Date of Hearing: July 16, 2025
Fiscal: Yes

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Chair
SB 524 (Arreguín) – As Amended June 25, 2025

SENATE VOTE: 28-10

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

SUBJECT: Law enforcement agencies: artificial intelligence

SYNOPSIS

Artificial intelligence (AI) has increasingly permeated nearly every sector of society, including law enforcement, where generative AI (GenAI) is now being used to assist in drafting police reports. Specifically, this technology can process audio from body-worn camera footage and generate a first draft of a report. While these drafts must still be reviewed and finalized by the responding officer, proponents highlight the potential for time savings and administrative efficiency.

However, the introduction of any new technology, particularly AI, raises important concerns. AI systems can reflect biases present in their training data and are known to occasionally produce incorrect, incoherent, or misleading outputs. In the context of policing, this can significantly impact the accuracy and reliability of official reports. Overreliance on AI may also lead officers to place undue trust in the technology, reducing the level of critical review applied during the reporting process. This could undermine the integrity of a key evidentiary component of the justice system.

This bill, sponsored by the California Public Defenders Association, seeks to build transparency and accountability into the use of AI in police reporting. It would require law enforcement agencies to adopt a policy ensuring that any report generated with the assistance of AI includes a disclosure on each page stating that AI was used. The final report must be signed by the officer, affirming that they reviewed the content and that the facts are true and correct. Additionally, the bill mandates the retention of the initial AI-generated draft and requires the maintenance of an audit trail identifying the person who used the AI system and linking the report to the specific audio or video footage used. Finally, the bill establishes that only the finalized, officer-reviewed report constitutes the officer's official statement.

This bill is supported by Oakland Privacy and the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors. This bill is opposed by the Police Chief's Association and the Peace Officers Research Association of California. This bill was passed by the Public Safety Committee on 6-0-3 vote.

Comment #5 outlines the Committee Amendments, which require contracted vendors providing AI technology to law enforcement agencies to use the data for its intended law enforcement purpose.

THIS BILL:

1) Requires each law enforcement agency to maintain a policy to require an official report prepared by a law enforcement officer or any member of a law enforcement agency that is generated using artificial intelligence either fully or partially to contain both of the following:

   a. On each page of the report, identification of every specific artificial intelligence program used and the following statement:

      "This report was written either fully or in part using artificial intelligence."

   b. The signature of the law enforcement officer or member of a law enforcement agency who prepared the final report, either in physical or electronic form, verifying that they reviewed the contents of that report and that the facts contained in the report are true and correct.

2) Requires that, whether fully or partially, the first draft created to be retained for as long as the final report is retained. If a law enforcement officer or any member of a law enforcement agency uses artificial intelligence to create an official report.

3) Provides that except for the final report, a draft of any report created with the use of artificial intelligence does not constitute an officer's official statement.

4) Requires the program used to generate a draft, interim, or final report to maintain an audit trail that, at a minimum, identifies both of the following:

   a. The person who used artificial intelligence to create a report.

   b. The video and audio footage used to create a report, if any.

5) Defines the following terms:

   a. "Artificial intelligence" to mean an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments. "Artificial intelligence" as used in the bill applies to artificial intelligence systems that automatically draft police report narratives based upon an analysis of in-car or dash-mounted cameras, or body-worn camera audio or video, and artificial intelligence systems that analyze a law enforcement officer's dictated report to generate a police report narrative automatically enhanced by generative artificial intelligence.

   b. "Law enforcement agency" to mean any department or agency of the state or any local government, special district, or other political subdivision thereof, that employs any peace officer.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Provides that on or before January 1, 2026, and before each time thereafter that a GenAI system or service, or a substantial modification to a GenAI system or service, released on or after January 1, 2022, is made publicly available to Californians for use, regardless of whether the terms of that use include compensation, the developer of the system or service shall post on the developer's internet website documentation regarding the data used by the

developer to train the generative artificial intelligence system or service, including specified information. (Civ. Code, § 3111.)

2) Provides that the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) shall, as appropriate perform a risk analysis of potential threats posed by the use of GenAI to California's critical infrastructure, including those that could lead to mass casualty events, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 11549.65 (b).)

