
SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Aisha Wahab, Chair

2023 - 2024 Regular

Bill No: AB 2621 **Hearing Date:** June 4, 2024
Author: Gabriel
Version: May 20, 2024
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: AB

Subject: *Law enforcement training*

HISTORY

Source: Everytown for Gun Safety

Prior Legislation: AB 449 (Ting, Ch. 524, Stats. of 2023)
AB 2870 (Santiago, Ch. 974, Stats. of 2022)
AB 57 (Gabriel, Ch. 691, Stats. of 2021)
AB 2235 (Gabriel, 2020), not heard due to COVID-19
AB 2236 (Gabriel, 2020), held in Assembly Appropriations
AB 12 (Irwin, Ch. 724, Stats. of 2019)
AB 165 (Gabriel, 2019), held in Senate Appropriations
AB 1014 (Skinner, Ch. 872, Stats. of 2014)

Support: 1 Hundred Years Enterprises; American Jewish Committee - Los Angeles; Anti-Defamation League; Brady California; California Public Defenders Association; Civil Prosecutors Coalition; Democrats for Israel – CA; Democrats for Israel Los Angeles; Equality California; Etta; Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence; Hadassah; Holocaust Museum LA; JCRC Bay Area; Jewish Center for Justice; Jewish Community Federation and Endowment Fund; Jewish Democratic Club of Marin; Jewish Democratic Club of Solano County; Jewish Democratic Coalition of The Bay Area; Jewish Family and Children's Service of Long Beach and Orange County; Jewish Family and Children's Services of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties; Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles; Jewish Family Service of San Diego; Jewish Family Services of Silicon Valley; Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles; Jewish Federation of The Greater San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys; Jewish Free Loan Association; Jewish Long Beach; Jewish Public Affairs Committee; Jewish Silicon Valley; March for Our Lives Action Fund; Progressive Zionists of California; San Diego County City Attorney's Office; San Francisco City Attorney's Office

Opposition: None known

Assembly Floor Vote: 75 - 0

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to 1) add a topic regarding gun violence restraining orders (GVROs) to the mandatory hate crimes training provided to peace officers by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), and clarify a topic related to hate crime waves and 2) revise the policies and standards that law enforcement agencies must adopt related to GVROs, as specified.

Existing law defines “hate crime” as a criminal act committed, in part or in whole, because of actual or perceived characteristics of the victim, including: disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or association with a person or group with one or more of the previously listed actual or perceived characteristics. (Pen. Code, § 422.55, subd. (a).)

Existing law specifies that “hate crime” includes a violation of statutes prohibiting interference with a person’s exercise of civil rights because of the actual or perceived characteristics, as listed above. (Pen. Code, § 422.55, subd. (b).)

Existing law Requires POST, in consultation with subject matter experts, to develop guidelines and a course of instruction and training for law enforcement officers who are employed as peace officers, or who are not yet employed as a peace officer but are enrolled in a training academy for law enforcement officers, addressing hate crimes. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subd. (a).)

Existing law states that the above hate crimes course of instruction shall make the maximum use of audio and video communication and other simulation methods, and shall include instruction in each of the following:

- Indicators of hate crimes;
- The impact of these crimes on the victim, the victim’s family and the community, and the assistance and compensation available to the victims;
- Knowledge of laws dealing with hate crimes and the legal rights of, and the remedies available to, victims of hate crimes;
- Law enforcement procedures, reporting, and documentation of hate crimes;
- Techniques and methods to handle incidents of hate crimes in a non-combative manner;
- Multi-mission criminal extremism, which means the nexus of certain hate crimes, antigovernment extremist crimes, anti-reproductive-rights crimes, and crimes committed in whole or in part because of the victim’s actual or perceived homelessness;
- The special problems inherent in some categories of hate crimes, including gender-bias crimes, disability-bias crimes, including those committed against homeless persons with disabilities, anti-immigrant crimes, and anti-Arab, and anti-Islamic crimes, and techniques and methods to handle these special problems; and,

- Preparation for, and response to, future anti-Arab/middle Eastern and anti-Islamic hate crime waves that the AG determines is likely. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subds. (a)-(c).)

