SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

AB 1337 (Ward)
Version: May 23, 2025
Hearing Date: July 15, 2025
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
CK

SUBJECT

Information Practices Act of 1977

DIGEST

This bill amends the Information Practices Act by expanding the definition of "personal information," extending its scope to cover local governmental entities, and bolstering protections regarding disclosures and accounting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Information Practices Act of 1977 (IPA) is the statutory scheme that governs the collection, use, retention, and disclosure of personal information by state agencies in California. Passed over 40 years ago, it has not been meaningfully updated since. Given the recent attempts by other jurisdictions to undermine Californians' reproductive rights and to target our transgender and immigrant communities, calls for strengthening Californians' privacy rights have grown stronger.

This bill makes several key changes to the IPA. It expands the definition of personal information to include information that relates to or is capable of being associated with a particular individual and includes a broader list of nonexclusive examples. The bill also extends its scope to cover local governmental agencies who are not subject to a comprehensive legal privacy framework. It also tightens the protections of the IPA to ensure no improper disclosures or sharing of information and that uses further the purposes for which the information was collected in the first place. These changes bring a long overdue strengthening of this important but woefully antiquated privacy protection statute.

The bill is sponsored by the Electronic Frontier Foundation and Oakland Privacy. It is supported by ACLU California Action and the League of Women Voters of California. It is opposed by a large coalition of local public entities and related associations, including the County Recorders Association of California and the City of Norwalk.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

1) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, Sec. 1.)

2) Establishes the Information Practices Act of 1977 (IPA), which declares that the right to privacy is a personal and fundamental right protected by Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution of California and by the United States Constitution and that all individuals have a right of privacy in information pertaining to them. It further states the following legislative findings:
    a) the right to privacy is being threatened by the indiscriminate collection, maintenance, and dissemination of personal information and the lack of effective laws and legal remedies;
    b) the increasing use of computers and other sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the potential risk to individual privacy that can occur from the maintenance of personal information; and
    c) in order to protect the privacy of individuals, it is necessary that the maintenance and dissemination of personal information be subject to strict limits. (Civ. Code § 1798 et seq.)

3) Defines "personal information" for purposes of the IPA as any information that is maintained by an agency that identifies or describes an individual, including, but not limited to, the individual's name, social security number, physical description, home address, home telephone number, education, financial matters, and medical or employment history. It includes statements made by, or attributed to, the individual. (Civ. Code § 1798.3(a).)

4) Defines "agency" to include every state office, officer, department, division, bureau, board, commission, or other state agency. "Agency" explicitly excludes:
    a) the California Legislature;
    b) any agency established under Article VI of the California Constitution;
    c) the State Compensation Insurance Fund, except as to any records that contain personal information about the employees of the State Compensation Insurance Fund; or
    d) a local agency, as defined. (Civ. Code § 1798.3(b).)

5) Prohibits an agency from disclosing any personal information in a manner that would link the information disclosed to the individual to whom it pertains unless the information is disclosed as specified, including:
    a) with the prior written voluntary consent of the individual to whom the personal information pertains within the preceding 30 days;

b) to a person or another agency if the transfer is necessary for the transferee agency to perform its constitutional or statutory duties, and the use is compatible with a purpose for which the information was collected;
c) to a governmental entity if required by state or federal law;
d) to any person pursuant to a search warrant;
e) pursuant to a subpoena, court order, search warrant, or other compulsory legal process with notification to the individual, unless notification is prohibited by law;
f) to a law enforcement or regulatory agency when required for an investigation of unlawful activity or for licensing, certification, or regulatory purposes, unless the disclosure is otherwise prohibited by law; and
g) for statistical and research purposes, as specified. (Civ. Code § 1798.24.)

6) Requires each agency to keep an accurate accounting of the date, nature, and purpose of each disclosure of a record made pursuant to specified circumstances; and requires each agency to retain that accounting for at least three years after the disclosure, or until the record is destroyed, whichever is shorter. (Civ. Code §§ 1798.25, 1798.27.)

7) Grants individuals with specified rights in connection with their personal information, including the right to inquire and be notified as to whether the agency maintains a record about them; to inspect all personal information in any record maintained; and to submit a request in writing to amend a record containing personal information pertaining to them maintained by an agency. (Civ. Code § 1798.30, et seq.)

