

Date of Hearing: June 26, 2024

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Juan Carrillo, Chair

SB 925 (Wiener) – As Amended June 3, 2024

SENATE VOTE: Not relevant

SUBJECT: City and County of San Francisco: merchandising sales.

SUMMARY: Allows the City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco) to require a permit for the sale on public property of merchandise that is a common target of retail theft, and to impose infractions and misdemeanors for violations. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Allows San Francisco to adopt an ordinance requiring a permit for the sale, on public property, including public streets or sidewalks, of merchandise that San Francisco has determined is a common target of retail theft.
- 2) Requires, if San Francisco passes such an ordinance, the ordinance to include all of the following written findings:
 - a) That there has been a significant pattern of merchandise being the subject of retail theft and then appearing for sale on public property within San Francisco.
 - b) That requiring a permit to sell will further the objective of preventing retail theft.
 - c) That there are reasonable permit requirements to enable the lawful sale of merchandise and to safeguard civil rights.
- 3) Provides that an ordinance adopted pursuant to this bill may remain in effect for up to three years, subject to annual renewal of the written findings.
- 4) Requires an ordinance adopted pursuant to this bill to identify a local permitting agency, separate from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), that shall be responsible for administering a permit system. The permitting agency shall:
 - a) Adopt rules and procedures for administering the permit system.
 - b) Issue permits to persons who are able to demonstrate that they obtained the merchandise lawfully and not through theft or extortion.
- 5) Allows an ordinance adopted pursuant to this bill to provide that selling merchandise without a permit is punishable as an infraction, and that subsequent violations after two prior convictions are infractions or misdemeanors punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months.
- 6) Provides that nothing in this bill shall be construed to affect the applicability of other state or local laws, as specified.

- 7) Provides that existing law governing the regulation of sidewalk vendors by cities and counties shall not be construed to affect the applicability of state or local laws that prohibit the purchase or sale of stolen property, as specified.
- 8) Finds and declares that a special statute is necessary and that a general statute cannot be made applicable within the meaning of Section 16 of Article IV of the California Constitution because of the need to address the issues relative to fencing and retail theft operations in San Francisco.
- 9) Provides that no reimbursement is required by this bill pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Allows, under the California Constitution, a city or county to “make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” This is commonly referred to as the police power of cities and counties.
- 2) Prohibits local authorities from regulating sidewalk vendors, unless they adopt a regulatory framework consistent with the following provisions:
 - a) Prohibits a city or county from requiring sidewalk vendors to operate within specific parts of the public right-of-way, except where that restriction is directly related to objective health, safety, or welfare concerns. Local authorities can neither restrict the overall number of sidewalk vendors, nor require sidewalk vendors to operate only in a designated area, unless these restrictions are directly related to health, safety, or welfare concerns.
 - b) Allows cities and counties to prohibit sidewalk vendors from operating near farmers markets, swap meets, and special events, and to prohibit stationary vendors (but not roaming vendors) in certain circumstances in parks and exclusively residential zones. Sidewalk vending in parks may be further restricted if the requirements are any of the following:
 - i) Directly related to objective health, safety, or welfare concerns.
 - ii) Necessary to ensure the public’s use and enjoyment of natural resources and recreational opportunities.
 - iii) Necessary to prevent an undue concentration of commercial activity that unreasonably interferes with the scenic and natural character of the park.
 - c) Allows cities and counties to adopt additional requirements regulating the time, place, and manner of sidewalk vending if the requirements are directly related to objective health, safety, or welfare concerns, as specified.

- d) Prohibits criminal penalties for violations of sidewalk vending ordinances and instead establishes an administrative fine structure.
- e) Allows a local authority with a compliant sidewalk vending program to impose an administrative penalty of \$100 for a first violation of the local sidewalk vending ordinance, \$200 for a second violation within one year of the first violation, and \$300 for each additional violation within one year of the first violation. Administrative penalties for vending without a permit follow a similar structure and are \$250, \$500, and \$1,000, respectively.
- f) Requires an adjudicator of these fines to take into account the ability of the violator to pay the fine and allows a violator to require an ability to pay determination at any point. A local authority must accept 20% of the fine in full satisfaction if the violator earns less than 125% of the federal poverty line.
- g) Prohibits any local authorities from imposing any additional financial penalties, and prohibits penalties for violations of sidewalk vending from being subject to arrest, except where permitted under law.

