



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 25th, 2026
10:00am - 11:00am
City Hall, Room 288

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2662 647 7890
- **Meeting Password:** g8yHjdasq24
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 United States Toll (San Francisco) (Please dial “#” after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:**
<https://sfpUBLIC.webex.com/sfpUBLIC/j.php?MTID=mda79bf8c53ae9df9caa62835a8c7232e>
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 4.

MEMBERS

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan’s Office – Frances Hsieh
Board President Rafael Mandelman’s Office – Renil Bejoy
Assessor’s Office – Holly Lung
City Attorney’s Office – Luis Zamora
Controller’s Office – Greyson Spencer
Treasurer’s Office – Eric Manke

AGENDA

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on January 21st, 2026.
- III. STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City’s state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters

- IV. PROPOSED LEGISLATION (Discussion and Action).** Discussion and possible action item: the Committee will review and discuss state legislation affecting the City and County of San Francisco. Items are listed by Department, then by bill number.

New Business

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Elly Hudson

SB 922 (Laird): Vehicles: Local Agency Charges: Use of Streets or Highways

Recommended Position: Support

Senate Bill 922 clarifies that local governments may recover the cost of street maintenance and repair of damages caused by public service operations -- such as waste hauling -- through service-related fees and charges. The bill responds to a recent court decision that disrupted long standing local practice and triggered litigation challenging how cities fund road repairs caused by heavy service vehicles. The measure restores clarity and ensures local governments can continue maintaining safe and reliable streets without shifting costs onto unrelated taxpayers.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Presenter: Elly Hudson

AB 1837 (González): Video Imaging of Parking Violations

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would extend the authorization for public transit operators to use camera enforcement technology on buses to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and at transit stops. It also expands the use of the cameras to enforce parking violations in bike lanes and double-parking.

San Francisco Environment Department

Presenter: Joseph Piasecki

SB 222 (Wiener): Residential heat pump systems: water heaters and HVAC installations

Recommended Position: Support

SB222 requires specified streamlining of local permitting for residential heat pump systems. The bill would require a city, county, or city and county, on or before July 1, 2028, to implement an online, automated permitting process that issues permits in real time to a licensed contractor for the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or residential heat pump HVAC system that meets certain criteria. For example, if the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC system would require installation of a new electrical panel or structural work, the project would not qualify for streamlining under SB222.

The bill would also require a city, county, or city and county, beginning July 1, 2027, to adopt and offer “asynchronous inspections” for installations of residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC systems. This means the contractor and inspector are not required to be on-site at the same time.

This bill also makes changes to existing law concerning the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act. The proposed changes would make homeowners association covenants, deed restrictions, and similar agreements among property owners that limit heat pump installations void and unenforceable.

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1974 (Stefani): Firearms: Voluntary firearm storage program

Recommended Position: Support

This bill authorizes law enforcement agencies to create a voluntary firearm storage program that allows persons to transfer custody of their firearm(s) to said law enforcement agency for temporary safekeeping to prevent firearm violence, suicide or injury.

The bill authorizes law enforcement agencies to provide clear instructions on the procedures for said program including checking a certain database to ensure firearms have not previously been reported lost, stolen, or involved in a crime. Firearms that are never retrieved by their owners within a one year period will be destroyed.

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1753 (Stefani): Protective Orders: Firearms and Ammunition

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would clarify and expand firearm relinquishment procedures for various protective and restraining orders. Under current law, orders can require a restrained person to relinquish any firearms in their possession or control; this bill would explicitly add ammunition to this requirement.

Second, the bill would apply prehearing firearm searches and recordkeeping requirements to civil harassment restraining orders, workplace violence restraining orders, postsecondary school restraining orders and elder or dependent adult abuse restraining orders.

Lastly, the bill would expand peace officer's authority, when responding to a domestic violence incident or enforcing a domestic violence or gun violence restraining order, to temporarily seize any ammunition in plain sight, consistent with existing requirements for firearms.

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1588 (Stefani): Vehicles: Sideshow Enhancements

Recommended Position: Support

This bill expands enforcement tools related to illegal vehicle sideshows, street takeovers, and motorbike takeovers. It authorizes warrant-based seizure and impoundment of vehicles identified through reliable video evidence, even if not seized at the time of the event, with release subject to existing 30-day impound requirements.

The bill creates a new standalone offense (Vehicle Code Section 23108) prohibiting participation in, or aiding and abetting, a sideshow or street takeover, including liability for organizers. It expressly incorporates "motorbike takeovers" into the sideshow code so that coordinated motorcycle and off highway vehicle takeovers are subject to the same criminal penalties, impound authority, and forfeiture provisions.

The measure also authorizes vehicle forfeiture upon conviction (subject to hardship provisions) and provides felony eligibility for performing drivers upon a second or subsequent conviction, or where bodily injury is proximately caused during the event.

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 1546 (Schultz): Vehicles: Driving Under the Influence

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would increase penalties for subsequent convictions for driving under the influence. Receiving a third DUI conviction within a 1 O-year period of a first conviction would be punishable as a misdemeanor or felony, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months to up to three years upon conviction. Individuals convicted of a fourth DUI within a 1 O-year period of their first conviction would be subject to longer license suspensions at five years and would be required to install a certified ignition interlock device for a mandatory period of 48 months.

