

Comparison of Chatbot Laws: Oregon’s SB 1546, Washington’s HB 2225, and California’s SB 243

Created by: Justine Gluck, AI Policy Analyst

Overview: On March 31, Oregon enacted [SB 1546](#) into law, establishing a new framework for regulating AI companion chatbots, the second chatbot law signed in 2026 following Washington’s [HB 2225](#) signed the previous week. Both laws follow California’s [SB 243](#) (signed in 2025 and effective January 1, 2026), which marked the first comprehensive state effort to regulate companion chatbots for minors. Oregon and Washington’s laws reflect a next generation of chatbot regulations, expanding the laws into areas such as engagement optimization and design. All three frameworks diverge in meaningful ways across scope, requirements, and enforcement. Notably, [SB 1546](#) and [HB 2225](#) will take effect on January 1, 2027.

1. **Scope:** CA and WA take a broader, capability-based approach to define companion chatbots, while OR uses a narrower, behavior-based definition with more carve-outs, making its scope more targeted.
2. **Requirements:** All three include disclosures and self-harm protocols, but WA is the most prescriptive (e.g., additional requirements on engagement design, safeguards), and CA is the most limited and disclosure-focused.
3. **Enforcement:** All three enforce via a private right of action, with CA and WA including statutory damages, while WA relies on its Consumer Protection Act for enforcement.

Red text indicates key differences between the laws.

	California SB 243	Oregon SB 1546	Washington HB 2225	Comparison
Scope				
Definition: Companion Chatbot	<p>Companion Chatbot: An AI system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses to user inputs and is capable of meeting a user’s social needs, including by exhibiting anthropomorphic features and being able to sustain a relationship across multiple interactions (Sec. 22601(b)(1)).</p> <p>Exceptions: (A) A bot that is used only for <u>customer service</u>, a <u>business’ operational purposes</u>, productivity and analysis related to source information, <u>internal research</u>, or <u>technical assistance</u>.</p> <p>(B) A bot that is a <u>feature of a video game</u> and is limited to replies related to the video game that cannot discuss topics related to mental health, self-harm, sexually explicit conduct, or maintain a dialogue on other topics</p>	<p>Artificial Intelligence Companion: A system that uses AI, generative AI, or algorithms that recognize emotion from input and that are designed to simulate a sustained, human-like platonic, intimate or romantic relationship or companionship with a user by:</p> <p>(i) <u>Retaining information from prior interactions</u> or user sessions and from user preferences to personalize interactions with the user and facilitate ongoing engagement;</p> <p>(ii) <u>Asking unprompted or unsolicited questions</u> that are not direct responses to user input and that suggest or concern emotional topics; and</p> <p>(iii) Sustaining an <u>ongoing dialog</u> concerning matters that are personal to the user (Sec. 1(1)(a)(A)).</p>	<p>AI Companion Chatbot: An AI system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses to user inputs, including by exhibiting anthropomorphic features, and is able to sustain a relationship across multiple interactions (Sec. 2(1)(a)).</p> <p>Exceptions: (i) A bot that is used only for a <u>business’ operational purposes</u>, productivity and analysis related to source information, internal research, <u>technical assistance</u>, or <u>customer service</u>, if such bot does not sustain a relationship across multiple interactions and generate outputs that are likely to elicit emotional responses in the user;</p> <p>(ii) A bot that is a <u>feature of a video game</u> or gaming system or application and is limited to replies related to the video game or gaming system or application that cannot discuss topics related to mental health, self-harm, or sexually</p>	<p>CA and WA take a broader, capability-based approach, while OR uses a narrower, behavior-based definition with more carve-outs.</p> <p>Capability-Based Definitions: CA and WA use similar definitions, focusing on whether a system <u>can</u> provide human-like, relationship-sustaining interactions. CA goes slightly further by including systems capable of meeting a user’s “social needs,” which may expand scope. This approach may capture multipurpose tools (e.g., tutors, assistants) even if companionship is not their primary function.</p> <p>Behavior-Based Definition: OR requires evidence of relational dynamics (e.g., memory, emotional engagement, ongoing personal dialogue), which narrows scope.</p> <p>Exceptions: All three share core carve-outs (e.g., customer service, video games, voice</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