FISCAL EFFECT: This bill is keyed fiscal and contains a state-mandated local program.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Bill Summary.** This bill allows San Francisco to adopt an ordinance requiring a permit for the sale, on public property, including public streets or sidewalks, of merchandise that San Francisco has determined is a common target of retail theft. Any such ordinance must include all of the following written findings:
 - a) That there has been a significant pattern of merchandise being the subject of retail theft and then appearing for sale on public property within San Francisco.
 - b) That requiring a permit to sell will further the objective of preventing retail theft.
 - c) That there are reasonable permit requirements to enable the lawful sale of merchandise and to safeguard civil rights.

Any such ordinance may remain in effect for up to three years, subject to annual renewal of the written findings. The ordinance must identify a local permitting agency, separate from the SFPD, which shall be responsible for administering the permit system. The permitting agency must adopt rules and procedures for administering the permit system. It must also issue permits to persons who are able to demonstrate that they obtained the merchandise lawfully and not through theft or extortion.

An ordinance adopted pursuant to this bill may provide that selling merchandise without a permit is punishable as an infraction, and that subsequent violations after two prior convictions are infractions or misdemeanors punishable by imprisonment in the county jail of up to six months.

This bill is sponsored by London N. Breed, Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco.

- 2) **Author’s Statement.** According to the author, “San Francisco's vibrant culture of street vending supports many families and showcases the diversity of our communities. But that cultural richness is threatened when bad actors are allowed to openly sell stolen goods on our streets, often pushing out legitimate street vendors and undermining public safety.

“SB 925 recognizes that a narrowly tailored, surgical response, which accounts for the realities and benefits of these local economies, is needed in order to adequately address the issue of illegal fencing. This bill does so by allowing San Francisco to create additional permitting requirements to sell items they have determined are commonly associated with retail theft and to give law enforcement the tools to hold bad actors accountable.”

- 3) **Background.** The California Constitution allows a city or county to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” This is commonly referred to as the police power of cities and counties. It is from this fundamental power that local governments derive their authority to regulate land uses through planning, zoning ordinances, and use permits. Local agencies also use this police power to abate nuisances and protect public health, safety and welfare.

As an extension of the police power, state law lets local governments require businesses operating in their jurisdictions to obtain a license and impose related licensing fees. Local governments license businesses for lots of reasons: to identify individuals operating businesses in their jurisdictions; to ensure compliance with other local laws; to facilitate contact in case a problem arises; and, to raise money to support public services that support those businesses. Cities and counties subject businesses to a wide variety of regulations to preserve the public health and welfare, such as limitations on their hours of operation, restrictions on where various types of businesses can be located within a jurisdiction, and regulations on the type of merchandise that can be sold. These regulations are typically intended to address concerns of local citizens about the impact of a business.

- 4) **Sidewalk Vendors and Immigrant Communities.** Sidewalk vendors are individuals that sell goods on streets and sidewalks from carts and other non-motorized conveyances. Some sidewalk vendors are stationary, while others move from one location to another. Although there is no statewide count, there are an estimated 10,000 sidewalk vendors selling food in the City of Los Angeles alone.

According to “Racial Justice for Street Vendors,” an article published by the California Law Review in June of 2021, “Street vending has long held economic and social significance for immigrant communities. For one thing, street vending and other public markets have traditionally filled the basic consumption needs of poor workers, demonstrating how immigrants support the informal economy as both producers and consumers. As a form of work, street vending is defined by relatively low barriers of entry at least when compared to selling goods and services within brick-and-mortar settings.

“In Southern California, street vending has long been tied to migrant communities, which has, unsurprisingly, sparked strong, divergent reactions among the public. During the late nineteenth century, Chinese migrants sold produce in the streets of Los Angeles. During this same period of time – a period marked by anti-Chinese sentiment in federal immigration policy – Los Angeleno lawmakers began creating and defining public space in narrow terms that privileged the interests of pedestrians and disregarded the interests of street vendors. Local officials began increasing licensing fees only for vegetable peddlers, who

were disproportionately Chinese. Fees for fruit peddlers, who were mostly white, did not increase. The Chinese peddlers went on strike and began challenging these ordinances in court, often successfully.