San Francisco Police Department

Presenter: Steven Lopez

AB 292 (Patterson): Domestic Violence

Recommended Position: Support

This bill would raise the penalties for a second or subsequent felony domestic violence conviction (273.5) within a period of seven years from a first conviction, punishable by two, four or five years' imprisonment in a state prison and/or a fine of up to \$10,000.

Secondly, the bill would also mandate that individuals with one prior felony conviction under PC. 273.5 be imprisoned in a county jail for not less than 60 days as a mandatory condition of probation.

- V. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Nathaniel Edwards, Mayor's Office, at: nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at softf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order

the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m0ac2b903b5068e368f7095f536446c75>
NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.
- To view the meeting via phone:
 - **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001
 - **Webinar ID:** 2662 272 8681
 - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.



STATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 21st, 2026
10:00am - 11:00am
City Hall, Room 288

OVERVIEW

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above. Members of the public may view the meeting by reviewing the details below, with the video link, phone number, and other related information provided:

- **Meeting ID:** 2662 272 8681
- **Meeting Password:** pvMfJHu8g93
- **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001 United States Toll (San Francisco) (Please dial “#” after entering the Meeting ID to view the meeting)
- **Link:**
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m0ac2b903b5068e368f7095f536446c75>
- **Public Comment:** Please review instructions on page 4.

MEMBERS

Mayor’s Office (Chair) – Eileen Mariano
Supervisor Connie Chan’s Office – Frances Hsieh
Board President Rafael Mandelman’s Office – Sophie Marie
Assessor’s Office – Holly Lung
City Attorney’s Office – Luis Zamora
Controller’s Office – Greyson Spencer
Treasurer’s Office – Eric Manke

AGENDA

Meeting commenced at 10:04am.

I. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Eileen Mariano, Frances Hsieh, Sophie Marie, Holly Lung, Luis Zamora, Greyson Spencer, Eric Manke

II. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (Action Item).** Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes from the meeting on October 15th, 2025.

Motion to approve: Luis Zamora

Seconded by: Sophie Marie

Approved: 7-0

III. **STATE LOBBYIST OVERVIEW AND UPDATE (Discussion Item).** The City's state lobbyist will present to the Committee an update on State legislative matters

IV. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest that are within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction and that do not appear on the agenda.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 10:33am.

Disability Access

Room 201 of City Hall is located at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible Muni lines serving this location are: #47 Van Ness, and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness, as well as Muni Metro stations at Van Ness and Civic Center. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 923-6142. There is accessible parking at the Civic Center Plaza garage.

The State Legislation Committee does not permit remote public comment by members of the public its meetings, except as legally required to enable people with disabilities to participate in such meetings. If you require remote access as a means of reasonable accommodation under ADA, please contact the State Legislation Committee to request remote access, including a description of the functional limitation(s) that precludes your ability to attend in person. Requests made at least two business days in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. For further assistance, please contact Nathaniel Edwards, Mayor's Office, at: nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

The government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Donna Hall at Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, by phone at 415-554-7724, by fax at 415-554-7854, or email the Sunshine Ordinance Taskforce Administrator at softf@sfgov.org. Citizens may obtain a free copy of the Sunshine Ordinance by contacting the Task Force, or by printing Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code on the Internet, at www.sfgov.org/sunshine.htm.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sec. 2.100 –2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone 415-581-2300, fax 415-581-2317, Internet website: www.sfgov.org/ethics.

Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order

the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

Public Comment

Public Comment will be taken in-person on each item on the agenda before or during consideration of that item.

- To view the meeting via computer systems:
<https://sfpublic.webex.com/sfpublic/j.php?MTID=m0ac2b903b5068e368f7095f536446c75>
NOTE: Depending on your broadband/WIFI connection, there may be a 30-second to 2-minute delay when viewing the meeting live.

- To view the meeting via phone:
 - **Join by Phone at:** +1-415-655-0001
 - **Webinar ID:** 2662 272 8681
 - **NOTE:** Once you join the meeting via the number above, enter the webinar ID and then press # to enter the meeting.

Information Regarding Providing Public Comment

Each individual may comment 1 time per agenda item.

Each individual may speak for up to 2 minutes; after which time the line is automatically silenced.

Documents that may have been provided to members of the State Legislation Committee in connection with the items on the agenda include proposed state legislation, consultant reports, correspondence and reports from City departments, and public correspondence. These may be inspected by contacting Eileen Mariano, Manager, State and Federal Affairs, Mayor's Office at: eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org.

Health Considerations

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	2/17/2026
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency
Contact Name	Monique Webster
Contact Email and Phone Number	Monique.webster@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Elly Hudson
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

SB 922

Senator John Laird (District 17, Democrat)

Vehicles: Local Agency Charges: Use of Streets or Highways

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

Senate Bill 922 clarifies that local governments may recover the cost of street maintenance and repair of damages caused by public service operations -- such as waste hauling -- through service-related fees and charges. The bill responds to a recent court decision that disrupted long standing local practice and triggered litigation challenging how cities fund road repairs caused by heavy service vehicles. The measure restores clarity and ensures local governments can continue maintaining safe and reliable streets without shifting costs onto unrelated taxpayers.