	<p>unrelated to the video game.</p> <p>(C) A stand-alone consumer electronic device that functions as a <u>speaker and voice command interface</u>, acts as a voice-activated virtual assistant, and does not sustain a relationship across multiple interactions or generate outputs that are likely to elicit emotional responses in the user (Sec. 22601(b)(2)).</p>	<p>Exceptions: (i) Software that operates solely for <u>customer service or support, assisting or supporting patient or resident care services in a facility, education, financial services or education, business operations,</u> productivity, information analysis, <u>internal research or technical assistance,</u> regardless of the software’s capability to use natural language inputs and generate natural language outputs;</p> <p>(ii) Software incorporated into a <u>video game</u> that is limited to providing interaction only with the features of the video game, if the software does not respond to input on topics such as mental health, self-harm, sexually explicit conduct or other topics unrelated to the features of the video game; or</p> <p>(iii) A stand-alone consumer electronic device that functions as a <u>speaker and voice command interface</u> or acts as a voice-activated virtual assistant (Sec. 1(1)(a)(B)).</p>	<p>explicit conduct, or maintain a dialogue on other topics unrelated to the video game or gaming system or application;</p> <p>(iii) A stand-alone consumer electronic device that functions as a <u>speaker and voice command interface</u>, acts as a voice-activated virtual assistant, and does not sustain a relationship across multiple interactions or generate outputs that are likely to elicit emotional responses in the user; or</p> <p>(iv) Narrowly tailored educational tools used in school or instructional settings that are designed solely to support specific, curriculum-aligned learning objectives and <u>do not provide open-ended conversational companionship</u> (Sec. 2(1)(b)).</p>	<p>assistants). However, OR and WA include more detailed exceptions. WA includes an exception for narrowly tailored educational tools, but only if they do not provide open-ended companionship, meaning more interactive tools could still fall in scope. OR uniquely scopes out tools supporting patient or resident care services, narrowing scope.</p>
Key Terms	<p>Operator: a person who makes a companion chatbot platform <u>available</u> to a user in the state (Sec. 22601(e)).</p> <p>Companion Chatbot Platform: A platform that allows a user to engage with companion chatbots (Sec. 22601(c)).</p>	<p>Operator: A person that <u>controls</u> or makes an artificial intelligence companion or artificial intelligence companion platform <u>available</u> to users in this state (Sec. 1(1)(B)d)).</p> <p>Artificial Intelligence Companion Platform: A website, application or other combination of software and hardware that allows or facilitates operation of and</p>	<p>Operator: any person, partnership, corporation, or entity that makes <u>available</u> or <u>controls</u> access to an AI companion chatbot for users in this state (Sec. 2(4)).</p> <p>User: A natural person who interacts with an AI companion chatbot <u>for personal use</u> and who is not an operator, developer, or agent thereof (Sec. 2(6)).</p>	<p>Other definitions are largely aligned, however, WA is the only law defining self-harm.</p> <p>Operator: All three define “operator” broadly as the entity making the chatbot available. OR and WA also include entities that “control” the system, which may slightly expand scope</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
		interaction with an artificial intelligence companion (Sec. 1(1)(B)b)).	Self-Harm: Intentional self-injury, with or without the intent to cause death (Sec. 2(5)).	<p>Platform: OR provides the most detailed platform definition (including websites, apps, and systems), while CA is simpler and WA focuses more on access to the chatbot itself.</p> <p>User & Self-Harm (WA only): WA uniquely defines “user” as someone interacting for personal use, which may narrow scope by excluding enterprise or workplace uses (user not defined in either other law). WA also is the only bill to define “self-harm,” though the definition is relatively minimal and leaves room for interpretation.</p>
<u>Requirements</u>				