“This battle over street vendor rights – and the social meaning of street vending – presaged a similar fight that would unfold more than a century later in East Los Angeles. As gentrification and exclusionary zoning laws began displacing poor residents of communities like Boyle Heights – a neighborhood with a significant Latinx residential population – advocates and community members began coalescing around street vendor rights as an attempt to empower themselves in the face of pending displacement.

“As gentrification efforts gained momentum in urban communities of color across the country, lawmakers and brick-and-mortar business owners pressured police to target those selling food in public spaces. Police harassment of female street vendors in that community led to the LA Street Vendor Campaign that pressured lawmakers for legislative reform, first in Los Angeles and then in Sacramento...

“In particular, immigrant rights advocates pointed to the disproportionate dangers posed by low-level or misdemeanor policing, a form of law enforcement commonly understood to lead to only minor outcomes. The reality has been that even minor contact with the criminal justice system can lead to an array of immigration consequences including removal from the United States. In 2018, California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the Safe Sidewalk Vending Act (SSVA). This law decriminalizes sidewalk vending. Lawmakers presented this law as an important effort to protect unauthorized immigrants who work in the informal economy.

“The SSVA sought to dial down the punitive aspects of the law governing street vending. In place of criminal penalties, the new law imposes a set of escalating fines. Crucially, the law instructs regulators to take into account a person’s ‘ability to pay’ when assessing fines and prohibits prosecutors from using criminal infractions or misdemeanors to punish those who fail to pay these fines. In other contexts, the failure to pay fees has had a ‘snowballing’ effect, in which minor infractions can quickly balloon into serious violations with criminal penalties. Defanging both the substantive grounds and the enforcement mechanisms helped to clear away any brush from adjacent areas of law that might transform an administrative or civil penalty into a criminal one.”

- 5) **State and Local Regulation of Sidewalk Vending.** Until 2019, cities and counties were able to regulate or ban sidewalk vending as they saw fit. Due to concerns that criminal citations for sidewalk vendors could enable deportation by the federal government, and to legalize the activity of sidewalk vending as a means of economic support for immigrant communities, the Legislature enacted SB 946 (Lara), Chapter 459, Statutes of 2018. SB 946 prohibited local governments from banning sidewalk vending, prohibited any infractions from being punishable as an infraction or misdemeanor, and established other parameters for local sidewalk vending ordinances.

Specifically, SB 946 prohibited cities and counties from regulating sidewalk vendors unless they adopt a regulatory framework consistent with the bill’s provisions. Among other things, SB 946 prohibited a city or county from requiring sidewalk vendors to operate within specific parts of the public right-of-way, unless that restriction is directly related to objective

health, safety, or welfare concerns. Local authorities can neither restrict the overall number of sidewalk vendors, nor require sidewalk vendors to operate only in a designated area, unless these restrictions are directly related to health, safety, or welfare concerns.

Cities and counties can also prohibit sidewalk vendors near farmers markets, swap meets, and special events, and they can prohibit stationary vendors (but not roaming vendors) in certain circumstances in parks and exclusively residential zones. Sidewalk vending in parks may be further restricted if the requirements are any of the following:

- a) Directly related to objective health, safety, or welfare concerns.
- b) Necessary to ensure the public's use and enjoyment of natural resources and recreational opportunities.
- c) Necessary to prevent an undue concentration of commercial activity that unreasonably interferes with the scenic and natural character of the park.

SB 946 allows cities and counties to adopt additional requirements regulating the time, place, and manner of sidewalk vending if the requirements are directly related to objective health, safety, or welfare concerns, such as requirements to:

- a) Limit the hours of operation of sidewalk vendors in a manner that is not unduly restrictive.
 - b) Maintain sanitary conditions.
 - c) Obtain a local business license and a valid seller's permit from the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration.
 - d) Require compliance with other generally applicable laws.
- 6) **Penalties Under SB 946.** SB 946 specifically prohibited criminal penalties for violations of sidewalk vending ordinances and instead established an administrative fine structure. The bill allowed a local authority with a compliant sidewalk vending program to impose an administrative penalty of \$100 for a first violation of the local sidewalk vending ordinance, \$200 for a second violation within one year of the first violation, and \$300 for each additional violation within one year of the first violation. Administrative penalties for vending without a permit follow a similar structure and are \$250, \$500, and \$1,000, respectively.