Background/Analysis

Local governments are responsible for maintaining most local streets and roads in California. Heavy service vehicles, such as garbage, recycling, and green waste trucks, regularly use local streets and contribute significantly to pavement wear and deterioration. For decades, local governments have included the cost of repairing this damage in the rates, fees, or franchise arrangements associated with providing those services, rather than relying solely on general fund revenues or limited state transportation funds.

In 2025, the Court of Appeal’s decision in *Rogers v. City of Redlands* upended this long-standing understanding. The court held that including street repair costs within a local government’s solid waste rates was unlawful, even where the charges were tied to the impacts of providing waste collection services. This interpretation departed from how local governments and many practitioners had historically understood the law and immediately created uncertainty across the state.

Challenge

The *Rogers* decision exists within a broader legal landscape that has increasingly scrutinized how local government charges are structured. In *Zolly v. City of Oakland* (2022), the California Supreme Court confirmed that certain solid waste related charges may be challenged by ratepayers and emphasized the need for clarity

regarding the legal basis for those charges. Earlier, in *County Sanitation District No. 2 v. County of Kern* (2005), the court interpreted the relevant statutory framework as being focused on vehicle weight fees, reinforcing that the underlying restriction was not designed to prohibit local cost recovery tied to providing public services. On the other hand, the Court of Appeal held in both *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association v. City of Roseville* (2002) and *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association v. City of Fresno* (2005) that Proposition 218 allows for recovery of costs for road impacts associated with provision of utility service.

Following *Rogers*, a number of cities have been sued over long-standing waste collection fees and franchise agreements. Litigation is already pending in multiple communities. Without legislative clarification, additional lawsuits are expected. Many are already in the works.

This issue is occurring at a time when California's streets are already in poor condition. A 2023 statewide assessment found that the average pavement condition across local streets is rated "At Risk," and that maintaining even that condition requires \$3.76 billion annually, while reaching "Good" condition requires about \$8.54 billion per year. At the same time, transportation revenues are projected to decline as vehicle electrification reduces gas tax receipts. Compounding the challenge, electric waste hauling trucks are heavier than traditional vehicles and can cause greater pavement damage, further increasing maintenance needs.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Senate Bill 922 restores clarity and long-standing local authority by reaffirming that charges used to recover the cost of street maintenance and repair associated with providing public services or operating public works are lawful and permitted. The bill makes clear that the existing prohibition at issue is limited to weight-based charges and does not apply to service-related fees that recover roadway impacts caused by public service operations.

The bill expressly rejects the interpretation adopted in *Rogers v. City of Redlands* and returns the law to the understanding that existed for decades prior to that decision. It does not create new fee authority, expand local taxing authority, or impose costs on the state.

By restoring certainty, Senate Bill 922 allows local governments to continue maintaining local streets safely and responsibly, ensures that roadway repair costs are borne by the activities that cause the damage, and reduces the risk of ongoing litigation that diverts public resources away from infrastructure and public safety.

Departments Impacted & Why

Public Works and/or City Administrator are the departments that would be most likely to charge fees.

Fiscal Impact

To our knowledge, San Francisco does not currently impose charges used to recover the cost of street maintenance and repair associated with providing public services or operating public works. But this legislation provides much needed clarity on this topic and would preserve the ability of the City to charge such fees in the future. And, the legislation clarifies the City's understanding that Section 9400.8 applies solely to fees based on weight and not to other generally applicable fees.

Support / Opposition

Sponsors/Support

League of California Cities (Cal Cities)
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	2/13/2026
Submitting Department	Municipal Transportation Agency
Contact Name	Monique Webster
Contact Email and Phone Number	Monique.webster@sfmta.com
SLC Meeting Presenter	Elly Hudson
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO XN/A

AB 1837

Assemblymember Mark González (District 54, Democrat)

Video Imaging of Parking Violations

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

[Provide high-level summary of the bill in question and brief explanation of recommended position.]

This bill would extend the authorization for public transit operators to use camera enforcement technology on buses to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and at transit stops. It also expands the use of the cameras to enforce parking violations in bike lanes and double-parking.

Background/Analysis

[Provide history of the issue in question and/or a description of the law as it currently stands.]

AB 917 (Bloom, 2021) established the authority for all public transit agencies in the state to install forward-facing cameras on public transit vehicles for the purposes of enforcing parking violations that occur in transit-only lanes and at transit stops, extending an authority that had previously only existed for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (since 2007) and the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (since 2016). AB 361 (Ward, 2023) also gave a similar authority to install automated forward-facing cameras on city-owned or district-owned parking enforcement vehicles to capture parking violations occurring in bicycle lanes. Both bills addressed key issues of transit efficiency and public safety. These authorities help to remove impediments to public transit by disincentivizing illegal parking and stopping in transit lanes. The authorities also help improve street safety -- by keeping these lanes clear, transit riders do not have to cross potentially dangerous gaps between the street and the curb, and transit operators do not have to make potentially dangerous maneuvers to ensure their riders can get on and off efficiently.

