

Date of Hearing: May 13, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
Buffy Wicks, Chair  
AB 2047 (Bauer-Kahan) – As Introduced February 17, 2026

Policy Committee:	Public Safety	Vote:	6 - 0
	Judiciary		9 - 3

Urgency: No      State Mandated Local Program: Yes      Reimbursable: No

**SUMMARY:**

This bill, the Firearm Printing Prevention Act, requires manufacturers of three-dimensional (3D) printers sold or transferred in California to equip those printers with firearm blocking technology, and establishes a Department of Justice (DOJ) regulatory program to investigate, certify, and oversee firearm blueprint detection algorithms, software controls processes, and manufacturer compliance.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Requires DOJ to investigate known firearm blueprint design files and existing firearm blueprint detection algorithms, and authorizes DOJ to create and maintain, or coordinate with a University of California academic department to create and maintain, a library of firearm blueprint files.
- 2) Requires DOJ, by July 1, 2027, to publish performance standards for firearm blueprint detection algorithms and software controls processes, and by January 1, 2028, to begin accepting applications and issuing certifications for both.
- 3) Requires DOJ, by March 1, 2028, to publish guidance for 3D printer manufacturers on equipping printers with firearm blocking technology, and by July 1, 2028, to begin accepting manufacturer self-attestations and voluntary compliance verifications.
- 4) Requires DOJ, by September 1, 2028, to publish and quarterly update a public list of printer makes and models with complete self-attestations, incomplete attestations, or compliance verifications.
- 5) Prohibits the sale or transfer of 3D printers in California that are not equipped with certified firearm blocking technology and not listed on the DOJ public list, with exemptions for printers sold to state-licensed firearms manufacturers, specified law enforcement and military uses, and industrial users in aerospace, biomedical, automotive, and engineering sectors.
- 6) Authorizes civil enforcement by the Attorney General, county counsel, city attorneys, and private individuals, with civil penalties up to \$25,000 per violation, injunctive relief, and attorney's fees for prevailing plaintiffs.
- 7) Makes it a misdemeanor to knowingly disable, deactivate, or circumvent firearm blocking technology in a 3D printer with intent to manufacture firearms, or to distribute modified versions of printers identified on the DOJ list.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

- 1) Significant ongoing costs (General Fund, special funds) to the Department of Justice (DOJ) to establish and operate a new multi-component regulatory program. DOJ has indicated that the costs are unquantifiable but very significant, and that the workload required under the bill is complex and requires technological expertise outside DOJ's existing scope and capabilities, leaving DOJ unable to determine how it would implement the bill and what implementation would cost. DOJ's responsibilities under the bill include: investigating existing firearm blueprint files and detection algorithms, developing and maintaining a library of firearm blueprint files (or coordinating with a University of California (UC) academic department to do so), publishing performance standards for detection algorithms and software controls processes by July 1, 2027, certifying and recertifying detection technology beginning January 1, 2028, publishing manufacturer guidance and processing manufacturer self-attestations on rolling deadlines through 2028, conducting voluntary compliance verifications and sample testing, maintaining a quarterly-updated public list of compliant and non-compliant printer makes and models, investigating questionable attestations, promulgating regulations, and enforcing civil penalties. These functions require technical expertise in 3D printing, firearms manufacturing, software engineering, and algorithm evaluation that DOJ has indicated is outside its existing scope. Implementation would require new specialized staff or contracted technical expertise, as well as additional attorneys, investigators, and administrative support. Partnership with a UC academic department for library maintenance, if pursued, would involve additional interagency or contract costs.
- 2) Cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the courts for civil enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General, county counsel, city attorneys, and private plaintiffs under the bill's civil penalty and private right of action provisions. Actual costs will depend on the number of cases filed and the amount of court time needed to resolve each case. It generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The state budget provides annual General Fund backfills to the Trial Court Trust Fund to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.

The Legislative Analyst's Office recently warned of General Fund structural deficits of around \$35 billion per year beginning in the 2027-28 fiscal year.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Purpose.** According to the author:

California has set a standard for the country in creating commonsense gun regulations and gun violence prevention work. AB 2047 continues this work by requiring that all three-dimensional printers sold in California are equipped with firearm blocking features to prohibit the printing of dangerous gun parts. Specifically, it requires that they have a firearm detection algorithm and software controls that identifies files that would produce guns and illegal gun parts and block such printing requests.

There is alarming data showing that 3D-printed firearms have become an escalating public safety threat. A report from Everytown for Gun Safety shows that recoveries of 3D-printed guns increased by 1,000 percent between 2020 and 2024. Just last month, Santa Rosa police seized three 3D printers along with 167 firearms- including 150 guns with obliterated serial numbers- in an illegal ghost gun manufacturing operation that left weapons easily accessible to a young child. As technology evolves, it's important that consumer protections change with it to ensure the safety of our communities.

- 2) **Background.** Ghost guns — firearms manufactured without serial numbers by persons not licensed to manufacture firearms — have been a growing enforcement concern in California. According to DOJ, California law enforcement agencies recorded a 1,236% increase in the number of ghost guns recovered from crimes involving family violence between 2019 and 2021. As highlighted by the Judiciary Committee's analysis, enforcement activity in early 2026 illustrates the scope of the problem: in February 2026, Santa Rosa police seized over 165 firearms and multiple 3D printers from a suspected ghost gun manufacturer, and a San Jose teenager was found with 27 finished or near-finished 3D-printed firearms and two printers.

Existing law already prohibits the use of a 3D printer to manufacture a firearm by any person other than a state-licensed firearms manufacturer, prohibits selling, transferring, or possessing a 3D printer whose sole or primary function is manufacturing firearms, authorizes civil actions against persons who knowingly distribute digital firearm manufacturing code, and creates a rebuttable presumption of unlawful conduct for certain targeted marketing of 3D printers for firearm manufacture.

This bill shifts enforcement upstream by requiring printer manufacturers to build detection and blocking technology into consumer 3D printers. Under the bill, DOJ or another designated state agency develops performance standards for detection algorithms and software controls processes, certifies qualifying technologies through an application and testing process, publishes manufacturer guidance, accepts manufacturer self-attestations, conducts voluntary compliance verifications, and maintains a public list of compliant and non-compliant printer models. Exemptions apply to printers sold exclusively to state-licensed firearms manufacturers, specified state and federal law enforcement users, and non-consumer industrial applications (aerospace, biomedical, automotive, and chemical/mechanical engineering). Operative dates for the sale and transfer prohibitions are delayed to provide time for the regulatory framework to be established.

Both the Public Safety and Judiciary Committee analyses discuss the bill's constitutional exposure, including Second Amendment and dormant Commerce Clause issues. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

**Analysis Prepared by:** Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081