3) Requires any state agency or department to consider procurement and enterprise use opportunities in which GenAI can improve the efficiency, effectiveness, accessibility, and equity of government operations consistent with existing policies for public sector GenAI procurement. (Gov. Code, § 11549.65 (c).)

4) Requires a state agency or department that utilizes GenAI to directly communicate with a person regarding government services and benefits shall ensure that those communications include both of the following:

   a. A disclaimer that indicates to the person that the communication was generated by GenAI, as specified.

   b. Information, or a link to an internet website containing information, describing how the person may contact a human employee of the state agency or department. (Gov. Code, § 11549.66.)

5) Requires persons that create, code or otherwise produce a GenAI system that has over 1,000,000 monthly visitors or users, as specified, to make available an AI detection tool that allows users to assess whether an image, video or audio content was created or altered by AI, and provides other detection functions, as specified. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.2.)

6) Requires persons that create, code or otherwise produce a GenAI system that has over 1,000,000 monthly visitors or users, as specified, to offer users the option to include a manifest disclosure in image, video, or audio content created or altered by the person's GenAI system that identifies the content as AI-generated, as specified. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.3.)

7) Requires specified political advertisements to include, in a clear and conspicuous manner, the following disclosure: "Ad generated or substantially altered using artificial intelligence." (Gov. Code, § 84514.)

8) Defines "artificial intelligence" as an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments. (Civ. Code, § 3110 (a); Gov. Code, §§ 11549.64, 84514 (d).)

9) Requires that all recorded data from body-worn cameras are property of their respective law enforcement agency and shall not be accessed or released for any unauthorized purpose, explicitly prohibit agency personnel from accessing recorded data for personal use and from uploading recorded data onto public and social media internet websites, and include sanctions for violations of this prohibition. (Pen. Code, § 832.18(8).)

10) Requires each local law enforcement agency to conspicuously post on their internet websites all current standards, policies, practices, operating procedures, and education and training materials that would otherwise be available to the public if a request was made pursuant to the California Public Records Act. (Pen. Code, § 13650.)

11) Requires state and local law enforcement agencies to make public specified information regarding individuals arrested by the agency, except to the extent that disclosure of a particular item would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or a related investigation. (Gov. Code, § 7923.610.)

COMMENTS:

1) **Author's statement**. According to the author:

Artificial Intelligence is spreading wildly and creating many concerns, particularly with regard to transparency. This bill is designed to build transparency into the process of creating police reports using AI without in any way impairing the ability of police agencies to use AI to enhance their work product. Adding a footer to a police report stating it was prepared using AI, naming the program used, and requiring an audit trail and the saving of relevant audio and video are already features built into products. The criminal justice system needs clarity and transparency to maintain trust. This bill does that.

2) **AI and GenAI.** The development of GenAI is creating exciting opportunities to grow California's economy and improve the lives of its residents. GenAI can generate compelling text, images and audio in an instant – but with novel technologies come novel safety concerns.

What is AI? In brief, AI is the mimicking of human intelligence by artificial systems such as computers. AI uses algorithms – sets of rules – to transform inputs into outputs. Inputs and outputs can be anything a computer can process: numbers, text, audio, video, or movement. AI is not fundamentally different from other computer functions; its novelty lies in its application. Unlike normal computer functions, AI is able to accomplish tasks that are normally performed by humans.

AI that are trained on small, specific datasets in order to make recommendations and predictions are sometimes referred to as "predictive AI." This differentiates them from GenAI, which are trained on massive datasets in order to produce detailed text and images. When Netflix suggests a TV show to a viewer, the recommendation is produced by predictive AI that has been trained on the viewing habits of Netflix users. When ChatGPT generates text in clear, concise paragraphs, it uses GenAI that has been trained on the written contents of the internet.

GenAI tools can be released in open-source or closed-source formats by their creators. Open-source tools are publically available; researchers and developers can access their code and parameters. This accessibility increases transparency, but it has downsides: when a tool's code and parameters can be easily accessed, they can be easily altered, and open-source tools have the potential to be used for nefarious purposes such as generating deepfake pornography and targeted propaganda. By comparison, closed-source tools are opaque with respect to their security features. It is harder for bad actors to generate illicit materials using these tools. But unlike open-source tools, closed-source tools are not subject to collective oversight because their inner workings cannot be examined by independent experts.