Challenge

[Describe the challenge or problem that this bill is trying to solve for and the impacts to San Francisco.]

The existing authority for camera enforcement expires on January 1, 2027, which would cause most local transit agencies to lose the ability to keep their transit only lane enforcement programs operational as they

work to maintain safe and efficient transit service. SFMTA is not subject to the sunset provision, however other Bay Area transit operators would be impacted. Camera enforcement programs have been used to great success with SFMTA reporting a 20% reduction in transit delays and AC Transit reporting their on-time performance improved from 54% to 75%. Other agencies have only recently begun their programs, and similar results are already expected.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

By removing the sunset on the pilot program authority, transit agencies will be able to continue to ensure safe and efficient public transit lanes for the foreseeable future. The bill also requires transit agencies undertaking a program after January 1, 2027, to report to the Legislature on the program’s effectiveness two years after implementation. By expanding the authority to use the cameras for video enforcement of unlawfully stopping or parking in bike lanes and double parking, the bill would further enhance movement and street safety for all users.

Departments Impacted & Why

SFMTA

Fiscal Impact

Expected revenue from citations

Support / Opposition

California Transit Association (Co-Sponsor)
Streets for All (Co-Sponsor)
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC
Transit)



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	2/13/2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Environment Dept - ENV
Contact Name	Joseph Piasecki
Contact Email and Phone Number	Joseph.piasecki@sfgov.org 415-519-4877
SLC Meeting Presenter	Joseph Piasecki
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO X N/A

SB222

Senator Scott Wiener, Senate District 11, Democrat

SB-222 Residential heat pump systems: water heaters and HVAC installations

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

SB222 requires specified streamlining of local permitting for residential heat pump systems. The bill would require a city, county, or city and county, on or before July 1, 2028, to implement an online, automated permitting process that issues permits in real time to a licensed contractor for the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or residential heat pump HVAC system that meets certain criteria. For example, if the installation of a residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC system would require installation of a new electrical panel or structural work, the project would not qualify for streamlining under SB222.

The bill would also require a city, county, or city and county, beginning July 1, 2027, to adopt and offer “asynchronous inspections” for installations of residential heat pump water heater or heat pump HVAC systems. This means the contractor and inspector are not required to be on-site at the same time.

This bill also makes changes to existing law concerning the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act. The proposed changes would make homeowners association covenants, deed restrictions, and similar agreements among property owners that limit heat pump installations void and unenforceable.

Background/Analysis

In San Francisco, residential buildings are responsible for 25% of citywide total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and natural gas use is responsible for 95% of GHG emissions from the operation of residential buildings. (Source: [San Francisco GHG Inventory – 2022](#)) Switching residential heating and water heating from gas-fueled appliances to electric heat pumps supplied with electricity from CleanPowerSF reduces the GHG emissions of an average San Francisco single family home by 90% on average (SF Environment analysis).

Californians need relief from high energy costs and the extreme temperature changes driven by climate change, and heat pumps are an essential solution to both problems. This bill will create a standardized

permitting process across the state that is faster, simpler, and cheaper for homeowners and contractors. Making these dual-use, zero-pollution air filtration and HVAC systems more accessible will help Californians build climate resilience and speed the recovery of communities impacted from climate disasters. Updating the permitting process is also an essential step to help the state meet its goals of installing 6 million heat pumps by 2030 and achieving carbon neutrality by 2045.

Interviews with heat pump installers point to a number of barriers to installing heat pump equipment, including costs compared to gas systems, inspection wait times, local architectural requirements, wide variations in requirements across jurisdictions, and the need to obtain multiple permit types for a water heater installation. Burdensome requirements and delays can drive up the cost of installations and limit the time that qualified contractors have to work on other projects, tightening the supply of labor available to meet increasing demand for heat pump appliances. Contractors and consumers report that the requirements and cost for installing a permitted heat pump vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. San Francisco primarily permits heat pumps via instant online trade permits – one of the fastest approaches in the state. Many jurisdictions permit heat pumps with a single consolidated permit and minimal fees, as proposed by the bill. In others, however, securing a permit can take significant back-and-forth with a city, and cost several thousand dollars; adoption of SB222 would substantially improve consistency, efficiency in public resources, and the experience of the public statewide.

Challenge

Like many communities statewide, San Francisco currently requires up to three separate permits (electrical, plumbing/mechanical, and building) in order to install a heat pump water heater or space heating system – which in turn requires three separate inspections. This generally requires the installation contractor to be on-site for 2 or more hours for each inspection; the labor cost of standing for three separate inspections can be greater than the cost of equipment or installation. Specialized inspection is valuable to public safety in large projects but poses practical and cost barriers to installation of individual appliances.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Simplifying permitting reduces the cost and time required to replacing gas appliances with heat pumps, accelerating adoption and aligning the permitting and inspection process to help achieve San Francisco's climate goals

Departments Impacted & Why

Building Inspection: Significant change to procedure for inspection. May require staff training. However, sending a single appropriately trained inspector to a project installing a single heat pump water heater would require less staff labor per project.