An adjudicator of these fines must take into account the ability of the violator to pay the fine, and a violator may request an ability to pay determination at any point. A local authority must accept 20% of the fine in full satisfaction if the violator earns less than 125% of the federal poverty line. SB 946 prohibited local authorities from imposing any additional financial penalties, prohibited penalties for violations of sidewalk vending from being infractions or misdemeanors, and prohibited sidewalk vendors from being subject to arrest, except where permitted under law.

- 7) **Enforcement Challenges for San Francisco.** In November of 2023, San Francisco instituted a ban on vending within a 300-foot radius of the exterior boundaries of the Mission

Street Corridor. Public Works Order No: 208803, which went into effect on November 27, 2023, noted a number of items, including the following:

- a) The Mission Police Station routinely receives community complaints about illegal Vending, including Vending without proper permits and Vending stolen goods, and other associated criminal and nuisance activities along Mission Street between 14th and Cesar Chavez Streets (the “Mission Street Corridor”), which pose objective health, safety, and welfare concerns to residents and visitors within the Mission District.
- b) Between October 10, 2022, through October 10, 2023, the Police Department received 580 calls for service or on-viewed incidents for the addresses on Mission Street, and the three most numerous types of calls pertained to assault and battery, petty theft, and vandalism.
- c) Illegal Vending, and concerns that illegal Vending has caused the street conditions of the Mission Street Corridor to be worse than ever, are common topics of discussion at community meetings, and the community members who attend these meetings routinely call for and support greater police action to make the Mission Street Corridor safer and more accessible for pedestrians.
- d) Mission Police Station has experienced elevated numbers of calls for service associated with the Mission Street Corridor that can be attributed in part to illegal purchasing and Vending (or “fencing”) of stolen property.
- e) Illegal vending activity along the Mission Street Corridor is associated with the fencing of suspected stolen property, and on nearly a daily basis, Police officers have observed the fencing of suspected stolen property on or about the Mission Street Corridor.
- f) There have been arrests along the Mission Street Corridor for stolen property offenses where the property stolen from businesses such as Walgreens, CVS, REI, Lululemon, and Victoria’s Secret in other parts of the City have been brought to the Mission Street Corridor for fencing as part of organized retail theft operations.
- g) The Police Department’s investigatory units have conducted numerous anti-fencing operations that have resulted in the recovery and seizure of large amounts of stolen property, often valued in the tens of thousands of dollars per seizure.
- h) A high concentration of pedestrians and Vendors on sidewalks fronting BART plazas presents potential threats to public health, safety, and welfare by obstructing pedestrian and wheelchair ingress and egress, particularly for individuals with disabilities.
- i) These illegal activities threaten and negatively affect the health, safety, and welfare of pedestrians, Vendors, BART riders, and City staff, including Public Works staff who have consistently and repeatedly encountered vandalism of City vehicles, threats of physical violence and bodily harm, actual physical violence and bodily harm, verbal insults, and intimidation, and one such incident resulted in the arrest of an unpermitted Vendor who had threatened to kill a City employee who was discharging his duties as a street vending inspector, and the issuance of a protective order from the San Francisco Superior Court, which requires the unpermitted Vendor to stay away from the City employee whom the unpermitted Vendor had threatened.

