Ohio House Technology and Innovation Committee
1 Capitol Sq, Columbus, OH 43215

California
Note: Passed 8 AI Laws So Far

Bill Number: Senate Bill 53
Status: Signed into law.
Brief Summary: Senate Bill 53 imposes obligations on, and otherwise regulates, developers who have trained, or initiated training of, a foundational/frontier AI models; for example, models with compute thresholds of 10^26 FLOPs.[1] Requires companies to publish frameworks describing how "catastrophic risks are identified, mitigated, and governed."[2] These frameworks must include "documentation of governance structures, mitigation processes, cybersecurity practices, and a developer's alignment with national/international standards" and "assess catastrophic risk." Frontier developers are required to publish transparency reports on model details, and also "summaries of catastrophic risk assessments." Legislation also includes provisions on safety incident disclosures.

Why Problematic: Senate Bill 53 is an improvement over California's vetoed Senate Bill 1047, changing direction from a law that requires AI developers to anticipate future harm and take precautionary steps to mitigate unknown activity, instead mandating that business operations are documented through extensive paperwork requirements, including rule disclosures and cumbersome reporting requirements. Its scoping provisions on 10^26 FLOPs are still arbitrarily defined. Rather than regulating and punishing tangible harms, Senate Bill 53 punishes innovators with steep fines and lawsuits for the crime of not following ticky-tack paperwork rules and requirements. California would have been better off regulating tangible consumer harms, but Senate Bill 53 is an improvement over its initially disastrous proposal.

[1] FLOPS, or Floating-point Operations Per Second, measures how many calculations an AI can perform in decimal numbers each second. Regulators have chosen 10^26 to be the cutoff for a regulated "frontier" AI model.
[2] Justine Gluck, "California's SB 53: The First Frontier AI Law, Explained," Future of Privacy Forum, October 3, 2025, https://fpf.org/blog/californias-sb-53-the-first-frontier-ai-law-explained/.

Bill Number: AB 325
Status: Signed into law.
Brief Summary: Amends California state antitrust law by expanding activity prohibitions under the Cartwright Act to "make it unlawful, except as provided, for a person to use or distribute any pricing algorithm that uses, incorporates, or was trained with data other than nonpublic competitor data if the person either distributes the pricing algorithm, as specified, or uses the pricing algorithm to set or recommend a price or commercial term of a product or service. service and the pricing algorithm was used by another person to set or recommend a price or commercial term of a product or service in the same market or a related market." More simply, if someone uses a "computer, software, or other technology" (such as excel or more advanced AI's) and a competitor's prices to set their own prices, then you are subject to the "common pricing algorithm" regulation.[3]

Why Problematic: In economics, prices are signals that convey information—and AB 325 could be broadly interpreted to effectively regulate the prices of all California market transactions.[4] Given the overly broad nature of the law, many companies will ignore it—leaving interpretation to the California attorney general who can pick and choose under which circumstances the law will be enforced. That is bad for legal certainty and for sound economic decision-making.

New York
Note: 70 Bills Under Consideration

Bill Number and Name: S6953B/A6453B—Responsible AI Safety and Education (RAISE) Act
Status: Under Consideration.
Brief Summary: New York's RAISE Act closely resembles California's vetoed Senate Bill 1047. RAISE regulates frontier AI models; for example, models with compute thresholds of 10^26 FLOPs. It is one of America's first frontier AI "transparency" bills, currently sitting on Governor Hochul's desk. The RAISE Act regulates so-called "catastrophic harms" that would affect United States national security. It requires frontier AI models to disclose safety reports, report safety incidents to state attorneys general, and be subject to audits. It also prohibits deployment of AI models if they create an "unreasonable risk of critical harm."

Why Problematic: The RAISE Act is a frontier AI safety bill masquerading as a transparency policy. Setting aside that frontier model AI national security questions are direct concerns of the U.S. Congress, which has more information and clearances to handle this kind of sensitive model information, the policy proposal is an innovation-crushing nightmare. Adopting definitions, vague mandates, and reporting requirements from California's vetoed Senate Bill 1047, the bill creates an assortment of paperwork requirements that drive up reporting and compliance costs. Like California Senate Bill 1047 and Senate Bill 53, the scoping provisions are arbitrary. Importantly, like Senate Bill 1047, the ban on deployment of AI models with "unreasonable risk of critical harm," does not define "unreasonable," instead leaving it ambiguous. That harms both AI model development and deployment.

[3] Dean W. Ball, Turning a Blind Eye, Hyperdimensional, October 23, 2025, https://www.hyperdimensional.co/p/turning-a-blind-eye.
[4] *Ibid.*

Bill Number: Assembly 3719—Robot Tax Act
Status: Under Consideration.
Brief Summary: Since many Americans worry that AI advancement will displace jobs, New York has responded with a so-called "robot tax" on employers. In the words of this legislation, 3719 would specifically impose a tax on "using technology to displace workers," equal to the state and local taxes and fees of a worker.