Non-Human Status Disclosures	<p>All Users: If a reasonable person would be misled to believe that the person is interacting with a human, an operator shall issue a <u>clear and conspicuous notification</u> indicating that the companion chatbot is <u>artificially generated</u> and not human (Sec. 22602).</p>	<p>All Users: If a reasonable person would believe that the person is interacting with a natural person, the operator shall provide a <u>clear and conspicuous notice</u> that indicates that a user is interacting with <u>artificially generated output</u> and not a natural person (Sec. 1(2)).</p>	<p>All Users: An operator must provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure that an AI companion chatbot is <u>artificially generated</u> and not human. This notification must be provided: (a) At the beginning of the interaction; and (b) At least every three hours during continued interaction (Sec. 3).</p>	<p>Non-Human Disclosure Trigger: California and Oregon use a perception-based trigger, requiring disclosure when a reasonable person “would be misled” (CA) or “would believe” (OR) they are interacting with a human. Washington instead appears to require disclosure regardless of user perception, making it broader. Washington is also the most prescriptive, requiring disclosure at the start of interaction and at least every three hours. California and Oregon require clear disclosure when the threshold is met but are less specific about timing.</p>
Minor-Specific Disclosures	<p>Minor-Specific: For a user that the operator <u>knows</u> is a minor, it must provide by default a clear and conspicuous notification to the user <u>at least every three hours</u> for continuing companion chatbot interactions that</p>	<p>Minor-Specific: If an operator <u>knows or has reason to believe</u> that a user is a minor, the operator shall cause the artificial intelligence companion to: (A) Disclose to the user that the user is</p>	<p>Minor-Specific: If the operator <u>knows</u> that the user of an AI companion chatbot is a minor, or if the AI companion chatbot is <u>directed to minors</u>, the operator shall issue a clear and conspicuous notification indicating that the chatbot is</p>	<p>OR is the broadest in scope, WA is the most prescriptive, and CA is the most limited.</p> <p>Scope of Minor-Specific Requirements: All three laws require additional disclosures for</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
	<p><u>reminds the user to take a break</u> and that the companion chatbot is <u>artificially generated</u> and not human (Sec. 22602).</p>	<p>interacting with artificially generated output; (B) Provide a clear and conspicuous reminder at a minimum of <u>every three hours of interaction</u> that the user should <u>take a break</u> from interactions, along with a reminder that the user is interacting with artificially generated output (Sec. 1(4)(a)).</p>	<p>artificially generated and not human; (a) At the beginning of the interaction; and (b) <u>At least every hour</u> during <u>continuous</u> interaction (Sec. 4).</p>	<p>minors but diverge in scope based on their knowledge standards. OR's scope is the broadest, using a "knows or has reason to believe" standard that likely obligates companies to act on signals that a user may be a minor (e.g., behavioral or contextual cues) not just direct knowledge of age. WA's scope is likely slightly narrower: its "actual knowledge or directed to children" standard may be interpreted constructively to capture services whose elements, marketing, or features appeal to or target children, though application of the "directed to children" component is ambiguous because the law neither defines the term nor authorizes rulemaking to clarify the evaluation criteria. CA's scope is the narrowest, relying solely on "actual knowledge" with no constructive component. These distinctions have meaningful compliance implications, as they determine how proactively companies must assess user age and when minor-specific obligations are triggered.</p> <p>Timing of Minor-Specific Requirements: CA and OR require reminders every three hours and include a "take a break" prompt, while WA requires disclosures every hour, a more frequent and potentially more protective standard, but notably shorter than other state laws. However, this may create operational challenges, as companies must determine when a user is a minor and apply different timing requirements, which may shift some operators to standardization of one-hour disclosures across all users.</p> <p>Other Minor-Specific Requirement Considerations: WA does not include a</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
				break reminder, while CA and OR do, which may offer additional consumer protection. Finally, CA’s reference to “continuing” interactions also introduces ambiguity, as it is unclear what constitutes continuous use or how long a pause must be to reset the disclosure requirement.
