
SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Jesse Arreguín, Chair
2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 630 **Hearing Date:** June 24, 2025
Author: Mark González
Version: April 30, 2025
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: AB

Subject: *Abandoned recreational vehicles*

HISTORY

Source: Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass

Prior Legislation: AB 2525 (Zbur), Ch. 721, Stats. of 2024
AB 2786 (Jones-Sawyer), Ch. 592, Stats. of 2018
AB 478 (Ridley-Thomas), Ch. 67, Stats. of 2003

Support: California Big City Mayor's Coalition; California Contract Cities Association; California Police Chiefs Association; City of Norwalk; City of San Diego; City and County of San Francisco; League of California Cities; Office of Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass; San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Opposition: ACLU California Action; Alliance San Diego; California Public Defenders Association; CD11 Coalition for Human Rights; Corporation for Supportive Housing; Debt Free Justice California; Disability Rights California; Housing California; Justice2Jobs Coalition; LA Defensa; National Alliance to End Homelessness; National Vehicle Residency Collective; The Bride's Chamber; Venice Justice Committee; Western Center on Law & Poverty

Assembly Floor Vote: 70 - 0

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize a public agency to remove and dispose of an abandoned recreational vehicle if the recreational vehicle is estimated to have a value of \$4,000 or less and the public agency has verified that the recreational vehicle is inoperable, as specified.

Existing law guarantees the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, and provides that no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized. (U.S. Const., 4th Amend.; Cal. Const. art I, § 13.)

Existing law makes it unlawful for a peace officer or an unauthorized person to remove an unattended vehicle from a highway to a garage or to any other place except as provided for by California statute. (Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (a).)

Existing law clarifies that the removal and storage of a vehicle, as authorized by California statute, is a seizure and must be reasonable under the Fourth Amendment and California Constitution. (Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (b).)

Existing law provides that vehicle removals authorized by any authority, including California statute, that are based on the community caretaking exception, are reasonable only if the removal was necessary to achieve the community caretaking need, such as ensuring the safe flow of traffic or protecting property from theft or vandalism. (Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (b).)

Existing law provides that law enforcement and other agencies having authority to remove vehicles shall also have the authority to provide hearings, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (c).)

Existing law places the burden of establishing the validity of the removal on the storing agency. (Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (c).)

Existing law authorizes a peace officer or other traffic enforcer of a local jurisdiction to remove a vehicle in many circumstances, including if it is left unattended, as specified, parked on a highway so as to obstruct traffic or create a hazard, illegally parked, as specified, stopped or parked for more than four hours upon the right-of-way of a freeway and the driver cannot move the vehicle, parked or left standing on a highway for 72 or more consecutive hours in violation of a local ordinance, and others. (Veh. Code, § 22651.)

Existing law authorizes any state, county or city authority charged with the maintenance of any highway to move any vehicle which is disabled or abandoned or which constitutes an obstruction to traffic from the place where it is located on a highway to the nearest available position on the same highway as may be necessary to keep the highway open or safe for public travel. (Veh. Code, § 22654, subd. (c).)

Existing law authorizes a city, county, or city and county to adopt an ordinance establishing procedures for the abatement and removal, as public nuisances, of abandoned, wrecked, dismantled, or inoperative vehicles or parts of an inoperative vehicle from private or public property. (Veh. Code, § 22660.)

Existing law requires an ordinance establishing procedures for the removal of abandoned vehicles to contain certain provisions, including a provision exempting vehicles under certain circumstances:

- A vehicle or part that is completely enclosed within a building in a lawful manner where it is not visible from the street or other public or private property; or,
- A vehicle or part that is stored or parked in a lawful manner on private property in connection with the business of a licensed dismantler, licensed vehicle dealer, or a junkyard. (Veh. Code, § 22661, subd. (b).)

Existing law authorizes any peace officer or other employee of the state, county, or city, as specified, who has reasonable grounds to believe that a vehicle has been abandoned, as determined pursuant to an existing statutory procedure, to remove that vehicle from a highway or from public or private property. (Veh. Code, § 22669, subd. (a).)

Existing law requires the public agency causing the removal of a vehicle to determine, for lien sale purposes, whether its value is under \$500, between \$500 and \$4,000, or over \$4,000. (Veh. Code, § 22670.)

Existing law specifies that whenever a vehicle has been removed to a garage, the keeper shall have a lien dependent upon possession for his or her compensation for towage and for caring for and keeping safe the vehicle for a period not exceeding 60 days, as specified, and provides that no lien shall attach to any personal property in or on the vehicle, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 22851, subds. (a), (b).)