Bay Area Air District Rule 9-6 requires new tank-type residential water heaters (75k Btu or less) installed or sold in the Bay Area after January 1, 2027, and new residential furnaces installed or sold after January 1, 2029 to emit zero NOx. Electric heat pumps are the only technology that meets these zero NOx standards and comply with CA Title 24 Part 6 Energy Standards. Updating permitting and inspection processes will be essential to improving efficiency in City processes, supporting safe & legal work, and meeting expectations of the public as these technologies become the norm.

SF Environment: Legislation would help the installation of heat pump water heaters and space heaters, helping the city's residential buildings make changes that are essential to the city's climate goals. Helps improve equitable access to clean heat and clean water heating.

Fiscal Impact

This legislation caps the cost a municipality can charge for a HPWH permit at \$150. While this may lower existing permit fees in San Francisco, the simplicity of access, and promotion by SFE should lead to more installations as residents take advantage of existing appliance incentives.

DBI: May estimate fiscal impact.

SFE: No impact.

State: No known impact.

Support / Opposition

SUPPORT: (Verified 1/21/26)

A. O. Smith Corporation
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Building Decarbonization Coalition
Carrier Global Corporation
Efficiency First California
Green Building Initiative
Lg Electronics USA
Natural Resources Defense Council
Rewiring America
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban
Research Association
U.S. Green Building Council, California

OPPOSITION: (Verified 1/21/26)

Community Associations Institute - California
Legislative Action Committee League of California
Cities



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	February 17, 2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Police Department
Contact Name	Steven Lopez
Contact Email and Phone Number	Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Steven Lopez
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

[AB 1974]

**[Assemlbmember Catherine Stefani, Assembly District #19, Democrat – San Francisco]
[Firearms: Voluntary firearm storage program]**

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill authorizes law enforcement agencies to create a voluntary firearm storage program that allows persons to transfer custody of their firearm(s) to said law enforcement agency for temporary safekeeping to prevent firearm violence, suicide or injury.

The bill authorizes law enforcement agencies to provide clear instructions on the procedures for said program including checking a certain database to ensure firearms have not previously been reported lost, stolen, or involved in a crime. Firearms that are never retrieved by their owners within a one year period will be destroyed.

Background/Analysis

Firearm storage in California is mostly limited to licensed firearm dealers who have discretion to store firearms for customers for various reasons such as travel, visiting guests, moving or any other reason. However, it is not guaranteed that every firearm dealer will offer this service and availability varies significantly by location in the State.

Currently, most law enforcement agencies do not provide temporary storage options for firearms, as firearms surrendered to law enforcement are generally subject to permanent relinquishment and destruction. Allowing agencies to set up procedures for voluntary surrender would create an additional, reliable alternative for firearm owners, particularly those experiencing a mental health crisis or facing limited access to secure storage options.

Challenge

San Francisco currently does not have any licensed firearm dealers within its jurisdiction so gun owners need to travel outside of city limits to find a firearm dealer that will temporarily store a firearm. This lack of local options can be especially problematic in urgent situations, potentially leaving firearms in environments where their continued presence may pose a serious safety risk.

In 2025, SFPD announced a partnership with the non-profit organization Pierce's Pledge establishing a temporary firearm surrender program for members of the public to make use of. While this partnership helped address the immediate storage gap, it operates outside a formal statutory framework and is limited in scope.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1974 would provide clear legal authority for law enforcement agencies to offer voluntary firearm storage throughout the State ensuring consistency and sustainability. By expanding on the model offered in San Francisco, this bill provides firearm owners with a safe, local and temporary storage option, eliminating the need to travel outside the city and supporting public safety objectives.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill has the potential to impact the San Francisco Police Department and San Francisco Sheriff's Office by allowing these agencies to develop procedures to temporarily store firearms.

Fiscal Impact

This bill has the potential to fiscally impact law enforcement agencies in terms of storage costs of temporarily stored firearms, although the bill does not place any prohibitions on agencies to levy any reasonable fees to offset operational expenses.

Support / Opposition

None to report at this time.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org

Date Submitted	February 13th, 2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Police Department
Contact Name	Steven Lopez
Contact Email and Phone Number	Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Steven Lopez
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

[AB 1753]

[Assemblymember, Catherine Stefani, Assembly District #19, Democrat-San Francisco]

[Protective Orders: Firearms and Ammunition]

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would clarify and expand firearm relinquishment procedures for various protective and restraining orders. Under current law, orders can require a restrained person to relinquish any firearms in their possession or control; this bill would explicitly add ammunition to this requirement.

Second, the bill would apply prehearing firearm searches and recordkeeping requirements to civil harassment restraining orders, workplace violence restraining orders, postsecondary school restraining orders and elder or dependent adult abuse restraining orders.

Lastly, the bill would expand peace officer’s authority, when responding to a domestic violence incident or enforcing a domestic violence or gun violence restraining order, to temporarily seize any ammunition in plain sight, consistent with existing requirements for firearms.