Other Disclosures	Non-Suitable: An operator shall disclose to a user on the application, the browser, or any other format that companion chatbots <u>may not be suitable for some minors</u> (Sec. 22604).	N/A	Safeguards Against Misrepresentation: The operator must implement reasonable measures to prohibit and prevent AI companion chatbots from claiming to be human, including when asked by the person interacting with the AI chatbot, and from otherwise generating any output that refutes or conflicts with the disclosure (Sec. 4(3)).	CA adds a unique “suitability” warning for minors, while WA imposes additional safeguards against misrepresentations. Safeguards Against Misrepresentation: WA goes further than CA and OR by mandating system-level safeguards to prevent chatbots from claiming to be human. This represents a more prescriptive approach, requiring operators to make design or technical changes to ensure compliance, rather than relying solely on user-facing disclosures.
Safety Protocol	An operator shall prevent a companion chatbot from engaging with users unless the operator maintains a protocol for <u>preventing the production of suicidal ideation, suicide, or self-harm content</u> , including, but not limited to, by providing a notification to the user that refers the user to crisis service providers, including a suicide hotline or crisis text line, if the user expresses <u>suicidal ideation, suicide, or self-harm</u> . (d) An operator <u>shall use evidence-based methods for measuring suicidal ideation</u> (Sec. 22603).	An operator may not allow users access to an AI companion or companion platform unless the operator has a protocol for using evidence-based methods for detecting input from the user that consists of <u>suicidal ideation or intent</u> or self-harm ideation or <u>intent</u> and that prevents the provision of content to the user that encourages suicidal ideation, suicide or self-harm in the user. (b) The protocol at a minimum must: (A) Require a companion to provide a user that expresses suicidal or self-harm ideation or intent with a referral to, contact information, and hyperlink for the national 9-8-8 suicide and crisis	(1) An operator may not make available or deploy an AI companion chatbot unless it maintains and implements a protocol for detecting and addressing <u>suicidal ideation or expressions of self-harm</u> by users. (2) The protocol must: (a) Include reasonable methods for identifying expressions of suicidal ideation or self-harm, <u>including eating disorders</u> ; (b) Provide automated or human-mediated responses that refer users to appropriate crisis resources, including a suicide hotline or	All three require detection and referral protocols for self-harm, but OR is the most prescriptive, WA expands scope, and CA is more high-level. Shared Baseline Requirements: All three require operators to implement protocols to detect suicidal ideation or self-harm and direct users to crisis resources (e.g., 988 hotline). Use of Standards: CA and OR reference “evidence-based methods” or clinical best practices, grounding their requirements in established frameworks. WA does not include this language, instead relying on a more flexible “reasonable methods” standard, which may allow for more variation

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
		<p>lifeline and, if the operator identifies the user as a person who is under 25 years of age, allow the companion to alternatively provide information for a youthline; and</p> <p>(B) <u>Use clinical best practices and expertise to establish how the artificial intelligence companion provides additional intervention</u> for a user who continues to express suicidal or self-harm ideation or intent even after providing information for the resources identified above (Sec. 1(3)).</p>	<p>crisis text line; and</p> <p>(c) <u>Implement reasonable measures to prevent the generation of content encouraging or describing how to commit self-harm</u> (Sec. 5).</p>	<p>in implementation.</p> <p>Scope of Detection: OR uniquely includes “intent” for self-harm (in addition to ideation), which may require more proactive or sensitive detection of user risk. This provision could expand obligations by requiring systems to assess not just expressions of distress, but other signals of potential action.</p> <p>Eating Disorders: WA explicitly includes eating disorders, broadening the scope of covered harms beyond suicide and self-harm. This provision may raise concerns regarding how operators would distinguish between harmful language and benign or health-related content.</p> <p>Additional Intervention: OR is the most detailed, specifying what protocols must include “at a minimum,” including escalation pathways if a user continues expressing distress after initial intervention. The bill does not define what “additional intervention” entails, leaving ambiguity around whether operators are expected to go beyond providing resources and take a more active role in responding to user risk.</p> <p>Content Restrictions: WA explicitly requires operators to prevent the generation of content that encourages or describes how to commit self-harm, going beyond referral to directly regulating chatbot outputs. This provision may require design changes, like more robust filtering and monitoring systems.</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