Existing law defines a “vehicle” as a device used to propel, move, or draw people or property on a highway, excluding devices moved exclusively by human power or used on stationary rails or tracks. (Veh. Code, § 670.)

Existing law defines “recreational vehicle” as both of the following:

- A motor home, travel trailer, truck camper, or camping trailer, with or without motive power, designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other occupancy, that meets all of the following criteria:
 - It contains less than 320 square feet of internal living room area, excluding built-in equipment, including, but not limited to, wardrobe, closets, cabinets, kitchen units or fixtures, and bath or toilet rooms.
 - It contains 400 square feet or less of gross area measured at maximum horizontal projections.
 - It is built on a single chassis.
 - It is either self-propelled, truck-mounted, or permanently towable on the highways without a permit.
- A park trailer, as defined. (Health and Saf. Code, § 18010.)

Existing law defines a “park trailer” as a trailer designed for human habitation for recreational or seasonal use only, which meets all of the following requirements:

- It contains 400 square feet or less of gross floor area, excluding loft area space if that loft area space meets specified requirements. It may not exceed 14 feet in width at the maximum horizontal projection.
- It is built upon a single chassis.
- It may only be transported upon the public highways with a permit, as specified. (Health and Saf. Code, § 18009.3.)

Existing law provides that whenever a peace officer or any other employee of an authorized public agency as specified removes, or causes the removal of a vehicle determined to be abandoned and the public agency, or at the request of the public agency, the lienholder

determines the estimated value of the vehicle is \$500 or less, the public agency that removed, or caused the removal of vehicle shall cause the disposal of the vehicle, subject to the following requirements:

- Not less than 72 hours before the vehicle is removed, the peace officer or the authorized public employee has securely attached to the vehicle a distinctive notice which states that the vehicle will be removed by the public agency.
- Immediately after removal of the vehicle, the public agency which removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle shall notify the Stolen Vehicle System of the Department of Justice in Sacramento of the removal.
- The public agency that removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle or, at the request of the public agency, the lienholder shall obtain a copy of the names and addresses of all persons having an interest in the vehicle, if any, from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), as specified.
- Within 48 hours of the removal, excluding weekends and holidays, the public agency that removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle or, at the request of the public agency, the lienholder shall send a notice to the registered and legal owners at their addresses of record with the DMV, and to any other person known to have an interest in the vehicle, which must include information about the public agency providing the notice, the location of storage, the authority for removal of the vehicle, the right to a post-storage hearing, and other information, as specified.
- A requested hearing shall be conducted within 48 hours of the request, excluding weekends and holidays, as specified.
- The public agency employing the person, or utilizing the services of a contractor or franchiser that removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle and that directed any towing or storage, is responsible for the costs incurred for towing and storage if it is determined in the hearing that reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle was abandoned are not established.
- An authorization for disposal may not be issued by the public agency that removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle to a lienholder who is storing the vehicle prior to the conclusion of a requested post-storage hearing or any judicial review of that hearing.
- If, after 15 days from the notification date, the vehicle remains unclaimed and the towing and storage fees have not been paid, and if no request for a post-storage hearing was requested or a post-storage hearing was not attended, the public agency that removed, or caused the removal of, the vehicle shall provide to the lienholder who is storing the vehicle, on a form approved by the DMV authorization to dispose of the vehicle.
- If the vehicle is claimed by the owner or their agent within 15 days of the notice date, the lienholder who is storing the vehicle may collect reasonable fees for services rendered, but may not collect lien sale fees.

- Disposal of the vehicle by the lienholder who is storing the vehicle may only be to a licensed dismantler or scrap iron processor, as provided.
- If the names and addresses of the registered and legal owners of the vehicle are not available from the records of the DMV, the public agency may issue to the lienholder who stored the vehicle an authorization for disposal at any time after the removal.
- A vehicle disposed of pursuant to the above provisions may not be reconstructed or made operable, unless it is a vehicle that qualifies for either horseless carriage license plates or historical vehicle license plates. (Veh. Code, § 22851.3, subds. (a)-(l).)

This bill provides that whenever a peace officer or other employee authorized by a public agency to perform this task removes or causes the removal of a recreational vehicle (RV) determined to be abandoned, and the public agency or lienholder determines the estimated value of the RV at \$4,000 or less, the public agency shall cause the disposal of the RV pursuant to the requirements set forth in Section 22851.3 of the Vehicle Code.

