costs in the aggregate to local jurisdictions to provide specified information to POST under SB 2. Actual costs to each jurisdiction would depend on a number of factors, including the number of peace officers employed by the agency, the rate of officer turnover, and how many officers are subject to an investigation that would prompt reporting by this measure. These costs likely would be reimbursable by the state, the extent of which would be determined by the Commission on State Mandates. Considering that there are over 500 local law enforcement agencies across the state, costs to comply with this measure could be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars in the aggregate at a minimum. (General Fund, local funds)

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

“Cal Cities recognizes the need to establish a peace officer decertification process through POST.”

“The League opposes modifications to the legal standard on use of force; to the extent, such proposed changes elevate the safety risk to law enforcement officers. Specific proposals in this area should be carefully reviewed so that the impacts of any changes are fully understood.”

“The League opposes legislation that would unduly expose cities to increased liability and cost.”

Staff Comments:

The bill saw significant improvements coming out of the Senate Appropriations Committee as it relates to the Bane Act. The original intent standard was restored and wrongful death lawsuits may only be brought under the Bane Act if the conduct “constitutes a crime of violence or a crime of moral turpitude”.

Qualified immunity provisions are eliminated for public employees for injury caused by their instituting or prosecuting any judicial or administrative proceeding within the scope of their employment, even if they act maliciously and without probable cause, liability of peace or correctional officers for injuries caused to persons in custody, and failure to obtain medical care for a person in custody.

There remain significant issues related to the decertification process. This includes the membership of the advisory body as well as the powers granted to them to independently investigate and carry out action against peace officers without collaboration with the employing agency. This effectively impacts the leadership of our chiefs of police, removing them from investigative processes and decision-making as it relates to officer conduct.

The administrative requirements associated with the increased reporting to POST will vary across agencies based on size and community interaction.

Support and Opposition:*Support*

Alliance for Boys and Men of Color (co-sponsor)
ACLU of California (co-sponsor)
Anti-Police-Terror Project (co-sponsor)
Black Lives Matter Los Angeles (co-sponsor)
California Families United 4 Justice (co-sponsor)
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (co-sponsor)
PolicyLink (co-sponsor)
STOP Coalition (co-sponsor)
UDW/AFSCME Local 3930 (co-sponsor)
Youth Justice Coalition (co-sponsor)
AFSCME Local 3299
Against Bigotry, Responding with Action
American Association of Independent Music
American Federation of Musicians
Artist Rights Alliance
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
Asian Solidarity Collective
Bend the Arc: Jewish Action

Black Music Action Coalition
Brotherhood Crusade
California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice
California Faculty Association
California for Safety and Justice
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Innocence Coalition
California Innocence Project
California Nurses Association
California Public Defenders Association
Change for Justice
Children's Defense Fund - CA
Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice
Community Advocates for Just and Moral Governance
Consumer Attorneys of California
Courage California
Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley
East Bay for Everyone
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC)
Equal Rights Advocates
Essie Justice Group
Everytown for Gun Safety
Fresno Barrios Unidos
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Giffords
Indivisible CA: StateStrong
Indivisible East Bay
Indivisible South Bay LA
Indivisible Yolo
Initiate Justice
Justice Reinvestment Coalition of Alameda County
Kern County Participatory Defense
Ricardo Lara, California Insurance Commissioner
Law Enforcement Accountability Network
Law Enforcement Action Partnership
League of Women Voters of California
Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
Los Angeles LGBT Center
Loyola Project for the Innocent
Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center
Mexican American Bar Association of Los Angeles County
Mid-City Community Advocacy Network
Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
Music Artists Coalition
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter
National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform
NextGen California
Northern California Innocence Project
Northridge Indivisible
OC Emergency Response Coalition

Organizers in Solidarity
Pacifica Social Justice
People's Budget Orange County
PICO California
Pillars of the Community
Prosecutors Alliance of California
Public Health Institute
Recording Industry Association of America
Roots of Change
Salesforce.com
San Diegans for Justice
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
San Francisco Public Defender
San Jose State University Human Rights Institute
Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform
Libby Schaaf, Mayor, City of Oakland
Screen Actors Guild – American Federation of Television and Radio Artists
Showing Up for Racial Justice Long Beach
Showing Up for Racial Justice San Diego
Showing Up for Racial Justice North County
Smart Justice California
Songwriters of North America
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
Team Justice
Think Dignity
Tides Advocacy
Together We Will/Indivisible - Los Gatos
We the People - San Diego
White People 4 Black Lives
Yalla Indivisible

Opposition

Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs
Association of Probation Supervisors of Los Angeles County
California Association of Highway Patrolmen
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California Correctional Peace Officers Association
California Fraternal Order of Police
California Peace Officers Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California State Sheriffs' Association
California Statewide Law Enforcement Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Deputy Sheriffs Association of San Diego
Hawthorne Police Officers Association
Long Beach Police Officers Association
Los Angeles County Probation Managers Association AFSCME Local 1967
Los Angeles Police Protective League

Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Sacramento County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Employees' Benefit Association
San Diego District Attorney Investigator's Association
San Diego Police Officers Association
San Francisco Police Officers Association
Santa Ana Police Officers Association