3) **AI and Police Reports.** Unsurprisingly, as in many other fields, AI and GenAI have made their way into the world of policing. Relevant to this bill is the growing use of GenAI to assist in creating reports that document police incidents. Typically, after responding to an incident, an officer must file a report detailing key facts related to the investigation. These reports become the official record of the incident and are often referenced in subsequent legal proceedings. However, these reports can be time-consuming to produce: 89% of officers report that the time spent on paperwork limits their ability to be active in the community.[1] GenAI offers the potential to streamline this process by enabling faster and more efficient report creation.

In response to this need, companies such as Axon and Truleo have developed GenAI-powered services to assist in drafting initial police reports. These systems allow officers to link body-worn camera footage to GenAI tools that analyze the incident and generate a draft report. Officers are encouraged to narrate events in real time, as the technology relies on audio rather than video to produce the report. This technology has already been adopted in several Bay Area communities, including East Palo Alto, Campbell, and San Mateo.[2] This technology was summarily described by the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services:

> When an officer uploads their video, the footage is sent to the cloud to be analyzed by AI, which produces the first draft of a police report based on the audio. Because the transcription is based entirely on audio, officers are encouraged to narrate the situation in real time. The AI tools are not able to parse or summarize the video's visual content.
>
> With Draft One and Truleo, the officer begins by selecting the incident's category (traffic violation, domestic incident, etc.) and creating a template. The officer then reviews the AI–created report, filling in the brackets for additional details that may be relevant. They can also manually edit the report, changing or adding information.
>
> The narrative ends with the disclosure that the report was generated by AI, and the officer's signature testifies to the accuracy of the document. The report is submitted through the Axon system or by Truleo to their department's records management system.[3]

Proponents of this technology claim it frees up officers to spend more time in their communities. However, the only randomized controlled trial evaluating this claim found no measurable difference in the time officers spent creating police reports.[4] This finding mirrors results from similar deployments of ambient AI scribes in healthcare settings where the time saving aspects of the technology appear to have been overblown.[5] In both contexts, the lack of significant time

---

[1] Nuance Dragon Law Enforcement. "2021 Role of Technology in Law Enforcement Paperwork Annual Report", October 2021, https://www.nuance.com/content/dam/nuance/en_us/collateral/dragon/report/rpt-2021-role-of-technology-in-law-enforcement-paperwork-annual-report-en-us.pdf?srsltid=AfmBOoEihdDJMXupTOZR9lEI8Mnhi6MZGq4-gcnj-xrIzQkw0SMii9F.

[2] Sukey Lewis, "How Artificial Intelligence Is Changing The Reports Police Writ," *KQED* (Oct. 3, 2024), https://www.kqed.org/news/12007520/how-artificial-intelligence-is-changing-the-reports-police.

[3] Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, "Community Policing Dispatch, Using AI to Write Police Reports" (Jan. 2025), https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/01-2025/ai_reports.html.

[4] Ian T. Adams et al., "No man's hand: artificial intelligence does not improve police report writing speed", *Journal of Experimental Criminology* (Oct. 2, 2024).

[5] Stephan P. Ma et al., "Ambient artificial intelligence scribes: utilization and impact on documentation time", (Dec. 17, 2024), https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-abstract/32/2/381/7926614?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=true. This article shows that doctors are only saving between 5-20 minutes per day.

savings may stem from the fact that the AI-generated report serves only as an initial draft, which still requires careful review and editing before becoming an official record.

Some advocates also suggest that AI-generated reports may reduce bias compared to those written by humans. Yet, it is well documented that GenAI systems can reflect and even amplify societal biases embedded in their training data.[6] Despite this, Detective Jason Lucas of the Oklahoma City Police Department asserted, "Everything the AI-generated report says was heard; it's not creating evidence."[7] While this statement implies a high level of reliability, it misrepresents how GenAI works. These systems do not simply transcribe; they make probabilistic inferences based on input data and prompts. For example, when processing body-worn camera audio, the entire recording may be fed into the model alongside a prompt such as "draft a police report." The result is not a strict summary but a generated narrative that may combine unrelated elements or introduce inaccuracies.

