



PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE
Friday, March 27th, 2026
10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Hilton Orange County/Costa Mesa

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Introductions**
Chair Scott Nassif, Mayor, Apple Valley
Vice Chair Mark Kairis, Mayor, Hanford
- II. Public Comment**
- III. Legislative Review** *Action*
 - [AB 1959](#) (Patel) Juvenile justice. (*Attachment A*)
 - [AB 2582](#) (Schultz) Crimes: Prostitution. (*Attachment B*)
 - [AB 2749](#) (Sharp-Collins) Crimes: loitering. (*Attachment C*)
 - DUI Legislation ([AB 1605](#) and [SB 1156](#)). (*Attachment D*)
- IV. Existing Policy and Guiding Principles Discussion** (*Attachment E*) *Action*
- V. E-Bikes Task Force Update** (*Attachment F*) *Informational*
Waleed Hojeij, Policy Analyst, Cal Cities
- VI. State Legislation, Budget, and Regulatory Update** *Informational*
Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate, Cal Cities
- VII. Adjourn**

Next Meeting (Virtual): Friday, June 5, 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

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 League 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

Staff: Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate
Serena Scott, Legislative Affairs and Policy Analyst

AB 1959 (Patel) Juvenile Justice

Bill Summary:

This bill would provide that recall and resentencing provisions would not apply to juvenile defendants serving a sentence for an offense where it was pled and proved that the defendant has been convicted of more than one offense of murder in the first or second degree, that the offense constitutes a mass shooting, or that the offense was committed in a school zone or on the property of a place of worship.

Bills Description:

Under existing law, a person sentenced to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole who was under 18 years of age at the time of the offense to petition the court for recall of their sentence and resentencing. Existing law prohibits a person from seeking recall and resentencing pursuant to these provisions if it is pleaded and proved that the person committed certain offenses and the victim was a public safety official, including any law enforcement personnel.

AB 1959 would also prohibit a person from seeking recall and resentencing if they were convicted of more than one offense of murder in the first or second degree, if the offense constitutes a mass shooting or that the offense was committed in a school zone or on the property of a place of worship.

Proposition 57, the Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act, was passed by the voters in 2016. This measure amended the California Constitution to give state officials new flexibility to reduce the number of people incarcerated by the state. Specifically, this measure did the following:

- Created a new parole consideration process for people convicted of a nonviolent felony offense who are sentenced to state prison
- Allows state corrections officials with new authority to award certain credits that reduce the length of state prison sentences.
- Amended state law to require youth to have a hearing in juvenile court before they could be transferred to adult court for prosecution.

AB 1959 would, consistent with the intent of Proposition 57, authorize the district attorney to make a motion to transfer a minor from juvenile court to a court of criminal jurisdiction when the minor is alleged to have committed certain specified offenses when the minor was 14 or 15 years of age.

Background:

On March 5, 2001, after days of planning, Andy Williams took his father's 22-caliber revolver and 40 rounds of ammunition to Santana High School with the intent to shoot students. He killed two students, ages 14 and 17, and injured 13 others, including 11 students, a teacher, and the campus security officer. Williams pled guilty to two counts of first-degree murder and 13 counts of premeditated attempted murder. The judge imposed a sentence of 50 years to life, running most counts concurrently to avoid a life without parole (LWOP) sentence.

On September 10, 2024, the Board of Parole Hearings denied Williams' parole for three years. The commissioners found he posed an unreasonable risk to public safety, noting that he had not adequately addressed the factors that contributed to the crime and lacked insight into why he "committed this horrendous act of violence."

Despite that finding, on March 6, 2025, Williams filed a petition for recall and resentencing under PC 1170(d). Due to this legal loophole, the granting of his resentencing petition means he will now be resentenced in juvenile court. This is despite only serving 24 years of a 50-year-to-life sentence and being found unsafe for release. At nearly 40 years old, Williams is well beyond juvenile court jurisdiction. He would not undergo the resentencing process envisioned by the Legislature, and the court would not weigh the factors related to rehabilitation, maturity, or public safety.

In a recent hearing on the resentencing, the San Diego District Attorney appealed this ruling and is asking for a denial of this resentencing due to the violent nature of the crime. This next hearing date for the appeal will be sometime in June, 2026.

AB 1959 would help address this issue by prohibiting the recall and resentencing of a juvenile for specific crimes including school shootings.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:

Cal Cities has the following guiding policy on youth crime:

- Cal Cities supports efforts to address youth crime and violence.

Cal Cities was opposed to Proposition 57.

