SENATE THIRD READING
SB 524 (Arreguín)
As Amended September 02, 2025
Majority vote

SUMMARY

Requires every law enforcement agency (LEA) to maintain a policy that requires an artificial intelligence (AI) - generated official report to identify the type of AI program used to generate the report and include the signature of the officer who prepared the official report.

Major Provisions
1) Requires every LEA, as defined, to maintain a policy to require an official report prepared by a law enforcement officer or any member of a LEA that is generated using AI, either fully or partially, to contain both of the following:
   a) On each page of the official report, or within the body of the text, identify every specific AI program used in a manner that makes such identification readily apparent to the reader, and prominently state the following: "This report was written either fully or in part using artificial intelligence."
   b) The signature of the law enforcement officer or member of an LEA who prepared the official report, either in physical or electronic form, verifying that they reviewed the contents of that report and that the facts contained in the official report are true and correct.
2) Specifies that if a law enforcement officer or member of an LEA uses AI to create an official report, whether fully or partially, the first draft created shall be retained by the agency for as long as the official report is retained.
3) Specifies that, except for the official report, a draft of any report created with the use of AI shall not constitute an officer's statement.
4) Requires the agency utilizing AI to generate a first draft or official report to maintain an audit trail for as long as the official report is retained that, at a minimum, identifies both of the following:
   a) The person who used AI to create a report.
   b) The video and audio footage used to create a report, if any.
5) Prohibits a contracted vendor from sharing, selling, or otherwise using information provided by an LEA to be processed by AI except for either of the following purposes:
   a) The contracted LEA's purposes; or,
   b) Pursuant to a court order.
6) Defines "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.
7) Specifies that this definition of AI, as used in this bill, applies to AI 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 AI systems that analyze a law enforcement officer's dictated report to generate a police report narrative automatically enhanced by generative artificial intelligence (GenAI).
8) Defines "law enforcement agency" as any department or agency of the state or any local government, special district, or other political subdivision thereof that employs any peace officer, as specified.

9) Defines "contracted vendor" as a third party which has made AI available to law enforcement for the purpose of generating a draft police report.
10) Defines "first draft" as the initial document or narrative produced solely by AI.
11) Defines "official report" as the final version of the report that is signed by the officer pursuant to this bill.

COMMENTS

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."

Arguments in Support
According the *California Public Defenders Association,* "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
According to the *Peace Officer Research Association of California*, "While we recognize the intent of SB 524 to promote transparency in the use of emerging technologies, the bill raises serious concerns about unintended consequences that would undermine officer integrity, impose significant administrative burdens, and introduce unnecessary legal vulnerabilities.
"As currently amended, SB 524 requires law enforcement agencies to adopt policies governing the use of AI in generating official reports…
"PORAC's concerns include the following:
1) 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.
2) The requirement to retain all drafts, maintain an audit trail, and ensure compliance with AI-specific policies adds significant administrative costs.
3) Errors in documenting AI use or retaining drafts could be misconstrued as intentional noncompliance, leading to disciplinary actions or accusations of falsifying reports.
4) 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.
5) 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."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, "Costs (General Fund, special funds, local funds) to each LEA in the state to adopt conforming policies and ensure AI tools comply

with the bill′s requirements. There are approximately 600 LEAs in California. Although costs may be minor for each individual agency, in the aggregate statewide, costs may be significant, possibly in excess of $150,000. The state must reimburse local LEA costs from the General Fund if the Commission on State Mandates determines the duties imposed by this bill constitute a reimbursable state mandate. For their part, the Department of Justice reports no fiscal impact, and the California Highway Patrol reports it does not use AI technology for reports and would incur a minor and absorbable cost to implement an AI policy.″

VOTES

SENATE FLOOR: 28-10-2
YES: Allen, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Padilla, Pérez, Richardson, Rubio, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Umberg, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener
NO: Alvarado-Gil, Choi, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Seyarto, Strickland, Valladares
ABS, ABST OR NV: Hurtado, Reyes

ASM PUBLIC SAFETY: 6-0-3
YES: Schultz, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Nguyen, Sharp-Collins
ABS, ABST OR NV: Alanis, Lackey, Ramos

ASM PRIVACY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION: 12-2-1
YES: Bauer-Kahan, Bryan, DeMaio, Irwin, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Ortega, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Ward, Wicks, Wilson
NO: Macedo, Patterson
ABS, ABST OR NV: Dixon

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 11-3-1
YES: Wicks, Arambula, Calderon, Caloza, Elhawary, Fong, Mark González, Ahrens, Pacheco, Pellerin, Solache
NO: Sanchez, Dixon, Tangipa
ABS, ABST OR NV: Ta

UPDATED

VERSION: September 02, 2025

CONSULTANT: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744   FN: 0001459