8) Provides that an agency that fails to comply with any provisions of the IPA may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction, and, as specified, the agency may be liable to the individual in an amount equal to the sum of actual damages sustained by the individual, including damages for mental suffering, and the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees as determined by the court. (Civ. Code §§ 1798.46-1798.48.)

9) Provides that the intentional violation of any provision of the IPA, or any rules or regulations adopted thereunder, by an officer or employee of an agency shall constitute a cause for discipline, including termination of employment; and further specifies that the intentional disclosure of medical, psychiatric, or psychological information in violation of the disclosure provisions of the IPA is punishable as a misdemeanor if the wrongful disclosure results in economic loss or personal injury to the individual to whom the information pertains. (Civ. Code §§ 1798.55, 1798.57.)

10) Establishes the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), which grants consumers certain rights with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice, access, and disclosure; the right to deletion; the right to restrict the sale of information; and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights. It places attendant obligations on businesses to respect those rights. It does not apply to government entities. (Civ. Code § 1798.100 et seq.)

11) Defines "personal information" for purposes of the CCPA as information that identifies, relates to, describes, is reasonably capable of being associated with, or could reasonably be linked, directly or indirectly, with a particular consumer or household. The CCPA provides a nonexclusive series of categories of information deemed to be personal information, including biometric information, geolocation data, and "sensitive personal information." (Civ. Code § 1798.140(v)(1).)

This bill:

1) Updates the definition of "personal information" in the IPA to mean any information that identifies, relates to, describes, or is capable of being associated with, a particular individual, and includes a nonexclusive list of examples, including biometric information and information concerning an individual's gender or sexual orientation.

2) Adds local entities to the definition of "agency."

3) Requires agencies to inform individuals of the specific purpose or purposes for which their personal information will be used.

4) Prohibits agencies from using records containing personal information for any purpose or purposes other than the purpose or purposes for which that personal information was collected, except as authorized or required by state law.

5) Prohibits an agency from disclosing personal information in a manner that could be linked to the individual, except in certain circumstances, as defined.

6) Limits the exemptions to those that further the purpose for which the information was collected. It also tightens various other disclosure exemptions.

7) Prohibits the agencies from sharing personal information, without the consent of the individual, in response to a warrant or sharing with a law enforcement agency or regulatory agency for an investigation.

8) Requires agencies to retain records related to personal information disclosures for three years.

9) States that a negligent violation of any of the bill's provisions by an officer or employee of any agency constitutes a cause for discipline, including termination of employment. Removes the requirement that certain violations must result in economic loss or personal injury before it is considered a misdemeanor.

COMMENTS

1. The IPA and Californians' privacy

Article I, Section 1 of the California Constitution provides: "All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy." Privacy is therefore not just a policy goal, it is a constitutional right of every Californian. However, it has been under increasing assault.

The phrase "and privacy" was added to the California Constitution as a result of Proposition 11 in 1972; it was known as the "Privacy Initiative." The arguments in favor of the amendment were written by Assemblymember Kenneth Cory and Senator George Moscone. The ballot pamphlet stated in relevant part:

> At present there are no effective restraints on the information activities of government and business. This amendment creates a legal and enforceable right of privacy for every Californian. The right of privacy . . . prevents government and business interests from collecting and stockpiling unnecessary information about us and from misusing information gathered for one purpose in order to serve other purposes or to embarrass us. . . . The proliferation of government and business records over which we have no control limits our ability to control our personal lives. . . . Even more dangerous is the loss of control over the accuracy of government and business records on individuals. . . . Even if the existence of this information is known, few government agencies or private businesses permit individuals to review their files and correct errors. . . . Each time we apply for a credit card or a life insurance policy, file a tax return, interview for a job[,] or get a drivers' license, a dossier is opened and an informational profile is sketched.[1]

In 1977, the Legislature reaffirmed through the IPA that the right of privacy is a "personal and fundamental right" and that "all individuals have a right of privacy in information pertaining to them."[2] The Legislature further stated the following findings:

---

[1] *Hill v. National Collegiate Athletic Assn.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1, 17, quoting the official ballot pamphlet for the Privacy Initiative.
[2] Civ. Code § 1798.1.