Existing law provides that the guidelines developed by POST shall incorporate the items required to be included in POST's hate crimes course of instruction, and shall include a model hate crimes policy framework for use by law enforcement agencies that includes, but is not limited to:

- A message from the law enforcement agency's chief executive officer to the agency's officers and staff concerning the importance of hate crime laws and the agency's commitment to enforcement;
- The definition of hate crime, as specified;
- References to hate crime statutes, as specified;
- A title-by-title specific protocol that agency personnel are required to follow, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Preventing and preparing for likely hate crimes by, among other things, establishing contact with persons and communities who are likely targets, and forming and cooperating with community hate crime prevention and response networks;
 - Responding to reports of hate crimes, including reports of hate crimes committed under the color of authority;
 - Accessing assistance, by, among other things, activating the Department of Justice (DOJ) hate crime rapid response protocol when necessary;
 - Providing victim assistance and follow up, including community follow up;
 - Reporting;
 - A list of all requirements that law enforcement agencies must include in its hate crime policy. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6., subd. (c))

Existing law specifies that the course of training leading to the basic certificate issued by POST shall include the above hate crime guidelines and course of instruction. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subd. (d)(1).)

Existing law requires state and local law enforcement agencies, by July 1, 2024, to adopt a hate crimes policy that includes specified components. (Pen. Code § 422.87 (a).)

This bill expands the existing requirement that the POST hate crimes training include preparation for specified future hate crime waves to also include training on preparation for and response to anti-Arab, anti-Middle Easter, anti-Islamic, anti-LGBTQ, anti-Native American, anti-immigrant, anti-Asian American and Pacific Islander, and anti-Jewish hate crime waves.

This bill requires the POST hate crimes course to also cover identifying when a GVRO may be an appropriate tool for preventing hate crimes and the procedures for seeking a GVRO.

Existing law defines a “GVRO” as an order in writing, signed by the court, prohibiting and enjoining a named person from having in his or her custody or control, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving any firearms or ammunition. (Pen. Code, § 18100.)

Existing law requires a petition for a GVRO to describe the number, types, and locations of any firearms and ammunition presently believed by the petitioner to be possessed or controlled by the subject of the petition. (Pen. Code, § 18107.)

Existing law requires the court to notify the Department of Justice (DOJ) when a GVRO is issued, renewed, dissolved, or terminated. (Pen. Code, § 18115.)

Existing law prohibits a person that is subject to a GVRO from having in his or her custody any firearms or ammunition while the order is in effect. Specifies that this means the person cannot own, purchase, possess, or receive any firearms or ammunition. (Pen. Code, § 18120, subd. (a).)

Existing law requires the court to order the restrained person to surrender all firearms and ammunition in his or her control, or which the person possesses or owns. (Pen. Code, § 18120, subd. (b)(1).)

Existing law requires each municipal police department and county sheriff’s department, the Department of the California Highway Patrol, and the University of California and California State University Police Departments to develop, adopt, and implement written policies and standards relating to gun violence restraining orders. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (a).)

Existing law requires the policies and standards adopted per the above to instruct officers to consider the use of a gun violence restraining order during a domestic disturbance response to any residence which is associated with a firearm registration or record, during a response in which a firearm is present, or during a response in which one of the involved parties owns or possesses a firearm, and provides that the policies and standards should encourage the use of gun violence restraining orders in appropriate situations to prevent future violence involving a firearm. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (b).)

Existing law provides that the policies and standards should also instruct officers to consider the use of a gun violence restraining order during a contact with a person exhibiting mental health issues, including suicidal thoughts, statements, or actions, if that person owns or possesses a firearm, and shall encourage officers encountering situations in which there is reasonable cause to believe that the person poses an immediate and present danger of causing personal injury to themselves or another person by having custody or control of a firearm to consider obtaining a mental health evaluation of the person by a medically trained professional or to detain the person for mental health evaluation pursuant to agency policy relating to Section 5150 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (c).)