Fiscal Impact:

This bill would not have any fiscal impact on cities.

Staff Comments:

This bill is in response to the current case being adjudicated in San Diego and would make narrow clarifying changes to Proposition 57. The author only wants to address the current loophole that exists allows someone sentenced as a juvenile to request resentencing when parole had already been denied.

According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, since the implementation of Proposition 57 began in 2017, the prison population has declined by about 37,500 people (29 percent).

Support:

There are no organizations registered in support yet.

Opposition:

There are no organizations registered in opposition yet.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Public Safety Policy Committee discuss the bill and come to a decision on Cal Cities position.

Committee Recommendation:**Board Action:**

PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE Legislative Agenda

Staff: Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate
Serena Scott, Legislative Affairs and Policy Analyst

AB 2582 (Schultz) Crimes: prostitution.

Bill Summary:

This bill would require a person who commits prostitution with intent to receive compensation, money, or anything of value from another person to, for a first or second violation of those provisions, be offered a diversion program.

Bill Description:

Under existing law, loitering with the intent to purchase commercial sex is a misdemeanor, increased penalties for purchasing commercial sex from minors, and hotels and other places of business are required to display information on human trafficking and there are penalties for hotels and businesses that allow sex trafficking.

AB 2582 would require courts to offer diversion for a first or second violation of engaging in an act of prostitution ([CA Penal Code § 647 \(b\)\(1\) \(2025\)](#)) through an existing diversion program authorized under [California's general diversion statutes](#). The bill does not require the diversion program to be prostitution specific, but whatever established diversion is available, the defendant must meet the eligibility requirements.

The diversion requirement for first- and second-time offenses only applies to defendants who are charged with the intent to receive compensation, not to solicitors of prostitution. Meaning the "john's" that pay for sex will not be the eligible recipient of the AB 2582 diversion requirement.

Background:

SB 357 (Wiener, 2022) which went into effect on January 1, 2023, repealed the previous law that prohibited loitering with the intent to commit prostitution (Penal Code Section 653.20). The bill's author and supporters sought to repeal this offense due to the subjective nature of its interpretation by law enforcement and subsequent use. Senator Wiener stated that this provision and its enforcement is based on an officer's subjective perception of whether a person is "acting like" or "looks like " they intend to engage in prostitution.

Since SB 357 passed, Cal Cities has received reports from some cities regarding an increase in the level of prostitution and human trafficking in their communities. Last year, to address this issue, the Legislature passed [AB 379\(Schultz\)](#) which Cal Cities supported. AB 379 created a new offense for loitering with the intent to purchase commercial sex, increase penalties for purchasing commercial sex from minors, and requires hotels and other places of business to display information on human trafficking.

AB 2582 builds on California's previous efforts by bringing the attention to the unique needs and circumstances of the individuals who are paid to engage in sexual acts.

Individuals engage in sex work for a variety of reasons, which could include choice, circumstance, and coercion. Most frequently sex work is chosen out of survival and brings people in because it is the best option they have. Many sex workers struggle with poverty, destitution and have few other options for work. Others find that sex work offers better pay and more flexible working conditions than other jobs.

Some individuals who are charged with prostitution have also been victimized by traffickers or buyers. Sex trafficking and victimization disproportionately harms women of color and low-income individuals. Studies have also consistently shown the increased likelihood of risk factors among survivors, such as prior childhood abuse, parental substance abuse, economic distress, and homelessness or foster care involvement.

California law currently allows a judge to offer diversion to a defendant for a majority of existing misdemeanor offenses. California has additionally created many specialized diversion programs in recent years, including those for veterans, individuals with mental health conditions, and primary caregivers. The core aim of misdemeanor diversion is to give offenders a chance to seek treatment and education instead of spending time behind bars. Programs are designed to help defendants to reform and rejoin society safely.

Reports have shown diversion programs are especially impactful for sex workers. One study found that participants who completed a prostitution diversion program had a 68% lower risk of being rearrested, and that 77.3% were employed, volunteering, or enrolled in an educational program. Additionally, these programs can address the many underlying risk factors and obstacles survivors may face with exiting sex work, such as repeated instances of physical and sexual violence, isolation from support networks, high rates of mental health issues such as PTSD, substance use, and employment difficulties. According to the Yale Global Health Partnership in June 2020, arrest and conviction records for prostitution-related crimes make it harder for sex workers, and those cited for unlawful sex work, to find alternative employment - holding them in street economies and economic hardships -- "exacerbating ongoing race and gender discrimination".