This bill provides that the notice placed on an RV subject to removal 72 hours prior to its removal shall additionally include a notification that, if the RV is towed, it can be recovered for at least 15 days after the public agency notifies the registered owner of the recreational vehicle, and specifies that the notice shall also include contact information for an individual to learn where their vehicle and other possessions may be recovered.

This bill provides that if, after 30 days from the notification date, the RV remains unclaimed and the towing and storage fees have not been paid, and if no request for a post-storage hearing was required or a post-storage hearing was not attended, the public agency that removed, or caused the removal of, the RV shall provide to the lienholder who is storing the RV, on a form approved by the DMV, authorization to dispose of it.

This bill provides that authorization to dispose of the RV pursuant to the above provision shall include a verification that the RV is inoperable, and specifies that the lienholder may request the public agency to provide the authorization to dispose of the RV.

This bill specifies that if the RV is operable, the lienholder may request the public agency to provide the authorization to dispose of the RV only if it was towed due to it posing an environmental or public safety hazard.

This bill provides that for the purposes of its provisions, a RV is “inoperable” if it can only be moved by a tow truck.

This bill provides that the notice sent to the registered and legal owner of a removed RV within 48 hours of removal shall also include a notification that the registered owner has up to 30 days from the date of the notice to claim the RV.

This bill provides that if the RV is claimed by the owner or their agency within 30 days of the notice date, the lienholder who is storing the vehicle may collect reasonable fees for services rendered, but may not collect lien sale fees.

This bill provides that each jurisdiction shall report to their local legislative body, on an annual basis for each notice required to be posted 72 hours prior to the removal of a vehicle in the preceding year, all of the following:

- The number of RVs removed.
- The number of people found in the RV prior to removal.
- The number of RVs that were operable.
- The number of RVs that were inoperable.

COMMENTS

1. Need for This Bill

According to the Author:

Too many Angelenos are living in unsafe and unsanitary conditions inside broken-down RVs with no access to basic services. Meanwhile, our neighborhoods are dealing with the consequences of these vehicles being abandoned or recycled back onto the streets. AB 630 takes a necessary step toward improving public safety, preserving public spaces, and connecting those in need to better housing solutions.

2. Authority to Remove and Impound Generally

SB 1758 (Kopp) Chapter 1221, Statutes of 1994, gave law enforcement a new tool to enforce Vehicle Code violations—the ability to impound someone’s vehicle for driving while unlicensed or driving with a suspended license. After initial data showed that SB 1758 was effective in reducing convictions for driving without a license or with a suspended license, the Legislature began expanding the violations for which a vehicle could be impounded.¹ AB 2288 (Aguiar), Chapter 884, Statutes of 1996 expanded vehicle impoundments to include speed contests, and SB 1489 (Perata) Chapter 411, Statutes of 2002, granted law enforcement the ability to impound a vehicle for reckless driving. Today, there are nearly three dozen bases upon which local authorities – primarily peace officers – may remove and impound a vehicle under the California Vehicle Code.

California Vehicle Code section 22651 sets forth the main circumstances under which local authorities may remove and impound a vehicle, including leaving a vehicle unattended, obstructing traffic so as to create a hazard, identifying a stolen or embezzled vehicle, blocking a private driveway or firefighting equipment (including a hydrant), when an officer arrests a person driving or in control of a vehicle and is required to take the person into custody, identifying a vehicle which has been issued five or more unaddressed parking citations, and leaving the vehicle parked or standing on a road for 72 or more consecutive hours in violation of

¹ DeYoung, David. “An evaluation of the specific deterrent effects of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked, and unlicensed drivers in California.” *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. Vol. 31, Issues 1-2, January 1999, Pp. 45-53. An evaluation of the specific deterrent effects of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked, and unlicensed drivers in California - ScienceDirect

a local ordinance authorizing removal.² Of particular relevance to this bill, existing law also authorizes a peace officer or other local official designated to perform such functions to remove a vehicle from a street or public or private property when they have reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle has been abandoned.³

After removing a vehicle, per one of the aforementioned reasons or otherwise, the officer is required to take the vehicle to “the nearest garage or place of safety or to a garage designated or maintained” by the officer’s employing agency, a process commonly referred to as “impoundment.”⁴ Impoundments can last anywhere from 24 hours to 30 calendar days depending on a variety of factors, and a vehicle’s registered owner can usually reclaim their impounded vehicle by showing proof of registration and paying a specified fee.⁵ However, if a vehicle remains unclaimed for a certain length of time depending on the value of the vehicle, the keeper of that vehicle (usually the owner of the tow yard or impound lot, referred to as a “lienholder”), may dispose of the vehicle, as discussed in greater detail in Comment 4.