Existing law requires the policies and standards developed pursuant to the above to be consistent with any gun violence restraining order training administered by POST, and shall include the following:

- Standards and procedures for requesting and serving a temporary emergency gun violence restraining order.
- Standards and procedures for requesting and serving an ex parte gun violence restraining order.
- Standards and procedures for requesting and serving a gun violence restraining order issued after notice and hearing.
- Standards and procedures for the seizure of firearms and ammunition at the time of issuance of a temporary emergency gun violence restraining order.
- Standards and procedures for verifying the removal of firearms and ammunition from the subject of a gun violence restraining order.
- Standards and procedures for obtaining and serving a search warrant for firearms and ammunition.
- Responsibility of officers to attend gun violence restraining order hearings.
- Standards and procedures for requesting renewals of expiring gun violence restraining orders. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (d).)

Existing law specifies that municipal police departments, county sheriff's departments, the Department of the California Patrol, and the UC and CSU police departments are encouraged, but not required, to train officers on the standards and procedures. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (e).)

Existing law provides that in developing these policies and standards, law enforcement agencies are encouraged to consult with gun violence prevention experts and mental health professionals. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (f).)

Existing law specifies that policies and standards related to GVROs shall be made available to the public upon request. (Pen. Code, § 18108, subd. (g).)

This bill requires that the policies and standards related to GVROs that law enforcement agencies must adopt under existing laws must be updated, as necessary, to incorporate changes in the law governing GVROs.

This bill provides that the GVRO policies and standards shall instruct officers on the use of GVROs in appropriate situations to prevent future violence involving a firearm and encourage the use of de-escalation practices for officer and civilian safety when responding to incidents involving a firearm.

This bill specifies that the GVRO policies and standards shall instruct officers on the types of evidence a court considers in determining whether grounds exist for the issuance of a GVROs.

This bill specifies that the GVRO policies and standards shall instruct offices to consider whether a GVRO may be necessary during a response in which one of the involved parties has expressed an intent to acquire a firearm.

This bill provides that the GVRO policies and standards policies and standards should inform officers about the different procedures and protections afforded by different types of firearm-prohibiting emergency protective orders that are available to law enforcement petitioners and provide examples of situations in which each type of emergency protective order is most appropriate.

This bill specifies that the GVRO policies and standards should instruct offices to consider whether a GVRO may be necessary during a contact with a person exhibiting mental health issues, including suicidal thoughts, statements, or actions, if that person has expressed an intent to acquire a firearm, and should encourage officers to provide information about mental health referral services during a contact with a person exhibiting mental health issues.

This bill requires the written GVRO policies and standards developed pursuant to existing law to include the following:

- Standards and procedures for requesting and serving a temporary emergency GVRO, including determining prior to the expiration of such an order whether the subject of the order presents an ongoing increased risk for violence so that a gun violence restraining order issued after notice and hearing may be necessary.
- Standards and procedures for requesting and serving an ex parte GVRO, including determining prior to the expiration of such an order whether the subject of the GVRO presents an ongoing increased risk for violence so that a GVRO issued after notice and hearing may be necessary.
- Standards and procedures for storing firearms surrendered pursuant to a gun violence restraining order.
- Standards and procedures for returning firearms upon the termination of a gun violence restraining order, including verification that the respondent is not otherwise legally prohibited from possessing firearms.
- Standards and procedures for addressing violations of a gun violence restraining order.

This bill requires law enforcement agencies subject to the GVRO policies and standards requirements to make information regarding implemented GVRO policies and standards available to all officers.

This bill authorizes law enforcement agencies, in developing and updating these policies and standards, to consult with domestic violence service providers and other community based organizations, in addition to gun violence prevention experts and mental health professionals specified under existing law.

COMMENTS

1. Need for This Bill

According to the Author:

With hate crimes on the rise, the Legislature must ensure that law enforcement officers know of all the tools available to prevent an escalation in hate-based violence. AB 2621 will ensure that our first responders are aware of the steps they can take to prevent hate-based tragedies from occurring by issuing a GVRO in response to hate crimes. It will also require them to update their policies and procedures around GVROs whenever the laws are changed going forward.