- "The right to privacy is being threatened by the indiscriminate collection, maintenance, and dissemination of personal information and the lack of effective laws and legal remedies."
- "The increasing use of computers and other sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the potential risk to individual privacy that can occur from the maintenance of personal information."
- "In order to protect the privacy of individuals, it is necessary that the maintenance and dissemination of personal information be subject to strict limits."

Modeled after the Federal Privacy Act of 1974, the IPA governs the collection, maintenance, and disclosure of personal information by state agencies, specifically excluding local agencies. The IPA places guidelines and restrictions on the collection, maintenance, and disclosure of Californians' personal information, including a prohibition on the disclosure of an individual's personal information that can be used to identify them without the individual's consent except under one of a list of specified circumstances. State agencies are required to provide notice to individuals of their rights with respect to their personal information, the purposes for which the personal information will be used, and any foreseeable disclosures of that personal information.

The IPA also provides individuals with certain rights to be informed of what personal information an agency holds relating to that individual, to access and inspect that personal information, and to request corrections to that personal information, subject to specified exceptions. In addition, when state agencies contract with private entities for services, the contractors are typically governed by the IPA.

2. Updating the existing framework for the digital age

In response to growing concerns about the privacy and safety of consumers' data, AB 375 (Chau, Ch. 55, Stats. 2018) created the CCPA, later amended by initiative, which grants a set of rights to consumers with regard to their personal information, including enhanced notice and disclosure rights regarding information collection and use practices, access to the information collected, the right to delete certain information, the right to restrict the sale of information, and protection from discrimination for exercising these rights.

The CCPA defines "personal information" as information that identifies, relates to, describes, is reasonably capable of being associated with, or could reasonably be linked, directly or indirectly, with a particular consumer or household. The CCPA provides a nonexclusive series of categories of information deemed to be personal information, including biometric information, geolocation data, and "sensitive personal information."

However, the modernized protections of the CCPA only apply to businesses. The IPA, on the other hand, has not been updated in decades, leaving its framework vulnerable. The Legislature at the time could not conceive of the digital information revolution that was to come. This bill seeks to bring the IPA into this new era and bolster the protections for Californians' personal information that is collected, used, and retained by government agencies.

3. A strengthened IPA

According to the author:

> AB 1337 ensures Californians' right to privacy—explicitly protected in the state constitution—is lived out in the digital age. When the IPA was enacted nearly five decades ago, it was a groundbreaking step toward regulating how government agencies manage personally identifiable information. However, the law has not kept pace with the evolution of technology or the scale of information collected by public agencies today. As new threats to personal privacy have emerged—from geolocation tracking to biometric data collection—the need to modernize the law has become urgent.
>
> AB 1337 closes critical gaps in the state's governmental privacy framework and brings it into alignment with current best practices in data protection. AB 1337 ensures that privacy protections apply consistently across all levels of California government and reflect the realities of how data is generated, tracked, and stored in the modern world. The bill prohibits unauthorized secondary uses of personal data and ensures that privacy protections are in place regardless of which agency collects and holds the data.
>
> These changes to the IPA provide stronger protections for all Californians, particularly for vulnerable populations whose data is at heightened risk of misuse. These communities—including but not limited to LGBTQ+ individuals, seekers of reproductive healthcare, immigrants and DACA recipients, religious minorities, and low-income Californians—often face a disproportionate risk of surveillance, data misuse, and discriminatory outcomes resulting from weak privacy safeguards.
>
> AB 1337 directly resolves the problems identified by updating the IPA's outdated provisions, aligning it with modern privacy standards, and ensuring that individuals retain control over their personal data in interactions with all branches of government. In this way, the bill strengthens public trust, enhances accountability, and reinforces California's national leadership in protecting individual privacy rights.

This bill first expands the definition of "personal information," recognizing the enhanced ability to reidentify what previously was anonymous data and to cover the full scope of what is now considered personal information. The current definition is "any information that is maintained by an agency that identifies or describes an individual, including, but not limited to, the individual's name, social security number, physical description, home address, home telephone number, education, financial matters, and medical or employment history. It includes statements made by, or attributed to, the individual." This antiquated definition leaves a variety of forms of personal information out and can be narrowly read to only apply to information that is maintained in a form that it can be actively associated with a specific individual.