As growing evidence highlights the lived experiences of sex workers, policymakers are reassessing strategies to prevent vulnerable individuals from being pushed into sex work and subsequently trapped in cycles of criminalization.

A diversion program, sometimes referred to as a pretrial diversion program, is an alternative sentencing option in many court systems that allows a defendant charged with certain crimes to avoid a criminal conviction. Diversion or pretrial diversion may be available to people facing first-time arrests or non-violent misdemeanor offenses. While different jurisdictions have different programs, diversion may require a combination of education, counseling, and checking in with the court to avoid further run-ins with the law.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:Law Enforcement

"Cal Cities supports efforts to provide additional tools and language to address prostitution while avoiding re-victimizing vulnerable individuals. This could include reinstating the misdemeanor offense of loitering with the intent to commit prostitution, as long as there are safeguards to ensure that victims can be contacted by law enforcement in a safe and appropriate way and provides access to services over incarceration when determined appropriate." (Cal Cities Existing Policies & Guiding Principles, as approved by the board in February).

Fiscal Impacts

AB 2582 would create a state-mandated local program by requiring first- or second-time prostitution offenders to be offered diversion programs. This could increase local costs to expand and administer existing diversion programs, including services such as counseling, case management, or job training. However, the bill may also reduce local jail and court costs by diverting low-level cases from the criminal legal system.

Staff Comments:

AB 2582 provides individuals charged with misdemeanor prostitution with the opportunity to rehabilitate and heal via programs that can address past trauma, help the community, or gain practical skills that can allow them to turn to other forms of employment after their diversion is complete. If the terms of their diversion are breached, the defendant will then have to be charged through the criminal legal system.

AB 2582 does not override judicial discretion; it simply requires that diversion be offered when a qualifying program already exists. It does not mandate that local jurisdictions create new diversion programs. [It is also important for the committee to consider that many individuals engaged in sex work do so out of economic necessity or survival.](#) Even those that have other reasons for partaking in sex work, still experience increased risk as their occupation positions them to be especially [susceptible to violence, discrimination, illness and stigma.](#)

Since not all jurisdictions have diversion programs for which a charged sex worker is eligible, this bill would only be enforceable in areas with existing programs that meet the offender's eligibility requirements. While this raises questions about equitable application across counties, it also respects local capacity and budget restraints by not imposing programs where none exist.

Support:

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Catholic Conference
California Public Defenders Association

Opposition:

Access Reproductive Justice
California State Sheriff's Association
Community Health Project LA

Erotic Service Providers Legal, Education, and Research Project
Healthright 360
Stripper Worker Center
The Sidewalk Project
Transformative Harm Reduction Research Institute of the Voices

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Public Safety Policy Committee to discuss the bill and come to a decision on Cal Cities position to recommend to the Board of Directors.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE Legislative Agenda

Staff: Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate
Serena Scott, Policy and Legislative Affairs Analyst

AB 2749 (Sharp-Collins) Crimes: loitering.

Bill Summary:

This bill would provide that a person is guilty of misdemeanor loitering with intent to purchase commercial sex only if they take a direct but ineffectual act that goes beyond planning or preparation towards commission of the crime that indicates a definite and unambiguous intent to purchase commercial sex. The bill would not require the act to be a completed communication.

Bills Description:

Under existing law, loitering with the intent to purchase commercial sex is a misdemeanor, increased penalties for purchasing commercial sex from minors, and hotels and other places of business are required to display information on human trafficking and there are penalties for hotels and businesses that allow sex trafficking.

AB 2749 would change the existing legal definition of intent to purchase commercial sex. Specifically, code section 653.25. would be updated to read:

(a) It is unlawful for any person to loiter in any public place with the intent to purchase commercial sex. ~~This intent is evidenced by acting in a manner and under circumstances that openly demonstrate the purpose of inducing, enticing, or soliciting prostitution, or procuring another to commit prostitution such as circling an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, making unauthorized stops along known prostitution tracks, or engaging in other conduct indicative of soliciting to procure another to engage in commercial sex.~~ A person is guilty of this offense only if the person takes a direct but ineffectual act done towards its commission that indicates a definite and unambiguous intent to purchase commercial sex. The act must go beyond planning or preparation. It does not require a completed communication.

The new language will narrow the legal definition of soliciting. Especially as it requires "definite and unambiguous" intent.

Background:

Until 2022, it was a misdemeanor to loiter in a public place with the intent to engage in prostitution, meaning participation in a commercial sex transaction as either a buyer or a seller. The law also provided a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that could be used to determine whether a person had the requisite intent.