3. Vehicle Removal and The Fourth Amendment

The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects people from excessively intrusive government searches and seizures. The Supreme Court has emphasized that the Fourth Amendment requires adherence to judicial processes, and has stressed that searches and seizures occurring without a warrant issued by a judge or magistrate are considered to be per se unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment. There are exceptions, however, such exceptions must comply with the touchstone of the Fourth Amendment—reasonableness.⁶

Generally speaking, removing a vehicle constitutes a “seizure” under the Fourth Amendment, but officers may remove a vehicle without a warrant under certain conditions. Officers have the authority to remove vehicles that jeopardize public safety or impede the movement of vehicular traffic as part of their “community caretaking function.”⁷ The decision to remove the vehicle under the community caretaking doctrine depends on the location of the vehicle and the officer’s duty to prevent it from being an obstruction or hazard to traffic, or potentially being stolen.⁸ Therefore, removing the car must be reasonable in relation to the officer’s community caretaking function, and even in cases where a statute may authorize the removal of a vehicle, the removal must still be reasonable under the Fourth Amendment.⁹

² Many local ordinances explicitly prohibit leaving a vehicle on any public street or parking facility for 72 or more consecutive hours and authorize removal pursuant to this Vehicle Code provision (Veh. Code, § 22651, subd. (k).) For example, see Roseville Municipal Code § 11.20.020, City of Roseville, CA Parking in General; for an example of a 72-hour notice, see VEHICLE-VIOLATION-NOTICE-2018.pdf

³ Veh. Code, § 22669

⁴ Veh. Code, § 22850.

⁵ Veh. Code, §§ 22850.3, 22850.5, 22851, 22851.3

⁶ *Katz v. U.S.* (1967) 389 U.S. 347, 357; *Florida v. Jimeno* (1991) 500 U.S. 248, 250.)

⁷ See *South Dakota v. Opperman* (1976) 428 U.S. 364, 368-369) [“The authority of police to seize and remove from the streets vehicles impeding traffic or threatening public safety and convenience is beyond challenge.”]; *Coal. on Homelessness v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco* (2023) 93 Cal.App.5th 928 [discussing the vehicular community caretaking exception as covering “cars that are illegally parked, create a hazard to other drivers or an obstacle to the flow of traffic, or are a target for vandalism or theft,” but concluding “tows of legally parked cars based on unpaid tickets are not within the vehicular community caretaking exception.”]

⁸ *Miranda v. City of Cornelius* (9th Cir. 2005) 429 F.3d 858, 864.

⁹ *People v. Williams* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 756, 761-62; see also Veh. Code, § 22650, subd. (b).

4. Disposition of Vehicles, Lien Sales and Effect of This Bill

As mentioned above, officers who remove a vehicle must transfer it to a garage or tow yard for storage and safekeeping until the owner collects it or a specified period has elapsed during which the vehicle has gone unclaimed. At the time a vehicle is removed by law enforcement or another local governmental entity, that entity is responsible for determining whether that vehicle falls into one of three “estimated value categories: under \$500, between \$500 and \$4,000, or over \$4,000.”¹⁰ This valuation is central to the process of disposing of that vehicle. Existing law grants the owner of the garage or tow yard a lien against the vehicle as a means of providing compensation for towing and storing the vehicle for the period of impoundment.¹¹ After a specified time period has elapsed, depending on the value of the vehicle and whether the vehicle was abandoned or not, the lienholder may satisfy the lien via a “lien sale,” which is essentially a vehicle auction.¹²

Existing law sets forth a specific procedure for vehicles that have been removed by law enforcement¹³ after being deemed abandoned, and when the vehicle has been determined to be of “low value” (a valuation of \$500 or less). Under this procedure, law enforcement must attach a notice (“pre-removal notice”) to the vehicle at least 72 hours prior to its removal indicating that the removal will take place. Within 48 hours of removal, either the removing agency or the lienholder must send another notice (“post-removal notice”) to the vehicle’s registered owner at their addresses of record with the DMV, with the following information: contact information for the public agency providing the notice, information regarding where the vehicle is being stored, the legal authority for removal, a statement that the vehicle may be disposed of 15 days from the date of notice, and a notice that the owners have the opportunity for a hearing to determine the validity of the storage if a request is made within 10 days of the notice.¹⁴