Conversely, the definition of personal information in the CCPA appreciates that in combination with other sources of data an otherwise non-identifying data set can be connected to a specific person. This bill borrows from that definition to update the definition currently in the IPA: "The term 'personal information' means any information that identifies, relates to, describes, or is capable of being associated with, a particular individual." It then includes a nonexclusive list of examples, including genetic data and immigration status.

The bill also bolsters some additional protections in the IPA, including prohibiting agencies from using records containing personal information for any purpose or purposes other than the purpose or purposes for which that personal information was collected. However, this does not include uses authorized or required by state law.

Next, while various privacy laws apply to certain types of data held by local governmental entities, such as HIPAA and the California Medical Information Act (CMIA) applying to protected health information held by covered persons and entities, there is currently no comprehensive privacy regime applying to local governments, as CCPA applies only to certain businesses and the IPA only applies to state entities. This bill resolves this by removing the carve out in the IPA for local entities, thereby subjecting them to the privacy framework.

The timing of this is critical as troubling examples emerge of information regarding Californians in the hands of local entities being used in ways that undermine the state's principles:

> The sheriff of San Diego county defied a new policy limiting county cooperation with federal immigration authorities, setting up a showdown over California's efforts to shield residents from Donald Trump's mass deportation plans.
>
> On Tuesday, San Diego county supervisors voted to prohibit its sheriff's department from working with US Immigration and Customs

> Enforcement (Ice) on the federal agency's enforcement of civil immigration laws, including those that allow for deportations. . . .
>
> But shortly after, Sheriff Kelly Martinez said the board does not set policy for the sheriff, who, like the supervisors, is an elected official. She said she would not honor the new policy.[3]

In addition, "Riverside County Sheriff Chad Bianco, who has announced his plan to run for governor in 2026, vowed to work 'around' California law to assist federal immigration enforcement."[4] Given these concerns, it is all the more reason to extend Californians' privacy rights with respect to the information in local entities' control and to only allow that information to further the purposes for which it was collected.

In addition, the bill amends some of the exceptions to the general restriction on the nonconsensual disclosure of an individual's personal information. It removes the exception for search warrants and for providing it to a law enforcement or regulatory agency when required for an investigation of unlawful activity or for licensing, certification, or regulatory purposes, unless the disclosure is otherwise prohibited by law. However, it should be noted that agencies are still authorized to disclose personal information without consent to another person or governmental organization to the extent necessary to obtain information from the person or governmental organization for an investigation by the agency of a failure to comply with a specific state law that the agency is responsible for enforcing; and to any person pursuant to a subpoena, court order, or other compulsory legal process if, before the disclosure, the agency reasonably attempts to notify the individual to whom the record pertains, and if the notification is not prohibited by law.

Currently, another exception allows agencies to disclose personal information without consent to those officers, employees, attorneys, agents, or volunteers of the agency that have custody of the information if the disclosure is relevant and necessary in the ordinary course of the performance of their official duties and is related to the purpose for which the information was acquired. This bill strengthens this by requiring the disclosure to further the purpose for which the personal information was acquired.

The bill also tightens up the provisions requiring an accounting of any disclosures and the retention of that accounting. Currently, violations constitute cause for discipline, but

---

[3] *San Diego sheriff says she won't honor county's 'sanctuary' immigration policy* (December 11, 2024) The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/dec/11/san-diego-sanctuary-immigration-deportation-policy#:~:text=San%20Diego%20sheriff%20says%20she,policy%20%7C%20San%20Diego%20%7C%20The%20Guardian. All internet citations are current as of June 27, 2025.

[4] Nigel Duara, *A California sheriff is planning to break the state's sanctuary law. Here's how* (February 28, 2025) CalMatters, https://calmatters.org/justice/2025/02/sanctuary-state-amador-sheriff/.

only if the violation is intentional. This bill expands this to negligent violations of the law.