In 2022 Senator Wiener introduced SB 357 which went into effect on January 1, 2023, and repealed the previous law that prohibited loitering with the intent to commit prostitution (Penal Code Section 653.20).

Senator Weiner and supporters sought to repeal this offense due to the subjective nature of its interpretation by law enforcement and subsequent use. Senator Wiener stated that this provision and its enforcement is based on an officer's subjective perception of whether a person is "acting like" or "looks like " they intend to engage in prostitution. Due to its subjective nature, the provision led to discriminatory application of its enforcement against transgender, Black and Brown women, as well as further perpetuates violence towards those engaged in sex work. Further, the criminalized aspects of engaging in prostitution create a more dangerous environment for the work, increasing trauma and victimization of an already highly victimized population. Since SB 357 passed, Cal Cities has received reports from some cities regarding an increase in the level of prostitution and human trafficking in their communities.

To address this issue, Cal Cities supported [AB 379 \(Schultz\)](#) last year which passed in the legislature and was signed by the Governor. AB 379 focused on increasing penalties for those attempting to purchase commercial sex, especially from minors and victims of human trafficking.

Specifically, AB 379 reestablished the loitering with the intent to purchase commercial sex offense (653.25). All these changes established California's existing law that loitering with the intent to purchase commercial sex is a misdemeanor, there are increased penalties for purchasing commercial sex from minors, and hotels and other places of business are required to display information on human trafficking and there are penalties for hotels and businesses that allow sex trafficking.

However, [opposition of the bill argued](#) the vague definition of "intent," in 379 opened the door for biased policing. Survivor Policy Coalition stated "These sorts of laws will ultimately harm survivors rather than support them and have been widely criticized for enabling racial profiling, increasing incarceration rates, and diverting resources away from community-based solutions. Endorsing ineffective and harmful legal tools under the guise of trafficking prevention is a step backward in California's fight for justice and human rights".

[The Senate Floor analysis for 379 also raised concerns](#) that the language of AB 379 may be unconstitutionally overbroad. "For example, in a given case, an individual could be repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists because they are having car trouble. They could be circling an area looking for a friend or a parking spot and fall under the definition of soliciting commercial sex".

On the other hand, [proponents of the bill state](#) "the language enables law enforcement to intervene and prevent buyers from purchasing individuals for sex".

The sole purpose of AB 2749 is to update legal language around the definition of prostitution.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:Law Enforcement

Cal Cities supports efforts to provide additional tools and language to address prostitution while avoiding re-victimizing vulnerable individuals. This could include reinstating the misdemeanor offense of loitering with the intent to commit prostitution, as long as there are safeguards to ensure that victims can be contacted by law enforcement in a safe and appropriate way and provides access to services over incarceration when determined appropriate.

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact on cities.

Staff Comments:

Last year, Cal Cities supported AB 379 (Schultz) which added back the loitering statute to existing law. Specifically, it added that intent to purchase sex is evidenced “by acting in a manner and under circumstances that openly demonstrate the purpose of inducing, enticing, or soliciting prostitution, or procuring another to commit prostitution such as circling an area in a motor vehicle and repeatedly beckoning to, contacting, or attempting to contact or stop pedestrians or other motorists, making unauthorized stops along known prostitution tracks, or engaging in other conduct indicative of soliciting to procure another to engage in commercial sex”.

In the current version of AB 2749, the existing provision discussed above would be removed and replaced with language that defines loitering in a different way.

Cal Cities staff asks that the committee carefully review the new language, particularly how it defines intent, and determine whether this new definition fairly establishes clearer statutory guidance. It is also important to note that the author of AB 379, Nick Schultz, is a principal co-author of AB 2749.

New loitering definition language in AB 2749: “A person is guilty of this offense only if the person takes a direct but ineffectual act done towards its commission that indicates a definite and unambiguous intent to purchase commercial sex. The act must go beyond planning or preparation. It does not require a completed communication”.

Support:

No registered support on AB 2749 yet.

Opposition:

No registered opposition.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Public Safety Policy Committee discuss this bill and recommend a position to the Board of Directors.

Committee Recommendation:**Board Action:**



PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE Legislative Agenda

Staff: Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate
Serena Scott, Legislative Affairs and Policy Analyst

AB 1605 (Ransom) and SB 1156 (Caballero) DUI: Alcohol Sales

Bill Summary:

AB 1605 would require everyone that sells or furnishes alcoholic beverages to first review a form of written identification issued by California. This bill would provide that a person convicted of a DUI related offense shall be prohibited from purchasing alcohol for at least one year under certain conditions.

