

Date of Hearing: May 6, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Buffy Wicks, Chair
AB 2419 (Quirk-Silva) – As Introduced February 20, 2026

Policy Committee: Public Safety Vote: 9 - 0

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

SUMMARY:

This bill requires the County of Los Angeles to implement a body-worn camera program for the County of Los Angeles Probation Department and requires the county, probation department, and affected employee organizations to organize to develop a body-worn camera policy that mirrors best practices of law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles, as specified.

FISCAL EFFECT:

Potentially significant one-time and ongoing local costs to procure cameras, build out data storage and management infrastructure, develop policies, train staff, and operate a body-worn camera program covering all probation officers and staff who interact with probation clients in the field and in facilities. The Los Angeles County Probation Department is one of the largest probation agencies in the country, with several thousand sworn and civilian staff across juvenile facilities and adult and juvenile field operations. Because the bill imposes new operational duties on a single named local agency, the Commission on State Mandates would determine whether the bill creates a reimbursable state-mandated local program. If the Commission so determines, potentially significant ongoing General Fund costs could result for reimbursement of LA County's program costs.

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:

AB 2419 addresses longstanding oversight and safety failures within Los Angeles County's juvenile probation system. These facilities have faced repeated scrutiny after the California Board of State and Community Corrections found conditions unsuitable for confinement, and the county has paid billions of dollars in settlements to victims of mistreatment.

Body-worn cameras are already standard practice for many law enforcement agencies. They help de-escalate conflicts, improve accountability, and provide an objective record of interactions. Requiring their use by juvenile probation officers strengthens

transparency and public trust. It ensures that encounters between officers and youth rely on clear evidence rather than conflicting accounts, and helps our probation system to focus resources on safety and rehabilitation.

- 2) **Background.** Existing law directs law enforcement agencies adopting body-worn cameras to consider specified best practices for data downloading, retention, storage, and security; AB 748 (Ting), Chapter 960, Statutes of 2018, established the public-disclosure framework for critical-incident audio and video recordings; and the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training is required to treat tampering with body-worn camera data to conceal misconduct as serious misconduct for purposes of peace officer decertification. This bill layers a special-statute requirement on top of that framework specific to LA County Probation.
- 3) **Support and Opposition.** Supporters, led by Teamsters California and including the State Coalition of Probation Organizations, argue that body-worn cameras provide first-person documentation that fixed surveillance systems do not capture in close-range staff-youth interactions, strengthen institutional oversight, protect youth and staff from false allegations, and represent sound fiscal policy because avoided investigative time and reduced settlement risk could offset program costs. Opponents, led by LA Defensa, argue that the county should first achieve full compliance with existing fixed-camera coverage requirements under the stipulated judgment governing its juvenile facilities, that research does not consistently support body-worn cameras' effectiveness at improving evidence quality or reducing complaints and liability, that activation depends on officer discretion, and that detained youth have raised concerns about when and how cameras would be activated in private settings such as bathrooms and showers.
- 4) **Related Legislation.** SB 337 (Menjivar), of the current legislative session, requires California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to adopt body-worn camera policies for state prisons; it was gut-and-amended to require the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to adopt, and update regularly, a prison rape elimination policy. The bill is pending in Senate Rules.

SB 691 (Wahab), of the current legislative session, requires law enforcement agencies to update body-worn camera policies for sensitive medical and psychological encounters. SB 691 is currently pending referral in the Assembly.

- 5) **Prior Legislation.** AB 748 (Ting), Chapter 960, Statutes of 2018, established the critical-incident disclosure framework.

Several earlier proposals to establish statewide body-worn camera standards or release rules — including AB 1069 (Rodriguez), of the 2019-2020 Legislative Session, AB 66 (Weber), of the 2015-2016 Legislative Session, AB 1957 (Quirk), of the 2015-2016 Legislative Session, and AB 1940 (Cooper), of the 2015-2016 Legislative Session — failed passage or were not taken up.

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