4. Stakeholder positions

The Electronic Frontier Foundation and Oakland Privacy, the sponsors of the bill, make the case:

> For a law from 1977, especially one focusing on such a rapidly changing landscape as information and data, the IPA's original language has remained remarkably intact. The lack of wholesale changes for 48 years demonstrates the fundamental soundness of the law. We want to underline that: California state government has largely functioned under the umbrella of this law for almost half a century. It is one of the foundational building blocks of our state and it has passed the test of time. But most five decade old laws could benefit from a little updating and that time has come. Not only because so much time has passed, but because we are in a historical moment of great import when privacy from governmental intrusions is being deeply challenged by a federal government, that whatever your political inclinations, has totally upended the civil society consensus on data privacy in two months.
>
> We know the committee is aware of the funding freezes,[5] the incursion into the treasury database,[6] the vulnerability of social security,[7] the revocations of legal status,[8] the detentions of American citizens by ICE,[9] the rendition of undocumented immigrants to foreign prisons,[10] and the targeting of transgender Americans[11] and women seeking to terminate their pregnancies.[12] And we are only 180 days into this brave new world.
>
> All of the information the federal government has been collecting for decades about all of us is now in service of an agenda for weaponization

[5] https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2025/01/28/upshot/federal-programs-funding-trump-omb.html
[6] https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/doge-access-to-treasury-payment-systems-raises-serious-risks
[7] https://cahealthadvocates.org/social-security-is-under-attack-threatening-wellbeing-of-70-million-americans/
[8] https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-revokes-legal-status-530000-cubans-haitians-nicaraguans-venezuelans-2025-03-21/
[9] https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/president-trump-politics/sen-warner-seeks-answers-about-ice-detaining-us-citizen/3873086/
[10] https://time.com/7269604/el-salvador-photos-venezuelan-detainees/
[11] https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/6-ways-trumps-executive-orders-are-targeting-transgender-people
[12] https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-face-act-abortion-related-actions-justice-department/

> against the people on the wrong side of the culture war. If California is to protect the people who live here, as the Governor[13] and AG Bonta[14] have stated it is their intention to do, then now is the time to update the state's data handling regulations, including what is shared with the feds, and most importantly, to make sure that all data collected by California governmental agencies has the same baseline of privacy protections, no matter which branch of government collected it.

A variety of local governmental entities have written in opposition to the expansion of the IPA to cover them and the personal information they collect from Californians. A large coalition, including the League of California Cities and the California School Board Associations, argue:

> Local governments and the state have made considerable progress in providing wraparound services to those most in need by improving connectivity of resources. This progress has been made under the "no wrong door" approach. AB 1337 would undermine this hard-earned progress.
>
> The proposed amendments to Civil Code § 1798.24(d) & (e) would prohibit government agencies from sharing data with other government agencies unless it "furthers the purpose," for which the data were collected. This vague definition creates more questions than answers compared to the current standard that the data are shared in a way that "is related to," or "compatible with" the purpose for which the information was acquired.

The coalition also asserts that the bill ignores and conflicts with existing privacy and confidentiality laws:

> Put simply, local agencies take data privacy and confidentiality seriously and comply with a network of specific privacy and confidentiality laws. AB 1337 upends this longstanding framework with a blanket policy that conflicts with some existing laws or creates confusion and inconsistent compliance based on how agencies are used to compliance. While the California Consumer Privacy Act expressly provides that its requirements do not apply to information governed by CMIA, AB 1337 makes no attempt to square its broad requirements with the litany of existing privacy laws that apply to local programs.

---

[13] https://calmatters.org/politics/capitol/2024/11/gavin-newsom-special-session-trump-resistance/
[14] https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-issues-statement-president-trump%E2%80%99s-troubling-attacks-rule

Writing in support, the United Food and Commercial Workers Western States Council responds:

> AB 1337 will ensure that our information gets the same protections regardless of whether it is held by the state or local government. Vast amounts of personal information are collected by local and county entities, but that information is not protected by the IPA. Yet the IPA gives people important protections and rights for the identical information held by the equivalent state entity, such as data security requirements, restrictions on sharing the information, and the right to know what information the government has and correct it.
>
> These gaps in protections held by local entities have real world impacts that harm Californians. Cities and counties run various programs that collect information on everyone, including vulnerable populations. Several cities offer needed financial assistance to undocumented immigrants through adult assistance programs. County health departments have support programs for pregnancy, fetal and infant mortality review, and mental health resources. This sensitive information could be leaked unintentionally through lax security protections, revealing critical information about people's health or immigration status, and cities and counties are increasingly being pushed to share our information.
>
> Californians are left vulnerable as long as the IPA continues to nonsensically protect only information held by the state but not protect the exact same information held by local governments. AB 1337 addresses this issue by extending the IPA to local governments as well.