SB 1156 (Caballero) would prohibit the sale of alcohol to individuals with 2 or more DUI offenses. It will be a gut and amend bill as of 3/25/2026.

Bills Description:

Existing law provides for the issuance, suspension, revocation, and conditions upon licensure for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages. Under existing law, every person who sells furnishes, gives, or causes to be sold any alcoholic beverage to any person under 21 years of age is guilty of a misdemeanor.

AB 1605

This measure would require the California Department of Motor Vehicles to issue an identification card or a driver's license with the words "NO ALCOHOL SALES" on the face of the identification card for those that the court has issued an order.

AB 1605 would also require any licensee or their agent or employee to refuse to sell or serve alcoholic beverages to any person who provides an identification card as noted above.

A person who is granted probation for a DUI offense, shall be prohibited from purchasing alcohol for a period of up to one year to the entire probationary period if the underlying conviction involved any of the following:

- The person had .16 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol in their blood.
- The offense occurred within three years of a separate violation that resulted in a conviction.
- The offense involved damage to the property of another greater than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) or great bodily injury or death.

After issuing an order the court shall ensure that the physical copies of the person's driver's license or identification card are forfeited or surrendered to law enforcement.

The court shall impose a fee to cover the costs of the DMV in issuing a replacement. An individual with an income of less than 200 percent of the official federal poverty level is eligible to pay this fee on a payment plan.

SB 1156 (Caballero)

This measure has similar provision regarding the identification cards and checking for the cards during the sale of any alcohol. However, SB 1156 provides that if a person has two prior convictions for an alcohol related offense, the court shall issue an order prohibiting the person from purchasing alcohol for a period of 3 to 10 years.

The court shall consider all of the following:

- Severity of the offenses
- Prior history of driving under the influence.

Background:

According to the California Office of Traffic Safety, 1,355 people lost their lives in alcohol-related traffic crashes in 2023. These deaths accounted for nearly one-third of all traffic fatalities in the state that year. In 2021 alone, the DMV reported more than 206,000 mandatory license suspension or revocation actions related to DUI violations. Of these, at least 17,773 involved individuals who committed a repeat DUI offense after a prior suspension or revocation. This figure does not include third or fourth offense revocations, meaning the true number of repeat offenders is even higher. In recent years, the number of deaths and major incidents from drunk drivers has substantially increased.

Today, California imposes a range of penalties on individuals convicted of DUI offenses. These include fines, fees, and assessments that can range from approximately \$1,500 to \$5,000, mandatory DUI education programs, ignition interlock devices, jailtime, licensing suspensions, and increased penalties based on prior offenses, or the extent of harm caused. When DUI results in a fatality, penalties can include lengthy prison sentences, including life imprisonment, and fines of up to \$10,000.

Recently, Cal Matters did a series of investigations ([License to Kill](#)) on these instances which showed:

- Nearly 40% of the drivers charged with vehicular manslaughter since 2019 have a valid license.
- The DMV gave licenses to nearly 150 people less than a year after they allegedly killed someone on the road.
- Hundreds of drivers DMV records do not list convictions for manslaughter or another crime related to a fatal crash.
- Courts often do not notify the DMV of manslaughter convictions.

At a recent informational hearing held by the Senate Public Safety and Senate Transportation Committees DMV Director Steve Gordon testified that he did not know if his agency could speed up license suspensions and that he was unfamiliar with the numbers showing that the DMV rarely investigates motorists.

In response, the Legislature has made reform to the DUI statutes a priority with a slate of about ten measures.

Existing Cal Cities Policy:Alcohol

Cal Cities supports policies that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol consumption, and limit youth access to alcoholic beverages, so long as related state-mandated programs or services provide full reimbursement to all local agencies.

Cal Cities supports local policies that hold social hosts responsible for underage drinking that occurs on property under their possession, control, or authority.

Cal Cities supports additional penalties for repeat driving under the influence (DUI) offenders that include, but are not limited to, permanent revocation of an individual's driver's license.

Cal Cities supports legislation and other regulations intended to improve local governments' enforcement capability against alcohol licensees that are in violation of state law and local ordinances.

Cal Cities supports the ability of bars and restaurants to operate expanded outdoor premises with local and state approval.

Cal Cities supports the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-sale consumption if the beverages are in manufacturer prepackaged containers with local and state approval.