This risk was highlighted during a recent joint hearing of this Committee and the Assembly Health Committee, where a healthcare worker testified about a case involving an HIV-positive patient. In that instance, the GenAI system incorrectly described the patient as an "intravenous drug user" because they had mentioned "pine needles" in their yard, an inference drawn from statistical associations between knowing the patient was HIV-positive and having recently been in contact with "needles".[8] Such examples underscore why GenAI does not necessarily expedite police reporting: the output still demands rigorous human review to ensure it has not introduced unsupported claims. Furthermore, statements like Detective Lucas's risk fostering overconfidence in these tools, potentially leading to diminished scrutiny and more errors in official reports. Inaccuracies in police reports can have massive impacts on the legal proceedings and hallucinations or misinterpreted comments by GenAI may make this process murkier. As noted in the Assembly Public Safety Committee analysis of this bill:

> Police reports play a critical role in prosecutorial charging decisions, as well as judicial pretrial release decisions. An AI-generated police report calls into question whether the facts in such a report are sufficiently reliable to support prosecutorial charging, or judicial pretrial detention decisions.[9]

4) **What this bill would do.** This bill seeks to promote transparency in the use of artificial intelligence to generate police reports. To that end, it requires law enforcement agencies to adopt a policy mandating that any official report partially or entirely generated using AI include specific disclosures. Each page of such a report must identify every AI program used and prominently state: "This report was written either fully or in part using artificial intelligence." The final report must also be signed by the officer who prepared it, affirming that they reviewed its contents and that the facts contained therein are true and correct.

---

[6] Leonardo Nicoletti and Dina Bass, "Humans are Biased. Generative AI is Even Worse", *Bloomberg* (June 9, 2023), https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2023-generative-ai-bias/?embedded-checkout=true.

[7] Faye C. Elkins "Using AI to Write Police Report", *Dispatch* (Jan. 2025), https://cops.usdoj.gov/html/dispatch/01-2025/ai_reports.html.

[8] The May 27, 2025 hearing can be found at https://ahea.assembly.ca.gov/hearings/2025-2026-informational-hearings. The noted comment is found the testimony of Dr. Brent Sugimoto.

[9] Ferguson, *Generative Suspicion and the Risks of AI-Assisted Police Reports* (July 17, 2024). Northwestern L. Rev., at p. 55, available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/4897632.pdf?abstractid=4897632&mirid=1.

The bill further clarifies that only the final, officer-reviewed report may constitute the officer's official statement. Any draft generated using AI, regardless of its completeness, does not qualify as an official statement. In addition, for any report where AI is used to generate a draft or assist in narrative construction, the first created draft must be retained for the same duration as the final report.

To ensure accountability, the bill requires any AI system used to generate a draft, interim, or final report to maintain an audit trail. At a minimum, this audit trail must identify the individual who used the AI system, along with any associated video or audio footage, such as from body-worn, in-car, or dash-mounted cameras, used in generating the report.

For the purposes of this bill, "artificial intelligence" adopts the definition established in last year's legislation (Bauer-Kahan, Ch. 843, 2024) but is specifically applied to systems that (1) automatically generate police report narratives based on analysis of body-worn or in-car camera audio or video, or (2) enhance dictated officer reports using generative artificial intelligence.

5) **Privacy Concerns and Committee Amendments.** Although the primary objective of this bill is to increase transparency in the use of AI-generated police reports, it also raises important questions about privacy. Body-worn cameras were initially adopted to improve law enforcement accountability; however, over time, they have increasingly become tools for broader state surveillance. For example, AI has been integrated into body-worn camera systems to enable facial recognition, expanding their use beyond documentation to real-time identification and monitoring.[10] Notably, California's ban on the use of facial recognition technology by law enforcement expired in 2023 (Ting, Ch. 579, 2019). Since then, the technology has begun to resurface, including in the form of a phone app that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is reportedly using to identify individuals for deportation.[11] This new app incorporates both information from photos taken of individuals when they enter the state as well as information from the search and seizures, which likely contains bodycam footage.