Given the concerns about the impact these changes will have on local agencies and others, the author has agreed to an amendment that delays the operative date of the changes made by this bill until January 1, 2027. The amends also clarify that rules of conduct establishes pursuant to Section 1798.20 are subject to limitations or conditions set forth in an applicable collective bargaining agreement and clarify that sharing can occur to a branch of the federal government where *allowed* by state law. The author has committed to continuing to work with stakeholders and the Committee on appropriate modifications as necessary.

SUPPORT

Electronic Frontier Foundation (sponsor)
Oakland Privacy (sponsor)
A Voice for Choice Advocacy
ACLU California Action

Black Women for Wellness Action Project
California Civil Liberties Advocacy
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Initiative for Technology & Democracy
Consumer Federation of California
Courage California
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Kapor Center
League of Women Voters of California
LGBT Tech
Oakland Privacy
PFLAG Sacramento
Privacy Rights Clearinghouse
Tech Oversight California
TechEquity Action
UFCW - Western States Council
Ultraviolet Action

OPPOSITION

Alameda-contra Costa Transit District (ac Transit)
Association of California School Administrators
Association of California Healthcare Districts (ACHD)
California Alliance of Taxpayer Advocates
California Assessors' Association
California Association of County Treasurers & Tax Collectors
California Association of Joint Powers Authorities (CAJPA)
California Association of Public Hospitals & Health Systems
California Association of Recreation & Park Districts
California Hospital Association
California Municipal Clerks Association (CMCA)
California School Boards Association
California Special Districts Association
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
City of Belmont
City of Carlsbad
City of Foster City
City of Hanford
City of Hidden Hills
City of Merced
City of Norwalk
Contra Costa County
County Health Executives Association of California (CHEAC)
County of Butte

County of Fresno
County of San Benito
County Recorders Association of California
County Welfare Directors Association of California
District Hospital Leadership Forum
El Dorado Irrigation District
League of California Cities
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)
San Bernardino County
Town of Hillsborough
University of California
Urban Counties of California (UCC)

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 81 (Arreguín, 2025) prohibits a health care provider entity and its personnel, to the extent permitted by state and federal law and to the extent possible, from granting access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement without a valid judicial warrant or court order. SB 81 is currently in the Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee.

AB 894 (Carrillo, 2025) requires a general acute care hospital to inform a patient that the patient may restrict or prohibit the use or disclosure of protected health information in the hospital's patient directory, as provided for in federal regulations, as specified. AB 894 is currently in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Prior Legislation:

AB 2388 (Patterson, 2024) would have amended the IPA by expanding the definition of personal information and bolstering protections against agencies distributing, selling, or renting the personal information of Californians for financial gain. AB 2388 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2677 (Gabriel, 2022) would have amended the IPA by updating definitions, bolstering existing protections, applying data minimization principles, limiting disclosure, and increasing accountability. The bill was vetoed by Governor Newsom, who stated: "I am concerned this bill is overly prescriptive and could conflict with the State's goal to provide person-centered, data driven, and integrated services. Additionally, this bill would cost tens of millions of dollars to implement across multiple state agencies that were not accounted for in the budget."

AB 825 (Levine, Ch. 527, Stats. 2021) added "genetic information" to the definition of personal information for purposes of the laws requiring certain businesses to implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices to protect personal information they own, license, or maintain. It required businesses and agencies that maintain personal information to disclose a breach of genetic information.

AB 3223 (Gallagher, 2020) would have prohibited an agency from selling, renting, or exchanging for commercial purposes the PI an agency holds without the consent of the person to whom that information applies. It would have held an agency liable for all damages resulting from a negligent or intentional violation of the IPA. This bill died at the Assembly Desk.

AB 1130 (Levine, Ch. 750, Stats. 2019) updated the definition of "personal information" in various consumer protection statutes, including the data breach notification law, to include certain government identification numbers and biometric data.

AB 375 (Chau, Ch. 55, Stats. 2018) *See* Comment 2.

AB 928 (Olsen, Ch. 851, Stats. 2014) required each state department and state agency to conspicuously post its privacy policy, including specified information, on its website.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 64, Noes 0)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 1)
Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 0)
****