Fiscal Impact:

This measure would create a new crime and could require a higher level of service from court staff and law enforcement. This measure would also require the DMV to issue different identification cards which would have a fiscal impact on the state.

Staff Comments:

While Cal Cities has policy related to additional penalties for repeated DUI offenders, it does not provide policy on the prohibition of alcohol.

Proposed new policy: *Cal Cities supports other enforcement mechanisms to address repeated DUI convictions including the prohibition on the purchase of alcohol for individuals with multiple DUI convictions.*

Support:

No registered support on these measures.

Opposition:

No registered opposition on these measures.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Public Safety Policy Committee discuss the bills and come to a decision on Cal Cities policy for a recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action:

PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE Legislative Agenda

Staff: Jolena Voorhis, Legislative Advocate

Proposed Changes to Existing Policies and Guiding Principles

According to League of California Cities policy, every policy committee updates the official policy book (now published online) every two years, and all changes must be consistent with past actions of the Cal Cities Board of Directors.

The Board of Directors adopted the proposed changes made by the Public Safety Policy Committee over the past two years on February 19, 2026, as approved by the policy committee on January 23, 2026.

At the January Policy Committee, members expressed interest in discussing additional changes to the policies. This discussion was held over until the March meeting so that staff could provide background and analysis on the proposed changes.

Surveillance Technology (Adopted in 2018)

Minor revisions are proposed to the policy which states as follows (proposed changes are in bold and underlined or strikeout):

“Cal Cities opposes policies that restrict law enforcement agencies from utilizing **constitutionally permitted tools or efforts, including** surveillance **and other** technology that **would otherwise** enhance their ability to prevent, **detect and preserve evidence of** criminal activity **and arrest those as to whom there is probable cause to believe that they have committed crimes**”.

The existing policy has allowed Cal Cities to oppose legislation which would restrict local governments from using license plate reading technology and other surveillance tools:

AB 1034 (Wilson) Facial Recognition

This measure would have prohibited law enforcement agencies from installing cameras which include facial recognition software.

Cal Cities Position: Opposed.

Status: Held on the Senate Floor; this bill was amended and changed to a bill on a different subject.

Proposition 36 Policy (Adopted in 2024)

The existing policy was adopted by the Board of Directors on July 11, 2024. This language was requested by several members of the Board during the discussion on Proposition 36 to state that Cal Cities support of Proposition 36 was not intended to return to mass incarceration but to support treatment and diversion for repeat offenders.

The proposed revision would remove the language as adopted by the Board which has been one of Cal Cities main talking points in the fight for additional funding for Proposition 36 implementation.

Proposed changes to policy (changes are in bold and underlined or strikeout):
Cal Cities supports Proposition 36 efforts to reduce retail theft and shoplifting, and efforts to reduce the possession, sale, and distribution of "hard drugs." Cal Cities supports increased charges or penalties for those who involve minors in fentanyl trafficking, who conduct trafficking activities in close proximity to schools or other areas designated for children, or who directly sell fentanyl to minors. Cal Cities also supports **further efforts to reforms of Proposition 47, as needed to advance these efforts.** ~~while avoiding the return to mass incarceration.~~

Alcohol Policy (Revised in 2006)

Proposed revisions to the alcohol policy with the addition of drugs and other minor word changes. There is existing policy that covers illegal and illicit substances under the Mental Health and Substance Abuse section and in the Cannabis section of the Existing Policies and Guiding Principles.

"Alcohol and Drugs

Cal Cities supports policies that limit the ability of minors to engage in alcohol or drug consumption, and limit youth access to alcoholic beverages **and illegal drugs; so long as related any related** state-mandated programs or services **shall** provide for full reimbursement to all local agencies.

Cal Cities supports local policies that hold social hosts responsible for underage drinking **or illegal drug usage** that occurs on property under their possession, control, or authority.

Cal Cities supports additional penalties for repeat driving under the **influence of alcohol or drugs** (DUI) offenders that include, but are not limited to, permanent revocation of an individual's driver's license.

Cal Cities supports legislation and other regulations intended to improve local governments' enforcement capability against alcohol licensees that are in violation of state law and local ordinances.

Cal Cities supports the ability of bars and restaurants to operate expanded outdoor premises with local and state approval.

Cal Cities supports the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-sale consumption if the beverages are in manufacturer prepackaged containers with local and state approval.