- j) The high concentration of Vending activities and illegal activities in the areas around the BART plazas has led to unsanitary sidewalk conditions and sidewalk obstructions in violation of the Regulations and the Good Neighbor Policies and the extensive noncompliance with the Vending ordinance, Regulations, and policies has rendered enforcement of such laws, Regulations, and policies infeasible despite the Department's yearlong effort to send street inspectors to such areas on a weekly basis, which efforts have been hindered by the limited number of inspectors available to perform street inspections due in part to inspectors' belief that their health, safety, and welfare may be threatened by Vendors.
 - k) For more than 12 months, the Department has routinely encountered unpermitted Vendors occupying sidewalks and BART property on or about the Mission Street Corridor, and during this time, the Department has pursued vigorous and sustained enforcement of Article 5.9 of the Public Works Code, the Regulations, and the Good Neighbor Policies, but sidewalk conditions have not improved significantly.
- 8) **Policy Considerations.** The Committee may wish to consider the following:
- a) **Are Existing Remedies Sufficient?** As noted above, San Francisco imposed a moratorium on vending in the Mission District late last year, which seems to have alleviated the problems that had cropped up there. The Committee may wish to consider if San Francisco's existing authority under its constitutional police powers and the statutory provisions enacted via SB 946 are sufficient to address these problems, or if the additional authority granted by this bill is merited.
 - b) **Invitation for Others to Follow?** As noted by opponents, the Committee may wish to consider the degree to which this bill could invite other local jurisdictions to follow suit with their own legislative efforts in the future.
 - c) **Patchwork of Vending Regulations?** Adding to the point noted above, the Committee may wish to consider if this bill could lead to an eventual patchwork of differing requirements throughout the state over time.
 - d) **Potential Impacts on Food Vendors.** The author has stated this bill is not intended to apply to food vendors in San Francisco. The Committee may wish to consider if the bill should be amended to clarify that the list of merchandise that San Francisco develops shall not include food items, unless those food items are pre-packaged and not prepared for sale on-site.
 - e) **Who's Gonna Know?** The Committee may wish to consider if San Francisco should be required to carry out a public information campaign before it begins to exercise the authority granted under this bill, so that vendors do not get caught unawares due to no fault of their own.
 - f) **What Could Possibly Go Wrong?** This bill provides the very significant enforcement mechanisms of infractions and misdemeanors to San Francisco that carry serious consequences for those who could be charged. The Committee may wish to consider if San Francisco should be granted these tools in perpetuity, or if the bill should contain a repeal date with requirements to report back to the Legislature in order to determine if any abuses are occurring and to provide a guaranteed check on these powers in the future.

- g) **Lock ‘em Up?** This bill allows a person to be charged with a misdemeanor that carries a sentence of up to six months in jail for violations. The Committee may wish to consider whether this degree of punishment is necessary to curtail the problems San Francisco is encountering.
- 9) **Committee Amendments.** In order to address some of the policy considerations outlined above, the Committee may wish to adopt the following amendments:

Amend PEN496f. (a) as follows:

496f. (a) The City and County of San Francisco may adopt an ordinance requiring a permit for the sale, on public property, including public streets or sidewalks, of merchandise that the City and County of San Francisco has determined is a common target of retail theft. **Merchandise shall not include food items, unless those food items are pre-packaged and not prepared for sale on-site.** If the city and county passes such an ordinance, the ordinance shall include all of the following written findings:

Amend the remainder of the bill as follows:

(e) (1) If an ordinance is adopted pursuant to this section, the City and County of San Francisco shall, by January 1, 2029, submit a report to the relevant committees of the Legislature that includes all of the following:

(A) The local permitting agency that was made responsible for administering the permit system.

(B) The rules and procedures the permitting agency adopted for administering the permit system.

(C) The list or lists of merchandise that the City and County of San Francisco determined was a common target of retail theft.

(D) Whether the City and County of San Francisco elected to renew its ordinance and, if so, when.

(E) The total number of permits issued pursuant to this section.

(F) The method by which the local permitting agency determined whether an applicant for a permit was able to demonstrate that they obtained merchandise lawfully and not through theft or extortion.

(G) The total number of infractions and misdemeanors issued, and the number for which convictions were reached.

(H) The perceived race or ethnicity, gender, and age of the person issued an infraction or misdemeanor, provided that the identification of these characteristics was solely based on the observation and perception of the local authority who issued the infraction or misdemeanor.

(I) The actions taken by a local authority when issuing infractions or misdemeanors, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(i) Whether the local authority asked for consent to search the person, and, if so, whether consent was provided.

(ii) Whether the local authority searched the person or any property, and, if so, the basis for the search and any contraband or evidence discovered.

(iii) Whether the local authority seized any property and, if so, the type of property that was seized and the basis for seizing the property.

(2) A report submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(f) The City and County of San Francisco shall administer a public information campaign for at least 30 calendar days prior to the enactment of an ordinance pursuant to this section, including public announcements in major media outlets and press releases.

~~(e)~~ (g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the applicability of other state or local laws, including, but not limited to, Section 496.

(h) This section shall become inoperative on January 1, 2030, and as of that date is repealed.