If, after 15 days from the post-removal notification, the vehicle remains unclaimed and the towing and storage fees have not been paid, and no request for post storage hearing was received, the removal agency must provide the lienholder with authorization to dispose of the vehicle. Existing law requires that disposal of the vehicle may only be to a licensed dismantler or scrap iron processor. It is important to note that if the names and addresses of the registered owners of the vehicle are not available from the DMV, the removing agency may immediately authorize the disposal of the vehicle by the lienholder.¹⁵

According to the Author, it is imperative that this process for disposing of low-value abandoned vehicles be amended to address a growing challenge related to RVs. The Author states that “The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) estimates that nearly 6,500 individuals experiencing homelessness in the City of Los Angeles live in approximately 4,000 RVs. This number has increased by 40% since 2018, comprising 22% of the City’s unsheltered homeless population. Many of these RVs are in extreme disrepair, exposing occupants to hazardous

¹⁰ Veh. Code, § 22670

¹¹ Veh. Code, § 22851. The lien is dependent on possession, which is deemed to arise when the vehicle is removed and in transit. However, no lien shall attach to the personal property within the vehicle.

¹² Most of the statutory requirements regarding lien sales are located in Civ. Code, § 3067, et. seq.

¹³ The statute indicates that any public agency authorized to remove abandoned vehicles may perform the functions described, but for the sake of brevity will simply refer to all authorized entities as “law enforcement.”

¹⁴ Veh. Code, § 22851.3, subds. (a)-(d).) A requested hearing must be held within 48 hours of that request.

¹⁵ Veh. Code, § 22851.3, subds. (h), (j), (k).

conditions and contributing to public health risks such as improper waste disposal, fire hazards, and unsafe generator use.” Under current law, RVs are subject to the same valuation scheme as basic automobiles, which, according to the Author leads to harmful outcomes. That is, if the value of the RV “exceeds \$500, the RV must be auctioned through a lien sale, where predatory buyers—commonly referred to as “vanlords”—can purchase RVs for as little as \$50 and quickly return them to the streets, perpetuating the cycle of unsafe housing and environmental hazards.”

In an effort to address this issue, this bill authorizes the disposal of an abandoned RV in accordance with the process outlined above if the RV is valued at less than \$4,000. The bill makes other modifications to that process, including requiring that the pre-removal notice include contact information for the removal agency and a statement that a removed RV can be recovered for at least 15 days, and requiring that the post-removal notice include a statement that the registered owner of an RV has up to 30 days from the date of notice to claim the RV. However, it is unclear, given the specific language in these provisions, what these separate timeframes are referring to, when they commence, and why they are different. The Author and Committee may wish to amend the 15 day reclamation provision to align with the provision allowing for the recovery of the vehicle by the owner within 30 days of the issuance of the post-removal notice. Moreover, given the fact that many of these RVs are homes for the otherwise houseless, and in many cases may not be current on their DMV registration, the Author and Committee may wish to consider requiring removal agencies to make an effort to furnish the post-removal notice to residents/owners of an RV whose owner/resident is unidentifiable at the scene of the removal (i.e. no license plate/registration tab/visible Vehicle Identification Number).¹⁶

In addition, the bill states that if, after 30 days from the issuance of the post-removal notification, the RV remains unclaimed and the towing and storage fees have not been paid, and if no request for a poststorage hearing was received or a poststorage hearing was not attended, the removal agency shall provide the lienholder with authorization to dispose of the RV. However, the authorization to dispose the RV must include a verification that the RV is inoperable – if the RV is operable, the removal agency can only authorize disposal if the RV was towed due to an environmental or public safety hazard. If the RV is claimed within 30 days, the bill permits the lienholder to collect reasonable fees for services rendered. Finally, the bill requires local jurisdictions to collect specified data each year regarding the removed RVs, such as the number of such vehicles, the number of people found in the vehicles prior to removal, and the number of inoperable and operable removed RVs, as well as other data elements.