Domestic Violence Policy Addition

Given the range of domestic violence-related legislation that has passed this year, along with newly introduced bills and the interest expressed by committee members, we ask you

to consider the following proposed policy aimed at preventing domestic violence and enhancing protections for survivors:

“Cal Cities supports legislation that strengthens protections for survivors of domestic violence, including providing courts with tools to increase penalties for offenders who violate domestic violence protective orders, particularly in serious or repeated cases.”

“Cal Cities supports expanded access to survivor-centered resources, such as professional domestic violence response teams, that provide coordinated, expert intervention when implemented at the discretion of local governments and in collaboration with law enforcement to ensure both survivor safety and effective response”.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Public Safety Policy Committee discuss the proposed changes to the existing policy and recommend a final decision on Cal Cities policies to the Board.

[Cal Cities Public Safety Existing Policies and Guiding Principles](#)

Cal Cities E-Bike Policy Framework Draft

EXISTING POLICY:

Micromobility

Cal Cities supports efforts that promote safety and reassert local authority when regulating emerging transportation technologies, such as e-scooters and e-bicycles, and opposes efforts to limit this authority and the city's access to meaningful data from companies operating within their jurisdiction.

PROPOSED STATEMENT:

Cal Cities supports the continued growth and use of emerging transportation technologies, such as e-scooters and e-bicycles (e-bikes) as an important mobility option that reduces vehicle trips, lowers greenhouse gas emissions, and expands transportation opportunities. Cal Cities supports efforts that promote safety and reassert local authority when regulating and opposes efforts to limit this authority and the city's access to meaningful data from companies operating within their jurisdiction.

Cal Cities supports policies that encourage safe and responsible e-bike use. Cal Cities supports a balanced statewide framework that establishes clear device classifications, manufacturing and labeling standards, rider eligibility, while allowing local governments to retain authority over operational rules such as speed limits, facility access, impoundment, and use within public rights-of-way. State policy should prioritize public safety, address high-risk devices and behaviors, and ensure that manufacturers and retailers provide accurate, tamper-resistant information about e-bike capabilities.

To ensure effective implementation, Cal Cities emphasizes the need to preserve local flexibility and avoid unfunded mandates or broad state preemption of local authority. The state should provide funding, technical assistance, and education resources to support local enforcement and outreach, and should partner with cities to access and analyze meaningful data on micromobility usage and safety outcomes. A collaborative, data-driven approach will allow policies to evolve with technology while ensuring e-bikes are safely and effectively integrated into California's diverse communities.

HOW WE GOT HERE:

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities) supports the continued growth and use of electric bicycles (e-bikes) as an important mobility tool that helps reduce vehicle trips, lowers greenhouse gas emissions, improves transportation access, and expands mobility options for residents of all ages and abilities. E-bikes support equity and access by enabling longer or more physically demanding trips for older adults, individuals with physical limitations, and residents with limited transportation options.

At the same time, cities across California are experiencing safety challenges related to rapid adoption, high-speed devices, unsafe rider behavior, unclear equipment classifications, and enforcement limitations. Cal Cities therefore supports the development of balanced statewide guardrails that promote safety, clarify device classifications, and support enforceable standards while preserving local flexibility and equitable access. The goal is not to discourage responsible e-bike use, but to ensure safe integration of these devices into communities while protecting pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and riders themselves.

Policy Framework and Proposals

1. Preserve Local Authority and Flexibility

The state should expressly recognize and preserve the authority of local governments to adopt, implement, and enforce local ordinances regulating the operation, use, and access of e-bikes on local streets, trails, and public rights-of-way. Local jurisdictions must retain flexibility to respond to unique community conditions, infrastructure constraints, and safety concerns, including management of shared-use paths, downtown areas, rural roads, and trail systems.

Any new statewide requirements related to e-bikes should not impose unfunded mandates on local governments. If new responsibilities are assigned to cities, the state should provide funding, technical assistance, and reasonable implementation timelines.

2. Statewide Framework with Local Implementation

California should establish a clear and consistent statewide framework defining e-bike classifications, manufacturing standards, and labeling requirements while allowing local governments discretion over operational rules such as speed limits and facility access.

Responsibility for defining device classifications and rider eligibility should remain at the state level, while local governments retain authority over where and how devices operate. Any statewide regulatory updates should be assigned to an appropriate state agency to allow standards to evolve with technology, rather than forcing cities to repeatedly update local definitions.

3. Safety-First Policy Development

State policy should prioritize public safety by addressing high-speed and high-power e-bikes, particularly where they pose risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Local governments should retain authority to regulate behavior that endangers public safety, including reckless operation, modified devices, and unlawful use by minors.