Due to legislative deadlines, these amendments should be adopted in the Public Safety Committee.

10) **Related Legislation.** AB 2791 (Wilson) allows cities and counties to prohibit sidewalk vendors from operating within 250 feet of an annual fair. AB 2791 is pending in the Senate Local Government Committee.

11) **Previous Legislation.** SB 972 (Gonzalez), Chapter 489, Statutes of 2022, established a new type of retail food facility called a “compact mobile food operation” (CMFO) as a subcategory of mobile food facility that is non-motorized and operates from a pushcart or stand; exempted CMFOs from various provisions of the retail food code law, including certain sink requirements; prohibited criminal penalties from applying to CMFOs and instead limited enforcement to administrative penalties; and, exempted sales from CMFOs from counting toward the limits for cottage food operators or microenterprise home kitchens.

SB 1290 (Allen) of 2022 would have required, by January 1, 2025, the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz), in consultation with others, to submit a specified report to the Legislature on local sidewalk vending in California. SB 1290 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 946 (Lara), Chapter 459, Statutes of 2018, decriminalized sidewalk vending and established various requirements for local regulation of sidewalk vendors.

12) **Arguments in Support.** London N. Breed, Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco and sponsor of this bill, writes, “Currently in San Francisco, there are a number of bad actors who are selling stolen goods on the street. As a result, our legitimate vendors, who are working hard every day within the existing permitting system, are harmed and crowded out.

Our brick-and-mortar businesses are threatened each time someone runs into a store, steals an item, and sells it down the street at a discounted price. ADA path of travel is obstructed, and it is difficult for families to walk down the sidewalk. Disputes and conflicts erupt. City workers enforcing existing requirements have been assaulted and threatened. The situation is chaotic during the day, and worse at night.

“It is time that we make a change to address this issue and restore safety. SB 925 would help us do just that. By enabling San Francisco to create a list of frequently stolen goods, require a permit and proof of purchase to sell those goods, and enable us to pursue an infraction or misdemeanor if someone is found in repeated violation, this legislation would give us the tools we need to make our streets safer. It allows us to go after the bad actors who are stealing and selling those stolen goods, without pulling down our vending community.”

- 13) **Arguments in Opposition.** The Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice writes, “Street vending has long been a vital part of our local economies, offering affordable goods and services to residents while providing a means of livelihood for many individuals. SB 925 creates a narrative that unfairly stigmatizes street vendors by associating their activities with criminal behavior. This negative portrayal not only undermines the legitimacy of hardworking vendors but also contributes to a broader environment of distrust and marginalization.

“Moreover, the stringent new misdemeanors proposed by SB 925 are troubling. The bill allows for the imposition of severe penalties, including imprisonment, for selling merchandise without a permit after two prior convictions. Such punitive measures disproportionately impact vulnerable communities, including low-income individuals and immigrants, who rely on street vending as a primary source of income. These penalties could lead to significant hardship and exacerbate existing inequalities. By creating a state-mandated local program with new crimes, SB 925 sets a concerning precedent for other cities and counties throughout California. It opens the door for similar ordinances to be enacted elsewhere, potentially leading to a patchwork of stringent regulations that make it increasingly difficult for street vendors to operate legally. This approach fails to consider the broader economic and social benefits of street vending and instead prioritizes punitive measures that may not effectively address the root causes of retail theft.

“It is crucial to find a balanced solution that addresses the issue of stolen merchandise without disproportionately targeting street vendors. I urge you to reconsider the approach outlined in SB 925 and to work towards policies that support and regulate street vending in a fair and equitable manner. This includes providing accessible permitting processes, offering support and resources to vendors, and fostering a collaborative environment between vendors, law enforcement, and local communities.”

- 14) **Double-Referral.** This bill is double-referred to the Public Safety Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

London Breed, Mayor of City & County of San Francisco [SPONSOR]
Bay Area Council
Central City SRO Collaborative

Civic Center Community Benefit District
Clecha
Galeria de la Raza
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center
La Voz Latina
Mid Market Community Benefit District
Mission Economic Development Agency
Mission Merchants Association
Mission Neighborhood Center
Mission Street Vendors Association
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)
Tenderloin Community Benefit District
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
University of California College of the Law

Opposition

California Human Development
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice

Analysis Prepared by: Angela Mapp / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958