Background/Analysis

From 2013 to 2022, the California Department of Justice reports that a majority of female homicide victims in the state were killed by current or former intimate partners, and most child homicide victims ages one to 14 were killed by a family member. Among domestic violence related firearm homicides, women account for roughly 83% of victims, while most minor victims were killed by a parent. Beyond fatalities, firearms are frequently used as tools of coercion and intimidation. Studies show that nearly one million women have been shot or shot at by an intimate partner. These figures demonstrate that firearm related harm in domestic violence extends beyond homicide. Domestic violence related firearm homicides also disproportionately impact communities of color. The same

The same report from CA DOJ found that Hispanic victims represented the second largest group, and black individuals are overrepresented among adult and minor victims in this category.

Domestic violence incidents are among the most dangerous and common calls for law enforcement. California agencies respond to roughly 164,000 domestic violence calls annually; although only one percent involve a firearm, that still translates to approximately 1,600 firearm related incidents. Research consistently shows that firearm presence in these situations greatly increases the risk of homicide for victims, children and responding officers.

While most studies focus on domestic violence, firearm access also elevates the risk in other contexts that trigger protective or restraining orders. California Department of Justice reports that 99% of protective orders with firearm provisions issued in 2023 were orders other than Gun Violence Restraining Orders (GVRO). This shows that courts routinely identify firearm related safety risks across a broad range of protective or restraining order types.

Challenge

There is a critical need to keep firearms and ammunition out of the hands of people who are the subject of protective or restraining orders due to credible safety concerns. The data on this issue is clear and well established, the presence of a firearm in these scenarios dramatically increase the risk of homicide for victims and law enforcement alike. While California has adopted several policies to reduce firearm related harm, the continued prevalence of interpersonal violence underscores the need to standardize firearm relinquishment procedures in all protective order contexts where a credible threat exists.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

Current law mandates that before the hearing of a domestic violence or gun violence restraining order, for a search to be conducted to determine among other things if the subject of the proposed order owns or possesses a firearm and for the firearm(s) to be relinquished. AB 1753 would expand this requirement in two ways: first, by explicitly including ammunition to this same requirement; and second, to expand this search and relinquishment procedure to other types of protective orders such as: civil harassment, workplace violence, postsecondary school, and elder/dependent adult abuse restraining orders.

The bill also expands the power of law enforcement when responding to a domestic violence incident or when enforcing a domestic violence or gun violence restraining order to temporarily seize any ammunition in plain sight. Current law only mandates officers to seize firearms in plain sight, not ammunition.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill has the potential to impact SFPD, the District Attorney's Office and the judicial system by expanding the category of restraining orders that mandate a prehearing firearms search.

Fiscal Impact

This bill is not expected to result in significant additional costs to local law enforcement.

Support / Opposition

None to report at this time.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org

Date Submitted	February 13th, 2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Police Department
Contact Name	Steven Lopez
Contact Email and Phone Number	Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Steven Lopez
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

[AB 1588]

**[Assemlymember, Catherine Stefani, Assembly District #19, Democrat-San Francisco]
[Vehicles: Sideshow Enhancements]**

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill expands enforcement tools related to illegal vehicle sideshows, street takeovers, and motorbike takeovers. It authorizes warrant-based seizure and impoundment of vehicles identified through reliable video evidence, even if not seized at the time of the event, with release subject to existing 30-day impound requirements.

The bill creates a new standalone offense (Vehicle Code Section 23108) prohibiting participation in, or aiding and abetting, a sideshow or street takeover, including liability for organizers. It expressly incorporates "motorbike takeovers" into the sideshow code so that coordinated motorcycle and off-highway vehicle takeovers are subject to the same criminal penalties, impound authority, and forfeiture provisions.

The measure also authorizes vehicle forfeiture upon conviction (subject to hardship provisions) and provides felony eligibility for performing drivers upon a second or subsequent conviction, or where bodily injury is proximately caused during the event.

Background/Analysis

Illegal sideshows and street takeovers have become increasingly dangerous and a widespread issue in California. According to the California Highway Patrol, there were approximately 7300 sideshow incidents in 2021. Between 2019-2024 they have resulted in approximately 264 crashes and 30 fatalities.

In addition to traffic collisions and loss of life, sideshows often involve reckless driving, assaults, vandalism and interfere with emergency response. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors have

attempted to address this issue through local ordinances and enforcement strategies; however, these efforts have produced limited results due to state level impoundment qualifications and the highly mobile nature of these events.

Under existing state law, 30-day impound authority for speed contests and related offenses generally requires arrest of the driver at the time of the incident. AB 1588 expands this authority by allowing a judge to issue a warrant for seizure based on an affidavit supported by reliable video evidence, without requiring an arrest at the scene of the sideshow.

Challenge

San Francisco residents have repeatedly and vocally expressed concerns regarding the regular and dangerous occurrence of sideshows in their neighborhoods. These events pose a serious risk to participants, bystanders and responding officers while significantly degrading the quality of life through excessive noise, property damage and prolonged roadway blockages.