Why Problematic: This is a crude tool that would significantly slow AI innovation and harm economic worker adjustments. It assumes all algorithms automate workers, even those that complement instead of replacing them. As I noted in co-authored paper at The Buckeye Institute, in healthcare, robot taxes particularly harm healthcare innovation, taxing "life-saving medical innovations and time-saving technologies that would allow doctors to spend more time treating patients." In New York's case, the tax is not even on "robots," but instead on all "technology" that would displace a worker. That ropes in a lot of yearly job churn, not just AI job dislocations. Importantly, and contrary to conventional wisdom, emerging economic research finds that industrial robot adoption increases, not decreases, jobs because the increase in productivity also increases the demand for workers.[5] Taxing robots, therefore, would likely not only slow economic adjustment, but also backfire on workers.

Michigan

Bill Number: House Bill 4667
Status: Under Consideration.
Brief Summary: Adds a new section; to the Michigan penal code that creates three new felonies involving AI systems, punishable by between four to eight years in prison based on the individual's involvement. This bill effectively makes it a felony if AI is used to commit a crime.[6]

Why Problematic: This idea sounds nice in theory—but it would have severe unintended consequences in practice. First, the definition of an AI system is obscenely broad: "any machine-based system that can process data, generate content, or simulate human-like interactions, including, but not limited to, chatbots, voice assistants, generative AI models, and automated decision-making tools." Second, rather than punishing users for the crime that is committed, which already has its own pre-defined enforcement penalties, the Michigan law tacks on a felony with mandatory prison time only because of AI involvement. In other words, by making it a felony to commit a crime that uses AI, misdemeanor offenses would also carry an additional felony charge, served consecutively with other offenses, punishable by eight years in prison on top of punishment for the other offense. Petty offenses using AI, like fake ID's, for example, would become life-ruining offenses instead.

[5] Ting Wang, Yi Zhang, Chun Liu, "Robot Adoption and Employment Adjustment: Firm-level Evidence from China," *China Economic Review*, Volume 84, April 2024, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1043951X24000269#:~:text=industry%20labor%20reallocation.-,Abstract,from%20their%20non%2Dadopting%20counterparts.
[6] Michigan Legislature, Legislative Analysis of House Bill 4667 of 2025, https://legislature.mi.gov/Bills/Bill?ObjectName=2025-HB-4667.

Bill Number: House Bill 4668
Status: Under Consideration.
Brief Summary: Regulates companies with at least one large AI models with computing power that costs more the $5 million or a combined cost of $100 million between all models in the last 12 months (measured by "prevailing market prices"). Mandates safety and security protocols to mitigate "critical risks" like cyberattack, or chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear weapon causing 100 deaths or $1 billion in damages. Also mandates risk assessments, third-party audits, public reports, and more.

Why Problematic: Following New York and California's lead, this bill applies regardless of whether anyone is harmed. The requirements in the bill are impractical, and the mandates are overly broad. See analysis of California SB 53 and New York S6953B/A6453B for further discussion.

Colorado

Law Name: Colorado AI Act
Status: Signed into law.
Brief Summary: The first comprehensive AI law in the United States. The law creates a framework that requires companies to anticipate and avoid so-called algorithmic discrimination when using "high-risk" AI systems to make a "consequential decision," a broadly defined term that includes education, employment, financial or lending services, government services, housing, insurance, legal services, and health care.

Why Problematic: Rollout of the Colorado AI Act has been a complete disaster. Governor Jared Polis' signing statement reads more like a veto notice—and the legislature has voted to kick the can down the road and delay the law's effective date as the legislature looks to amend the policy. Rather than lead the country with a model to emulate, the law instead has become the model to avoid. Its definitions are vague, and are likely to create an endless paperwork trap, where AI deployers and developers get caught heavy-handed bureaucracy.

Illinois/Nevada

Law Name: Illinois House Bill 1806—The Wellness and Oversight for Psychological Resources Act; and Nevada AB 406
Status: Both are signed into law.
Brief Summary: Illinois bans the use of AI "to provide mental health and therapeutic decision-making."[7] Solely permits AI use by a licensed professional where AI used or assisting in administrative or supplementary support in therapy or psychotherapy. Also prohibits licensed professionals from using AI to assist in providing supplementary support and prohibits AI from making independent therapeutic decisions. Nevada AB 406 similarly bans AI from providing mental healthcare services.

[7] Dr. Edward Longe, "Don't Follow Nevada's Mental Health Mistake," October 28, 2025, https://jamesmadison.org/dont-follow-nevadas-mental-health-mistake/.

Why Problematic: Millions of Americans cannot access mental healthcare services because the hours are inconvenient, it costs too much, or other personal issues with disclosure. These laws usher in a host of unintended consequences. Not only do large AI companies find carveouts with mental healthcare AI bans, but these rules also sweep in and ban legitimate AI therapy tools specifically built in partnership with licensed and trained mental healthcare professionals. These nuanced tools that, "incorporate crisis-detection protocols, clinical guardrails, and structured interventions tailored to specific conditions."[8] These are not just chatbots, but specialized medical treatment tools that have found themselves on the wrong side of imprudent AI prohibitions, with massive consequences for mental healthcare services.

Respectfully submitted,

Logan Kolas
Director of Technology Policy at the American Consumer Institute Center for Citizen Research
4350 Fairfax Drive
Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22203
www.TheAmericanConsumer.Org

[8] *Ibid.*