2. Hate Crimes and Related Peace Officer Training

In 1995, the DOJ began collecting and annually reporting data regarding hate crimes in California, and beginning in 2017, the DOJ was further required to publish that data on its OpenJustice Web Portal.¹ The most recent DOJ hate crimes report, presenting data collected from local law enforcement agencies in 2022, revealed some disturbing trends. Although the number of hate crime vents has fluctuated over the last decade, overall, hate crime events have increased by an alarming 145.7 percent, with 863 hate crime events reported in 2013 and 2,120 reported in 2022.² Since the prior year (2021), hate crime events had increased by 20 percent and the number of victims of reported hate crimes increased 13.5 percent.³ Reported hate crime events in all tracked bias categories (race, religion, sexual orientation, and gender) increased between 2021 and 2022, with the biggest percentage increase being attributable to gender-related hate crimes (55.6 percent increase) and the biggest in overall numbers attributable to racial bias (133 additional hate crime events).⁴

Generally, the DOJ's annual hate crime reports are accompanied by updated guidance for local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors on various topics related to hate crimes, including relevant state laws and best practices for hate crime investigation, training and reporting.⁵ The guidance for local law enforcement details the various hate crimes training requirements set forth in existing law, including the requirement that the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) develop guidelines and a course of instruction and training addressing specified hate crime topics. Under existing law, each peace officer must complete the training course within one year of it being made available, and then again every six years for in-service police officers.⁶ Additionally, recent legislation (AB 449, Ting, Ch. 524, Stats. of 2023) requires state

¹ AB 2524 (Irwin), Ch. 418, Stats. of 2016, the OpenJustice Data Act of 2016.

² "Hate Crime in California 2022." *California Department of Justice*. Published June 27, 2023. [Hate Crime In CA 2022f.pdf](#); the term "hate crime event" is defined as an occurrence where a hate crime is involved. There may be one or more suspects involved, one or more victims targeted, and one or more offenses involved for each event.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ The law enforcement bulletin can be found here: [2023-DLE-04 Information Bulletin.pdf \(ca.gov\)](#) the guidance for prosecutors can be found here: [Guidance to Prosecutors on Hate Crimes - Attorney General's Office - California Department of Justice](#)

⁶ Penal Code § 13519.6; Another provision, § 13519.41,

and local law enforcement agencies, by July 1, 2024, to adopt a hate crimes policy, which must include the elements of a model policy framework developed by POST.⁷

One component of this bill expands the current hate crime training provided by POST to include instruction on preparing for and responding to hate crime waves against specific racial, ethnic and religious groups, as well as instruction on the role that GVROs can play in preventing hate crimes. Specifically, as to the latter topic, the bill requires the POST course to instruct officers in identifying when a GVRO may be an appropriate tool to prevent a hate crime, and the specific procedures for seeking a GVRO.

3. Gun Violence Restraining Orders Generally

In 2014, California enacted the nation's first gun violence restraining order law (AB 1014 Skinner, Ch. 872, Stats. of 2014), which was modeled after similar domestic violence restraining order statutes, and went into effect on January 1, 2016.⁸ A GVRO prohibits the restrained person from purchasing or possessing firearms or ammunition and authorizes law enforcement to remove any firearms or ammunition already in the individual's possession. A court is required to notify DOJ when a GVRO is issued, renewed, dissolved, or terminated. The statutory scheme establishes three types of GVRO's: (1) a temporary emergency GVRO, (2) an ex parte GVRO, and (3) a GVRO issued after notice and hearing.

A temporary emergency GVRO may only be sought by a law enforcement officer. To obtain this order, a court must find that the subject of the petition poses an immediate and present danger of causing injury to himself, herself, or another by having in his or her custody or control, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm or ammunition; and the order is necessary to prevent personal injury to the subject of the order or another because less restrictive alternatives have been tried and been ineffective or have been determined to be inadequate or inappropriate under the circumstances.⁹

The second type of GVRO is an ex parte GVRO, which may be sought by an immediate family member of the subject of the petition; an individual who has a dating relationship with the subject or who has a child in common with the subject; an employer of the subject of the petition; a coworker, if they have had substantial and regular interactions with the subject for at least one year and have obtained the approval of the employer; an employee or teacher of a school that the subject has attended in the past 6 months, if the employee or teacher has obtained the approval of a school administrator or a school administration staff member with a supervisory role; or a law enforcement officer. The ex parte order may be issued if the court finds that (1) the subject of the petition poses a significant danger, in the near future, of causing personal injury to himself, herself, or another by having under his or her custody and control, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm as determined as determined by considering specified factors; and (2) an order is necessary to prevent personal injury to the subject of the petition or another because less restrictive alternatives either have been tried and found to be ineffective, or are inadequate or inappropriate for the circumstances of the subject of the petition.¹⁰

⁷ Penal Code §422.87

⁸ GVROs are also referred to as "extreme risk protection orders" or ERPOs.