As community frustration continues to grow, law enforcement requires additional state-level tools that both deter participation and reduce the need for dangerous, resource intensive enforcement tactics during active events.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1588 expands enforcement tools related to illegal sideshows, street takeovers, and motorbike takeovers. The bill authorizes warrant-based seizure and 30-day impoundment of vehicles identified through reliable video evidence, even if not seized at the time of the event, with release subject to existing impound requirements.

This allows SFPD to leverage technology to identify and locate vehicles after incidents, reducing the need for immediate intervention in volatile crowds while strengthening deterrence.

The bill also creates a new standalone offense (Vehicle Code Section 23108) prohibiting participation in, or aiding and abetting, a sideshow, expressly incorporating motorbike takeovers, authorizes vehicle forfeiture upon conviction, and provides felony eligibility for performing drivers upon repeat convictions or where bodily injury is caused.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill has the potential to impact the SFPD by giving officers alternatives to high risk sideshow corralling by way of leveraging technology to locate and impound vehicles after participation in a sideshow.

Fiscal Impact

This bill is not anticipated to result in significant additional costs to local law enforcement. By giving alternative options to sideshow corralling, the bill could potentially save personnel costs.

Support / Opposition

None to report at this time.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Joshua Cardenas at Joshua.Cardenas@sfgov.org.

Date Submitted	February 13 th , 2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Police Department
Contact Name	Steven Lopez
Contact Email and Phone Number	Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Steven Lopez
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

[AB 1546]

[Assemblymember, Nicholas Schultz, Assembly District #44, Democrat-Burbank]

[Vehicles: Driving Under the Influence]

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would increase penalties for subsequent convictions for driving under the influence. Receiving a third DUI conviction within a 10-year period of a first conviction would be punishable as a misdemeanor or felony, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months to up to three years upon conviction. Individuals convicted of a fourth DUI within a 10-year period of their first conviction would be subject to longer license suspensions at five years and would be required to install a certified ignition interlock device for a mandatory period of 48 months.

Background/Analysis

From 2017 to 2024 there have been approximately 1180 DUI arrests in the City and County of San Francisco. Impaired drivers continue to pose a significant threat to public safety, placing drivers, passengers, pedestrians and cyclists at risk.

Nationally, approximately 12,000 people are killed in impaired driving crashes, equating to roughly one death every 39 minutes. Repeat DUI offenders represent a heightened risk, as multiple convictions demonstrate a pattern of behavior that existing penalties have not sufficiently deterred.

Challenge

Repeat offenders present an ongoing danger to the public and strain law enforcement resources. Current sentencing structures do not appropriately distinguish habitual offenders from first-time offenders.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 1546 directly addresses repeat offenders by escalating consequences for individuals who continue to violate DUI laws within a 10-year period. By giving discretion to charge third or subsequent DUI charges as misdemeanors or felonies, the bill provides prosecutors and courts with greater discretion to seek penalties proportionate to the offender's history and risk to public safety.

For habitual repeat offenders who are convicted four or more times, they are kept off the roads for a longer period of time at five years and must also have an ignition interlock device installed on their vehicle for a longer period of time at 48 months. By raising the penalties and accountability measures for repeat offenders, we can keep dangerous drivers off the roads for longer periods of time and ensure they have sufficient time to seek rehabilitation for their behaviors.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill has the potential to impact the SFPD, SF Sheriffs, District Attorneys Office and the Public Defender's Office. The creation of wobblers for repeat DUI offenses could result in an increase in felony filings and longer periods of incarceration in county jail, affecting enforcement, prosecution, defense, and carceral custodial operations.

Fiscal Impact

This bill may result in increased costs associated with prosecution, public defense, court proceedings, and incarceration for individuals charged or convicted of repeat DUI offenses. These costs may be partially offset by reductions in DUI-related collisions, injuries, fatalities, and associated emergency response and healthcare expenditures.

Support / Opposition

None to report at this time.



State Legislation Committee Proposal Form

This form should be used to submit legislative proposals for consideration by the State Legislation Committee. We ask that you keep your submissions under two pages. Before submission, proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Department Head or Commission. Please send completed forms to Eileen Mariano at Eileen.f.mariano@sfgov.org, Aly Bonde at aly.bonde@sfgov.org, and Nathaniel Edwards at nathaniel.edwards@sfgov.org

Date Submitted	February 13 th , 2026
Submitting Department	San Francisco Police Department
Contact Name	Steven Lopez
Contact Email and Phone Number	Steven.Lopez1@sfgov.org
SLC Meeting Presenter	Steven Lopez
Reviewed and approved by Department Head?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Reviewed and approved by Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

[AB 292]
[Assemblymember, Joe Patterson, Assembly District #5, Republican-Rocklin]
[Domestic Violence]

Recommended Position

SPONSOR SUPPORT SUPPORT if amended OPPOSE OTHER & Describe

Summary

This bill would raise the penalties for a second or subsequent felony domestic violence conviction (273.5) within a period of seven years from a first conviction, punishable by two, four or five years' imprisonment in a state prison and/or a fine of up to \$10,000.