While current AI tools developed by Truleo and Axon rely on large language models (LLMs) that process only the audio from body-worn camera footage to generate police report narratives, there is no guarantee that future versions will not incorporate video analysis as well. This possibility raises important concerns about how data is stored, used, and accessed. In many commercial AI applications, content processed by an LLM may be retained or used for further model training.[12] Although vendors serving law enforcement, such as Truleo and Axon, currently assert that they restrict such uses unless the partnering department opts in to sharing, and that they comply with the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Security Policy, there remains a risk.[13] If these safeguards are ever relaxed or poorly enforced, especially by less scrupulous competitors, there is potential for a race to the bottom, where sensitive body-worn camera data

---

[10] Sophia Fox-Sowell, "AI-powered police body cameras are renewing privacy and bias concerns", *Statescoop* (July 1, 2025), https://statescoop.com/ai-powered-police-body-cameras-raise-privacy-bias-concerns/.

[11] Joseph Cox, "ICE Is Using a New Facial Recognition App to Identify People, Leaked Emails Show", *404 Media* (Jun. 26, 2025), https://www.404media.co/ice-is-using-a-new-facial-recognition-app-to-identify-people-leaked-emails-show/.

[12] OpenAI's data usage policy can be found at: https://help.openai.com/en/articles/5722486-how-your-data-is-used-to-improve-model-performance.

[13] Statements on Axon's compliance statement can be found at: https://investor.axon.com/2018-05-21-Axon-Announces-First-CJIS-Compliant-Artificial-Intelligence-Training-Center. CJIS Truleo's CJIS compliance statement can be found https://truleo.co/technology

could be repurposed to train other technologies, including facial recognition systems or other surveillance tools.

If access to audio or video data is permitted, it is conceivable that the information could be combined with other datasets or tools to create more expansive surveillance capabilities. While there is no evidence that current AI report-writing tools are being used in this way, the historical integration of surveillance technologies across law enforcement agencies raises reasonable concerns, particularly for vulnerable groups such as undocumented immigrants.[14] These potential future uses underscore the importance of placing proactive, statutory limits on how this data may be shared or reused.

Currently, both Truleo and Axon use cloud-based processing platforms – Truleo through Amazon Web Services' GovCloud and Axon through Microsoft's Azure Government Cloud.[15] These are secure, sovereign cloud environments designed for law enforcement use and preclude access from anyone except the contracting law enforcement agency. However, the California Penal Code only restricts unauthorized access or release of body-worn camera footage.[16] It does not explicitly prohibit law enforcement agencies from granting authorized third-party access, which could result in the use of body worn camera footage for something beyond producing the police report.

To that end, the author has agreed to amend the bill to include a prohibition on the contracted vendors who develop this technology. Specifically, vendors will be prohibited from using, selling, or sharing the information for any purpose other than the intended law enforcement use for which they were contracted – in this case, generating a draft police report. The amendments further clarify that vendors may only use or share the information in the context of judicial proceedings, investigations, or in compliance with a court order. The full text of the amendments is provided below:

(a) Each law enforcement agency shall maintain a policy to require an official report prepared by a law enforcement officer or any member of a law enforcement agency that is generated using artificial intelligence either fully or partially to contain both of the following:

(1) On each page of the report, identify every specific artificial intelligence program used and prominently state the following:

"This report was written either fully or in part using artificial intelligence."

(2) The signature of the law enforcement officer or member of a law enforcement agency who prepared the report, either in physical or electronic form, verifying that they reviewed the contents of the report and that the facts contained in the report are true and correct.

---

[14] Logan Seacrest and Jillian Snider. "The Past, Present, and Future of Police Body Cameras", *R Street* (July 1, 2025), https://www.rstreet.org/research/the-past-present-and-future-of-police-body-cameras/.
[15] Axon's partnership with Azure Cloud can be found https://www.axon.com/partners/microsoft. Truleo's partnership with AWS can be found https://truleo.co/technology.
[16] Pen. Code 832.18 § (b)(8).

(b) If a law enforcement officer or any member of a law enforcement agency uses artificial intelligence to create an official report, whether fully or partially, the first draft created shall be retained for as long as the final report is retained.

(c) The program used to generate a draft, interim, or final report shall maintain an audit trail that, at a minimum, identifies all of the following:

(1) The person who used artificial intelligence to create a report.