⁹ Pen. Code, § 18125.

¹⁰ Pen. Code, §§ 18150, 18155.

Within 21 days, and before the temporary or ex parte GVRO expires, one of the above listed categories of individuals may request that a court issue the third type of GVRO which is issued after notice and a hearing, enjoining the subject of the petition from having in his or her custody or control, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm or ammunition for a period of one to five years (often referred to as an “order after hearing” or OAH). At the hearing, the petitioner has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that the respondent poses a significant danger of causing personal injury to self or others by having access to firearms or ammunition and that a GVRO is necessary to prevent personal injury because less restrictive alternatives have been tried and found to be ineffective, or are inadequate or inappropriate for the respondent’s circumstances.¹¹

4. Law Enforcement Agency Policies and Standards Related to GVRO

Existing law requires local law enforcement agencies, the California Highway Patrol, and the University and Cal State University Police Departments to develop, adopt and implement written policies and standards relating to GVROs, which are required to instruct officers how to determine when the use of a GVRO is appropriate, specifically with regard to domestic violence situations and in encounters with individuals with mental health issues.¹² Existing law provides that written policies and standards must be consistent with any POST training regarding GVROs and include standards and procedures for requesting, renewing and serving GVROs, seizing firearms and verifying the removal of firearms from the respondent, and obtaining and serving search warrants. Additionally, existing law includes several permissive provisions suggesting that law enforcement agencies’ standards and policies related to GVROs ‘encourage’ the use of GVROs in appropriate situations to prevent future firearm violence, and that the policies encourage officers to consider obtaining a mental health evaluations in certain scenarios. Existing law also encourages, but does not require, law enforcement agencies to train officers on GVRO standards and procedures and to consult with gun violence prevention experts and mental health professions in developing the GVRO standards.¹³

This bill makes several additions to what must be included in the written policies and standards law enforcement agencies must adopt under existing law. Centrally, the bill requires that the policies be regularly updated to reflect changes in GVRO law, that they instruct officers on the use of GVROs in appropriate situations to prevent future firearm violence (instead of merely encouraging these practices, as is the case under existing law), and that they instruct officers on the types of evidence a court considers in issuing a GVRO. The bill also requires that the policies encourage officers to use de-escalation practices when responding to firearm incidents and to provide information about mental health referral services during a contact with a person exhibiting mental health issues. The bill also includes additional standards and procedures that agencies must incorporate into their written GVRO policies, including how to determine when an OAH is appropriate after the issuance of an ex parte order, officer responsibilities for participating in the evidence participation process, how to properly store firearms surrendered to law enforcement and how to subsequently return those firearms, and how to address GVRO violations.

¹¹ Pen. Code, § 18170 et seq.

¹² Pen. Code §18108.

¹³ *Ibid.*

The provision of existing law amended by this bill employs two phrases – “policies and standards” and “standards and procedures” – which may cause some confusion. It appears from context that the phrases are not intended to be used interchangeably throughout the provision at issue; “policies and standards” is meant to describe the overarching written policy that law enforcement agencies must adopt regarding GVROs, and “standards and procedures” appears to describe required components of that written policy. However, one provision of the bill employs “standards and procedures” when referring to the overarching written policy, and “policies and standards” should be used. The Author may wish to consider correcting this misnomer or replacing these terms altogether with ones that do not cause such confusion.

5. Constitutional Considerations

In *N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n v. Bruen* (2022) 142 S.Ct. 2111, the United States Supreme Court established a new test for determining whether a government restriction on carrying a firearm violates the Second Amendment:

“[W]hen the Second Amendment’s plain text covers an individual’s conduct, the Constitution presumptively protects that conduct. To justify its regulation, the government may not simply posit that the regulation promotes an important interest. Rather, the government must demonstrate that the regulation is consistent with this Nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation. Only if a firearm regulation is consistent with this Nation’s historical tradition may a court conclude that the individual’s conduct falls outside the Second Amendment’s ‘unqualified command.’” (*Id.* at 2126.)