Secondly, the bill would also mandate that individuals with one prior felony conviction under PC. 273.5 be imprisoned in a county jail for not less than 60 days as a mandatory condition of probation.

Background/Analysis

Domestic violence is not a private dispute, these incidents represent a high-risk violent crime that can have long lasting effects on survivors, officers and children that may be involved in these incidents. According to the National Institute of Health, approximately half of survivors of domestic violence report a recurrence of domestic violence within a year and further, half of perpetrators of domestic violence commit a new episode of general violence within three months of a prior incident.

*Beyond the danger posed to first responders, domestic violence calls represent immense danger for survivors due to the unpredictability of offenders and the high likelihood of escalation. Weapons are involved in approximately 19% of domestic violence incidents which increase the risk of homicide by **500%**. Children who are exposed to domestic violence are additionally at significantly higher risk of adverse, long-term outcomes such as post-traumatic stress, depression and anxiety.*

Challenge

Calls related to domestic violence are one of the most dangerous calls an officer can respond to and have substantially high risks of harm to victims, children and first responders that may be present at the scene. According to the FBI, approximately 4194 officer assaults occur annually from domestic violence calls and between 1980 and 2006 a total of 113,236 officer assaults occurred at responses related to these incidents. These calls disproportionately account for some of the highest numbers of line-of-duty deaths among officers nationwide.

These incidents are often volatile and unpredictable, with a well-documented tendency to escalate in both frequency and severity. Despite this reality, current state laws governing felony domestic violence do not adequately account for repeat offending. Under current law, felony domestic violence is punishable by imprisonment in county jail for not more than a year or state prison for 2-4 years. However, these sentencing guidelines do not change based on repeat offenses despite evidence showing that domestic violence offenders have higher recidivism rates than other felony offenders. Additionally, current law only mandates a 15 day stay in a county jail as a condition of probation for felony domestic violence for having one prior conviction within a seven-year period. The 60-day condition only applies to individuals with two or more prior convictions within the previous seven years of prior conviction. This short window represents a real danger to victims who will only have approximately two weeks to make safety plans before their abuser is released back into the community on probation.

Solution/Recommended Proposal

AB 292 is a measured, targeted and evidence-based response to the serious public safety risks posed by repeated felony domestic violence offenders. By applying the sentencing increase only to individuals with 2nd or subsequent felony convictions under PC 273.5 within a seven-year period, the bill focuses narrowly on repeat, high-risk offenders rather than first-time or misdemeanor conduct.

Increasing the mandatory county jail period as a condition of probation provides survivors with additional time to secure safety planning, housing, protective orders, and support services, while also creating a meaningful period of accountability for offenders. This approach balances public safety with judicial discretion and reinforces the seriousness of repeated violent conduct. AB 292 strengthens protections for survivors and children, addresses documented gaps in current sentencing law, and helps reduce the frequency and severity of dangerous domestic violence incidents benefiting survivors, law enforcement and the broader community alike.

Departments Impacted & Why

This bill has the potential to impact on SFPD, SF Sheriffs, District Attorneys Office and the Public Defender's Office due to increased prosecution, supervision, custody, and defense obligations related to repeat felony domestic violence cases.

Fiscal Impact

This bill may result in increased costs associated with prosecution, public defense, court proceedings, and incarceration for individuals transitioning into probation convicted of repeat felony domestic violence. These costs may be partially offset by long-term reductions in recidivism, emergency response demands, and downstream impacts on victims and the criminal justice system.

Support / Opposition

This bill is currently supported by the following organizations: California State Sheriffs' Association (Sponsor), Arcadia Police Officers' Association, Brea Police Association, Burbank Police Officers' Association, Calegislation, California Association of School Police Chiefs, California Baptist for Biblical Values, California Coalition of School Safety Professionals, California District Attorneys Association, California Narcotic Officers' Association, California Reserve Peace Officers Association, Chief Probation Officers' of California (CPOC), Claremont Police Officers Association, Crime Victims United of California, Culver City Police Officers' Association, Fullerton Police Officers' Association, Hilde B Foundation, Los Angeles School Police Management Association, Los Angeles School Police Officers Association, Murrieta Police Officers' Association, Newport Beach Police Association, Orange County Sheriff's Department, 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, San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department, Santa Ana Police Officers Association

This bill is also opposed by the following organizations: ACLU California Action, All of Us or None, Los Angeles Alliance for Boys and Men of Color, Anti Police-terror Project, California Attorneys for Criminal Justice, California Black Power Network, California Public Defenders Association, Californians for Safety and Justice, Californians United for A Responsible Budget, Dignity and Power, Now Drug Policy Alliance, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights, Fair Chance Project, Freedom 4 Youth, Friends Committee on Legislation of California, Initiate Justice Action, Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice, Justice2jobs Coalition, LA Defensa, Legal Services for Prisoners With Children, Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union, Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition, Liberation, and Empowerment, Rubicon Programs, Ryse Center, San Francisco Public Defender, Silicon Valley De-bug, Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition, Smart Justice California, South Bay People Power, Uncommon Law, Universidad Popular, Vera Institute of Justice