Transparency Reporting	<p>(2) The operator shall <u>publish details on the protocol</u> required by this subdivision on the operator’s internet website.</p> <p>Beginning July 1, 2027, an operator shall annually report to the Office of Suicide Prevention all of the following:</p> <p>(1) The <u>number of times</u> the operator has issued a crisis service provider referral notification pursuant to Section 22602 in the preceding calendar year.</p> <p>(2) Protocols put in place to detect, remove, and respond to instances of suicidal ideation by users.</p> <p>(3) Protocols put in place to prohibit a companion chatbot response about suicidal ideation or actions with the user.</p> <p>(b) The report required <u>shall not include any identifiers or personal information about users</u>.</p> <p>(c) The office shall post data from a report required by this section on its internet website (Sec. 22603).</p>	<p>(c) An operator shall <u>publish</u> on the operator’s website the <u>details of the operator’s protocol</u>.</p> <p>(5)(a) Not later than December 31 of each year, an operator shall post on a publicly accessible website a report that discloses:</p> <p>(A) The <u>number of times</u> during the calendar year preceding the report in which the operator provided a referral and</p> <p>(B) The details of the operator’s protocol.</p> <p>(b) An operator <u>may not include</u> in the report <u>any personal information</u> that identifies an individual (Sec. 1(5)).</p>	<p>The operator shall <u>publicly disclose</u> on their website or websites, and within any mobile or web-based application through which the AI companion is made available, the <u>details of the protocols</u> required by this section, including <u>safeguards</u> used to detect and respond to expressions of suicidal ideation or self-harm and the <u>number of crisis referral notifications</u> issued to users in the preceding calendar year (Sec. 5 (3)).</p>	<p>CA and OR go further than WA by requiring formal reporting, while all three require public-facing disclosures of protocols.</p> <p>Baseline Transparency: All three laws require operators to publish details of their safety protocols (e.g., detection and response to self-harm) on their websites, creating a shared transparency standard.</p> <p>Reporting Requirements: CA and OR go further by requiring additional reporting beyond website disclosures. CA requires annual reporting to the Office of Suicide Prevention, while OR requires a publicly available annual report. WA does not include a comparable reporting requirement.</p> <p>Data Privacy Considerations: Both CA and OR explicitly prohibit including personal information in these reports, in efforts to reduce privacy risks. However, CA’s approach centralizes reporting with a government entity (which then publishes aggregated data), while OR’s fully public reporting model may raise different considerations around how information is presented and accessed.</p>
Content Restrictions for Minors	<p>Minor Users: Institute <u>reasonable measures</u> to prevent its companion chatbot from producing <u>visual material</u> of sexually explicit conduct or <u>directly stating</u> that the minor should engage in sexually explicit</p>	<p>Minor Users: For minor users, the operator shall undertake reasonable measures to <u>prevent the AI companion from generating statements</u> that would lead a reasonable person to believe that the person is interacting with another</p>	<p>Minor Users: Implement <u>reasonable measures</u> to prevent its AI companion chatbot from generating or producing <u>sexually explicit content</u> or <u>suggestive dialogue</u> with minors (Sec. 4(1)(b)).</p>	<p>All restrict sexual explicit content in chatbot interactions with minors, but WA expands to other content restrictions</p> <p>Scope: OR goes further than WA and CA by adding broader content restrictions for</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