5. Related Legislation

SB 692 (Arreguin) authorizes a local government to perform emergency summary abatement of vehicles creating imminent health and safety hazards, and modifies notice requirements for local ordinances establishing procedures for the removal of abandoned vehicles. One relevant provision of SB 692 provides that the requirements of Section 22851.3 of the Vehicle Code relating to the disposal of low-value, abandoned vehicles shall be waived if the removing agency either 1) obtains a release signed by the owner assigning their interest in the vehicle to the agency or 2) determines that the vehicle poses a public nuisance, has posted a 15-day public notice to the vehicle specifying that the vehicle is subject to disposal if not removed, and allows

¹⁶ Of course, these individuals may be liable for other traffic-related citations/infractions, but the loss of one’s RV because an individual had no other mailing address registered with the DMV is likely a disproportionate consequence for simply failing to display a license plate.

for a post-removal hearing. If both bills are signed, this waiver would also apply to the notice and removal requirements for abandoned, low-value RVs proposed by this bill. SB 692 is currently awaiting referral in the Assembly.

6. Argument in Support

According to the California Big City Mayor's Coalition:

Unsheltered homelessness can take on many forms, including people living in vehicles. While RVs offer temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness, they can pose risks to public health, safety, and the environment—blocking narrow roads and intersections, discharging hazardous waste, taking up limited parking, and in some cases, contributing to crime or fire hazards. Most importantly, those living in RVs deserve access to safe, affordable housing. The California Vehicle Code states that the owner of any vehicle that has been impounded must be notified and given 10 days to reclaim the vehicle. If the impounded vehicle is valued at \$501 to \$4,000, the operators of the impound lot have 15 days to prepare the vehicle to enter a lien sale. The RVs are commonly bought by “vanlords”, who purchase multiple lien sale RVs for extremely low costs, sometimes as low as \$50. They then bring RVs back onto the streets and rent them out, perpetuating a challenging cycle. Currently, vehicles valued at \$500 or less may be dismantled without a lien sale. AB 630 would raise this threshold to allow an RV to be dismantled without a lien sale if it is valued at \$4,000 or less and the owner does not claim the vehicle or request a review hearing after the 15-day notification period.

7. Argument in Opposition

According to the California Public Defenders Association:

Existing law provides for a procedure for the disposition of vehicles valued at under \$500 where there are “reasonable grounds to believe that the vehicle has been abandoned.” AB 630 proposes to amend CVC § 22851.3 to include recreational vehicles valued at less than \$4,000. The bill would permit local municipalities and county agencies greater ability to remove shelter from California's unhoused population. As noted by the May 15th Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 630, California's unhoused population is currently at record levels and is characterized by “stark racial disparities” when compared with the overall population of California.

Raising the limit from \$500 to under \$4000 for public agencies to have abandoned vehicles dismantled is too high when there are a number of recreational vehicles for sale on eBay and other websites for \$4000 or less. Since AB 630 allows for dismantling of operable vehicles that are towed due to “posing an environmental or public safety hazard” that should be defined consistent with state law rather than leaving every municipality to make their own determination. Due to the other vague terms used in the legislation, AB 630 offers little due process protection to people living in recreational vehicles.

1. AB 630 does not define what constitutes an “abandoned vehicle” but rather states that recreational vehicles may be towed pursuant to CVC 22669(a), which allows for towing of a vehicle where there are “reasonable grounds to

believe” that the vehicle is abandoned. This allows local governments to have broad, and sometimes harsh, definitions of abandonment.

2. AB 630 does not require independent evaluation of the seized vehicle’s worth, instead entrusting the valuation process to the agents of the entity authorizing the towing of the vehicle. This raises the concern for conflicts of interest: the locality authorizing the towing of the vehicle has an interest in removing it from the roadway, as does the towing company who will likely profit from fees for the towing and storage of the vehicle or its disposal. Arguably, this would likely lead to vehicles of greater than \$4,000 in value being seized and ultimately destroyed.
3. The problem of AB 630’s lack of independent valuation is compounded by the failure in the legislation to provide a process for appealing the valuation of the vehicle, other than a writ of mandate pursuant to Government Code § 11523. This creates a rather difficult maze of costly bureaucratic and legal hurdles for the owner of a seized vehicle to overcome to challenge the seizure of their vehicle.
4. AB 630 provides for “reasonable fees” for the storage of the vehicle from the owner of the vehicle. However, reasonableness is subjective. For people struggling with housing “reasonable” storage fees amount to another potentially insurmountable barrier to reclaiming their vehicle.

Removing shelter from the most vulnerable and impoverished members of California’s population without meaningful due process is not a rational solution to California’s housing crisis. AB 630 is bad public policy which disproportionately impacts women and children, some of whom are escaping domestic violence. By taking the only asset these women have, it makes it less likely that they will be able to obtain or maintain employment and more likely that they will be forced to return to the abusive situations they fled. AB 630 is a severely flawed response to the affordability crisis facing the state.

-- END --