Guardrails may include age or eligibility standards for higher-speed devices, improved rider education, and enforcement tools to address dangerous or habitual violations. Policies should also recognize appropriate off-road uses while ensuring devices used in public spaces meet safety standards.

4. Clear Manufacturer and Retailer Responsibilities

Manufacturers and retailers should be required to provide clear, durable, and tamper-resistant labeling of e-bike classifications and technical specifications. The state should also address devices marketed as e-bikes that function as higher-speed motorized vehicles.

Cal Cities will oppose aftermarket modifications intended to mimic, conceal, or otherwise misrepresent an e-bike's original classification.

5. Support for Enforcement and Education

The state should provide funding, technical assistance, and educational resources to support local enforcement and outreach efforts, particularly in areas with high youth ridership and shared-use paths.

Because traditional traffic enforcement tools are often ineffective for e-bikes, cities should have access to practical enforcement options, including impound or storage authority when devices are involved in repeated or dangerous conduct.

6. Avoid Statewide Preemption Without Local Input

State legislation should avoid blanket preemption of local e-bike ordinances. Any statewide standards should be developed in consultation with local governments and allow stricter local rules where needed to address documented safety concerns.

Community conditions vary widely across California, and policies must preserve the ability of cities to respond to local realities.

7. Data-Driven and Adaptive Policy

The state should partner with local governments to collect and analyze data on e-bike usage, crashes, and safety outcomes to guide future policy updates. Data should include conflict locations and usage patterns to better target education and infrastructure investments.

CONDENSED VERSION

DRAFT Policy Platform: Electric Bicycle (E-Bike) Framework

Policy Statement

The League of California Cities supports the responsible expansion of electric bicycle (e-bike) use as a mobility option that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, improves transportation access, and advances equity for residents of all ages and abilities. At the same time, the League recognizes that rapid growth in e-bike use has created significant public safety, enforcement, and regulatory challenges for local governments.

Cal Cities therefore supports a balanced statewide policy framework that strengthens safety, clarifies device standards, and ensures enforceability while preserving local authority to address community-specific conditions.

Core Policy Principles

1. Protect Local Authority

The state must expressly preserve the authority of local governments to regulate the operation, use, and access of e-bikes on local streets, trails, and public rights-of-way. Cities must retain flexibility to respond to unique safety conditions, infrastructure limitations, and community needs.

State law should not preempt local ordinances or impose unfunded mandates. Any new responsibilities assigned to local governments must include funding, technical assistance, and reasonable implementation timelines.

2. Establish a Clear Statewide Regulatory Framework

The state should maintain responsibility for establishing and updating:

- E-bike classifications and definitions
- Manufacturing and equipment standards
- Labeling and identification requirements
- Rider eligibility standards

Regulatory authority should be assigned to a state agency to ensure standards can adapt to evolving technology without requiring frequent statutory changes.

3. Prioritize Public Safety

State policy must prioritize safety by addressing high-speed and high-power devices that pose risks to pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and riders.

Cal Cities supports policies that:

- Preserve local authority to regulate unsafe operation and reckless behavior
 - Address unlawful use by minors
 - Restrict unauthorized device modifications that increase speed or power
 - Establish reasonable eligibility standards for higher-speed devices
 - Strengthen rider education and safety awareness
-

4. Ensure Manufacturer and Retailer Accountability

Manufacturers and retailers should be required to:

- Provide clear, durable, tamper-resistant classification labeling
- Accurately market devices consistent with state definitions
- Comply with safety and equipment standards

The state should also establish mechanisms to improve device identification and traceability to support enforcement.

5. Support Local Enforcement and Education

The state should provide dedicated and ongoing funding to support local enforcement, education, and outreach efforts.

Local governments should have access to practical enforcement tools, including authority to impound or store devices involved in repeated or dangerous violations.

6. Prevent Broad State Preemption

State legislation should not broadly preempt local e-bike regulations. Any statewide policy must be developed in consultation with local governments and allow jurisdictions to adopt stricter rules where necessary to address documented safety concerns.

7. Promote Data-Driven Policy Development

The state should partner with local governments to collect and analyze data on e-bike usage, safety incidents, and enforcement trends. Data should inform future policy updates, infrastructure investments, and targeted education efforts.

Advocacy Position

Cal Cities supports legislation and regulatory actions consistent with this framework and will oppose measures that:

- Undermine local authority
- Create unfunded mandates
- Weaken safety standards
- Limit local governments' ability to address community-specific risks