



# SB 1203 Opposition — Lawmaker Outreach Guide

## Tips for Calling Lawmakers' Offices

---

### › **Keep it short**

Legislative staff handle dozens of calls daily. Aim for 90 seconds or less. State your name, your company, your location, and your ask — then make 2–3 focused points. Don't try to cover everything.

### › **Call the Capitol office**

Calls to the Capitol office go directly to the staff handling legislation. This is the most effective line for influencing an active vote on a bill.

### › **Lead with your local angle**

"I employ X security officers in [CITY]" lands harder than industry-wide statistics. Staff remember specifics.

### › **Ask for a clear action**

Don't just express concern — ask the legislator to vote no on SB 1203, or at minimum, to meet with your company before casting a vote.

### › **Follow up with a written note**

After the call, send a brief email reiterating your ask. It creates a paper trail and reinforces the message with staff who may not have been on the call.

### › **Be respectful and professional**

Frame your opposition as coming from someone who supports the bill's goals but believes it will backfire. "We want well-trained guards too — this bill makes that harder" is more persuasive than pure opposition.

### **Pick your top 3 talking points**

You won't have time for all six. Choose the 3 most relevant to your legislator's district and priorities:

- High-crime or retail-heavy district → **points 2, 4, and 6**
- Focused on affordability and cost of living → **points 1, 3, and 6**
- Major 2026/2028 events in their district → **points 2, 5, and 6**
- Focused on workers and jobs → **points 3, 6, and 4**

## Call Script

---

### OPENING — IDENTIFY YOURSELF

*"Hello, my name is [NAME] and I represent [COMPANY], a licensed private security company in [CITY/REGION]. I'm calling to respectfully urge [LEGISLATOR'S NAME] to oppose SB 1203."*

### Talking points — pick your top 3

- 1 California already leads the nation in training standards**

No other state requires 8 hours of Powers to Arrest and Use of Force with mandatory in-person instruction. SB 1203 doubles this requirement with no demonstrated public safety benefit — it raises the bar without evidence it's needed.
- 2 This bill creates a hiring bottleneck that will leave communities unprotected**

Outsourcing training to third-party organizations that don't yet exist at the necessary scale will delay hiring across all 360,000 security positions statewide. Hospitals, schools, retail centers, and public agencies will face dangerous staffing gaps.
- 3 The cost impact exceeds \$1 billion annually and Californians are already stretched thin**

Training mandates alone will cost over \$350 million per year; IWC wage increases add another \$750 million. In a state grappling with an affordability crisis, these expenses cascade — passed from security companies to clients, then to consumers through higher prices on groceries, healthcare, housing, and retail.
- 4 Higher costs push businesses toward unregulated "event staff" — making communities less safe**

When licensed security becomes too expensive, employers turn to untrained ushers, ambassadors, or AI and camera systems. These workers fall outside state training requirements entirely. SB 1203 doesn't raise the floor, it incentivizes going around it.
- 5 The timing couldn't be worse — California is hosting the World Cup, Super Bowl, and Olympics**

Major international events in 2026 and 2028 will demand tens of thousands of more certified security personnel, not less. Creating a hiring and training bottleneck right now undermines public safety at exactly the moment California needs a strong, deployable workforce.
- 6 This bill is a job killer that hurts the very workers it claims to help**

When costs rise, clients automate, cameras and AI replace human officers. The licensed security companies that invest in training and compliance become uncompetitive against underground operators who ignore the rules altogether, and workers lose good jobs as a result.

#### CLOSING ASK

*"We fully support well-trained security professionals — that's our business. But SB 1203 will make California less safe, not more. We urge [LEGISLATOR'S NAME] to oppose this bill. I'll be following up with a brief email as well. Thank you for your time."*

## Follow-Up Email Template

---

*Send this within 24 hours of your call to create a paper trail and reinforce your message.*

**To:** [LEGISLATOR'S NAME] — [Capitol office email]  
**Subject:** Opposition to SB 1203 — [COMPANY NAME], [CITY]

Dear [LEGISLATOR'S NAME or staff name],

I'm following up on my call earlier today. My name is [NAME], and I represent [COMPANY], a licensed private security company operating in [CITY/REGION]. We employ [X] security officers and serve clients including [types of clients: hospitals, retail centers, public agencies, etc.].

I'm writing to respectfully urge [LEGISLATOR'S NAME] to oppose SB 1203. While we strongly support rigorous training for security professionals — California already leads the nation in this area — we believe this bill will produce serious unintended consequences:

- [Insert your first talking point in 1–2 sentences]
- [Insert your second talking point in 1–2 sentences]
- [Insert your third talking point in 1–2 sentences]

SB 1203 risks making California less safe, not more by driving up costs, creating hiring bottlenecks, and pushing businesses toward unregulated alternatives. We urge a no vote on this bill.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with [LEGISLATOR'S NAME] or a member of your staff to discuss our concerns in more detail. Please feel free to reach me at [PHONE] or [EMAIL].

Thank you for your time and your service to our community.

Sincerely,  
[NAME]  
[TITLE]  
[COMPANY]  
[PHONE] | [EMAIL]