(2) The person who made any changes to a report.

(3) The video and audio footage used to create a report.

(d) A contracted vendor shall not share, sell, or otherwise use information provided by a law enforcement agency to be processed by artificial intelligence except for either of the following:

(1)The contracted law enforcement agency purposes.

(2) Pursuant to a court order.

 ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The California Public Defenders Association, sponsors of the bill, write in support:

Artificial Intelligence is ubiquitous, and yet regulation of it is in its infancy. It has recently been discovered that law enforcement in this state is using AI to generate police reports from the audio from body worn cameras. This AI software is being used without any notice to end-users of these reports.

Police officers write reports to memorialize criminal incidents – from reports of crimes to arrests. Those reports are powerful – they form the very basis of virtually every criminal prosecution. Prosecutors who file cases usually rely virtually 100 per cent on those police reports – conducting no original investigation. It is crucial that reports be accurate and complete.

Not only is there is serious risk that the generative AI programs being used may create reports that miss important information, but of greater concern is that they may include information that is inaccurate or even false.

It has been reported that a number of law enforcement agencies in the state are piloting a software program called "Draft One" but these agencies have been largely keeping its use a secret.

SB 524 requires transparency so that end-users-prosecutors, defense attorneys and courts- are informed that the police report they are relying on were generated either in whole or in part by a generative artificial intelligence program. Specifically, this bill requires the law enforcement agency maintain a policy which that requires the following:

(1) On each page of the report, identify every specific artificial intelligence program used and prominently state the following: "This report was written either fully or in part using artificial intelligence."

(2) The signature of the law enforcement officer or member of a law enforcement agency who prepared the report, either in physical or electronic form, verifying that they reviewed the contents of the report and that the facts contained in the report are true and correct.

SB 524 also requires the first draft be retained for as long as the final draft is retained.

Finally, SB 524 requires the program used to generate a draft, interim, or final report maintain an audit trail that, at a minimum, identifies all of the following: (1) The person who used artificial intelligence to create a report; (2) the person who made any changes to a report and (3) the video footage used to create a report.

Everything required by this bill mandates is available within the Draft One software and nothing more would be required of a law enforcement agency than an adjustment to the program's settings. The information required could then be generated automatically.

AI can be a very powerful and dangerous tool. It is essential that individuals who rely on reports generated by AI to make important decisions, such as whether to charge someone with a crime, be fully informed that AI was used to generate the report. SB 584 requires minimal steps be taken when AI is used by law enforcement. This bill will ensure there is transparency, and that everyone who relies on a police report be made aware that it was generated by AI. It also ensures that underlying information necessary to evaluate the reliability of the report generated be made accessible to the parties who rely on the report.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: In opposition to the bill, the Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC) argues:

PORAC's concerns include the following:

* The mandatory disclosure statement on every page of an AI-involved report could imply to the public, courts, or defense attorneys that such reports are inherently less reliable or credible. This stigmatizes officers' work, even if AI is used minimally for grammar corrections. The disclosure could be exploited in legal proceedings to challenge the veracity of their reports. A defense attorney might argue that AI introduced errors or biases, casting doubt on the officer's account, regardless of the officer's oversight or edits.

* The requirement to retain all drafts, maintain an audit trail, and ensure compliance with AI specific policies adds significant administrative costs.

* Errors in documenting AI use or retaining drafts could be misconstrued as intentional noncompliance, leading to disciplinary actions or accusations of falsifying reports.

* The bill's broad definition of AI could encompass common tools like spell-checkers, grammar software, or audio transcription programs. Officers may inadvertently violate the policy by using such tools without realizing they qualify as AI.

* The unfunded mandates will impose significant, labor (diverting officers' time from core duties), training and storage costs.

Given the growing integration of technology in modern policing, it is critical that policies regulating AI use strike a careful balance between accountability and practicality. Unfortunately, SB 524 overcorrects in a way that risks confusing innovation with misconduct.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Public Defenders Association (Sponsor)
County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Oakland Privacy
Prosecutors Alliance of California, a Project of Tides Advocacy
Smart Justice California, a Project of Tides Advocacy

Oppose

California Police Chiefs Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)

Analysis Prepared by: John Bennett / P. & C.P. / (916) 319-2200