Based on *Bruen*, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals invalidated a federal statute prohibiting a defendant from possessing a firearm pursuant to a domestic violence court order, even after the defendant was involved in five shootings over the course of approximately one month.¹⁴ The court examined several different historical statutes to see if there were any analogues which prohibited firearm possession based on civil proceedings alone.¹⁵ Ultimately, the court found that there were no such relevantly similar historical laws and found that the firearm prohibition was an, “an outlier that our ancestors would never have accepted.”¹⁶ The United States Supreme Court is now reviewing the case (certiorari granted *United States v. Rahimi* (2023) 143 S.Ct. 2688). On November 7, 2023, the Court heard oral arguments in the case. The justices’ questioning seemed to suggest that they would uphold the law at issue in the case.¹⁷ Many experts expect the decision to be issued by mid-late June 2024.¹⁸

Although the *Rahimi* case deals with domestic violence restraining orders, the inquiry principally revolved around prohibiting firearm possession based on a civil proceeding, which could implicate California’s GVRO laws depending on the outcome of the case. For the purposes of this bill, a change in the constitutionality of California’s GVRO firearm restrictions would have a

¹⁴ *U.S. v. Rahimi* (2023) 61 F.4th 443.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 455-460.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 461.

¹⁷ See Amy Howe, Justices appear wary of striking down domestic-violence gun restriction, SCOTUSblog (Nov. 7, 2023, 5:47 PM), <https://www.scotusblog.com/2023/11/justices-appear-wary-of-striking-down-domestic-violence-gun-restriction>)

¹⁸ “Rahimi, Decision Timing, and Opinion-Writing Predictions.” *Duke Center for Firearms Law*. 8 May 2024. [Rahimi, Decision Timing, and Opinion-Writing Predictions | Duke Center for Firearms Law](#)

significant impact on the content of the policies and standards law enforcement agencies must adopt. If the *Rahimi* decision comes down as many expect in June 2024, this bill will require every law enforcement agency required to adopt a GVRO policy under existing law to make substantial updates to those policies when the bill goes into effect on January 1, 2025.

6. Argument in Support

According to the Brady Campaign:

As you know, gun violence is a public health, safety, and equity crisis. Ten years ago, California passed the nation's first modern version of an "extreme risk" law. This landmark gun violence restraining order ("GVRO") law created a civil legal process through which law enforcement, concerned family members, and other designated individuals may request that a court issue an order temporarily restricting a person's access to firearms and ammunition when there is evidence that the person poses a significant danger for harming themselves or another person with a firearm. GVROs are one of the most effective tools available for preventing gun violence before it occurs. By promptly and temporarily removing firearms from a person at risk of harming others or themselves, GVROs fill a critical public safety need that is particularly useful for preventing mass violence and suicides. From 2016 - 2022, approximately 6,300 GVRO petitions have been filed in the state of California. 98% of those petitions were filed by law enforcement. As first responders when individuals are in crisis, it is more important than ever to ensure law enforcement agencies' standards and policies regarding GVROs have a uniform foundation. The actual use of GVROs as a tool for preventing gun violence is inconsistent across counties. A study published in 2021 found "substantial geographic variation" in GVRO use around California.

At the same time, hate-based violence is increasing across the state. In some California jurisdictions, hate based threats of violence have already been the basis for law enforcement seeking a life-saving GVRO. Preventing hate crimes with GVROs has been particularly effective in cities that otherwise have strong uptake of GVROs at the local level, like San Diego, San Francisco, and Sacramento. However, with inconsistent implementation around the state, this tool may be left underutilized precisely at a time when threats of hate-based violence are rising rapidly. The California Department of Justice's annual report on Hate Crimes in California for 2022 confirmed that hate crime events in our state have increased almost 150% over the last ten years. The Anti-Defamation League's May 2023 report "Hate in the Golden State: Extremism & Antisemitism in California, 2021-2022" outlines "significant increases" in extremist activity and antisemitic incidents over that time period, and specifically a "high level of extremist-related violence."

AB 2621 will ensure that existing law enforcement hate crimes training will properly prepare officers to identify situations where a GVRO can prevent a hate-related threat or tragedy. It will also ensure that local law enforcement agencies' written policies and standards on GVROs reflect the most up-to-date best practices for utilizing this life-saving tool to support effective implementation.