Date of Hearing: July 1, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Buffy Wicks, Chair
SB 1000 (Becker) – As Amended June 9, 2026

Policy Committee: Privacy and Consumer Protection Vote: 15 - 0

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

SUMMARY:

This bill revises the California AI Transparency Act, which governs covered providers of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) systems.

Specifically, this bill:

1) Removes the requirement that a covered provider have more than 1,000,000 monthly visitors or users, so the chapter reaches any GenAI system that is publicly accessible in the state.

2) Revises the required no-cost, consumer-facing tool — renamed a "disclosure verification tool" — that allows a user to assess whether content was created or altered by a covered provider's GenAI system, and adds and revises related privacy limits on the personal information a covered provider may collect or retain.

3) Revises the latent disclosure requirements for AI-generated content and the contractual obligations a covered provider must impose on third-party licensees, including shortening the deadline to terminate a noncompliant licensee's authorization from 96 to 72 hours.

4) Adds an urgency clause.

FISCAL EFFECT:

1) Potential minor costs to the Department of Justice (General Fund) for enforcement. The Attorney General's authority to enforce the chapter already exists under current law, which this bill does not amend: a violation is subject to a civil penalty of $5,000 per violation, collected in a civil action filed by the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel. The bill does not create any new enforcement authority or mechanism. By removing the requirement that a covered provider have more than 1,000,000 monthly users, the bill enlarges the population of providers subject to the chapter, but any additional enforcement activity, and the associated costs, would likely be minor and would depend on whether the Attorney General elects to pursue actions under existing authority.

2) The bill creates no new state program or appropriation, and the operative obligations apply to private covered providers. Enforcement by a city attorney or county counsel is permissive and would fall to local funds, so the bill imposes no reimbursable state-mandated local program. Any penalty revenue is not a significant or reliable funding source.

COMMENTS:

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

> As AI technology advances, distinguishing between human and machine-generated content becomes increasingly challenging. This ambiguity poses significant risks to Californians, exacerbating problems of disinformation, harassment, and fraud while threatening the integrity of the information environment our democracy and economy depend on. In 2024, the legislature passed SB 942, the first bill in the nation to establish disclosure requirements for synthetic content. Since then, content provenance technology has developed in such a way that the leading technologies for embedding provenance are not accurately described by the law. Additionally, some methods of marking content are still in their nascency, and aren't yet robust enough to withstand adversarial exploitation or certain kinds of transformations (e.g. file compression, spoofing attacks, added noise to an image, or file type conversions). The original act also did not address the risk that visible labels create a binary signal implying that unlabeled content is authentic and labeled content is suspect - regardless of whether either inference is warranted. Furthermore, obligations for developers established SB 942 do not require that the information embedded in AI generated or modified content be consistent - or interoperable with - widely adopted standards. Last year, AB 853 (Wicks) established obligations for large online platforms to read provenance data, but only if it was compliant with such standards. This gap risks establishing a fragmented ecosystem where new methods of provenance disclosure that aren't interoperable with current standards are not read by large online platforms, and never subsequently relayed to users. This bill is critical to ensuring California's content labeling laws are effective at providing consumers with consistent information about where the content they see online comes from.

2) **Background**. The California AI Transparency Act, codified in the Business and Professions Code, requires a covered provider of a GenAI system to make available a free tool allowing users to assess whether content was generated or altered by the provider's system, to offer disclosures identifying AI-generated content, and to impose disclosure-related obligations on third parties licensing the provider's system. This bill refines those requirements. The most consequential change for the scope of the chapter is the removal of the 1,000,000-monthly-user threshold from the definition of "covered provider," which extends coverage from the largest systems to any GenAI system publicly accessible in the state. The bill also reworks the detection tool into a "disclosure verification tool" with revised functionality and privacy limits, revises the information a latent disclosure must convey and the standards with which a disclosure must be compatible, and shortens the window — from 96 to 72 hours — within which a covered provider must terminate a licensee's authorization after learning the licensee has modified a system out of compliance. Many of the new obligations are qualified as applying only "to the extent technically feasible."

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