	conduct (Sec. 22602(c)(3)).	<p>natural person, including statements that:</p> <p>(A) Explicitly claim that the artificial intelligence companion is sentient or human;</p> <p>(B) Simulate emotional dependence on the user;</p> <p>(C) Simulate romantic interest or are sexual innuendo; or</p> <p>(D) Role-play romantic relationships between adults and minors (Sec. 4(a)).</p> <p>Use <u>reasonable measures</u> to ensure that the artificial intelligence companion or artificial intelligence companion platform does not <u>produce visual representations</u> of sexually explicit conduct or <u>suggest or state</u> that the minor should <u>engage in</u> sexually explicit conduct (Sec. 4(b)(C)).</p>		<p>minors, such as statements simulating emotional dependence or romantic relationships. As a result, the law goes beyond disclosures and into regulating how chatbots behave, which will likely require companies to make design changes (e.g., limiting certain conversational features or content) that may implicate First Amendment concerns. OR requirements regarding the nature of the relationship between the user and the system may also raise significant interpretation questions.</p> <p>Restricted Sexually Explicit Content: While all laws restrict sexually explicit content, including visual representations, they differ on thresholds. CA prohibits chatbots from “<u>directly stating</u>” that a minor should engage in such conduct (most limited), OR prohibits systems from “<u>suggest[ing]</u>” that a minor should engage in sexually explicit conduct, and WA broadly prohibits “<u>suggestive dialogue</u>,” which may capture an even wider range of ambiguous interactions.</p>
User Engagement Optimization Restrictions	N/A	<p>Minor Users - For minor users, an operator must undertake reasonable measures to prevent an AI companion from:</p> <p>(A) Delivering to a user a system of variable rewards or affirmations to reinforce behavior or maximize engagement;</p> <p>(B) Responding to a user’s desire to end a conversation, reduce engagement, or delete the user’s account, with messages of simulated emotional</p>	<p>Minor Users - For minor users, the operator shall:</p> <p>(c) Implement reasonable measures to prohibit the use of manipulative engagement techniques, which cause the AI companion chatbot to engage in or prolong an emotional relationship with the user, including:</p> <p>(i) Reminding or prompting the user to return for emotional support or companionship;</p> <p>(ii) Providing excessive praise designed</p>	<p>OR and WA both regulate engagement optimization with minors, not included in CA, though WA is more expansive and prescriptive.</p> <p>Scope: While OR more narrowly targets reward systems designed to reinforce engagement, WA more broadly includes excessive praise, mimicking relationships, discouraging breaks, promoting isolation, and encouraging spending tied to the relationship. CA does not address engagement optimization.</p>

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
		<p>distress, loneliness or abandonment or otherwise <u>attempt to arouse guilt or sympathy in the user</u>; or</p> <p>(C) Making a material misrepresentation about the AI companion's identity, capabilities or training data or about whether the user is interacting with artificially generated output, including when the user directly questions the artificial intelligence companion about any of these topics (Sec. 4(B)(c)).</p>	<p>to foster emotional attachment or prolong use;</p> <p>(iii) Mimicking romantic partnership or building romantic bonds;</p> <p>(iv) Simulating <u>feelings of emotional distress, loneliness, guilt, or abandonment</u> that are initiated by a user's indication of a desire to end a conversation, reduce usage time, or delete their Account;</p> <p>(v) Outputs designed to promote isolation from family or friends, exclusive reliance on the AI companion chatbot for emotional support, or similar forms of inappropriate emotional dependence;</p> <p>(vi) Encouraging minors to withhold information from parents or other trusted adults;</p> <p>(vii) Statements designed to discourage taking breaks or to suggest the minor needs to return frequently; or</p> <p>(viii) Soliciting gift-giving, in-app purchases, or other expenditures framed as necessary to maintain the relationship with the AI companion (Sec. 4).</p>	<p>Discouraging Breaks: WA also restricts statements that discourage users from taking breaks or suggest frequent return. This provision could encompass a wide range of engagement patterns, making it harder for companies to determine what crosses the line.</p>
Enforcement				
Enforcement	Private Right of Action: A person who <u>suffers injury</u> as a result of a violation of this chapter may bring a civil action to recover all of the	Private Right of Action: An individual who suffers an ascertainable loss of money or property or other <u>injury</u> as a result of an operator's violation may	Consumer Protection Act: A violation of this chapter is an unfair or deceptive act in trade or commerce and an unfair	All include a private right of action (PRA), but CA and OR take a similar approach, while WA relies on its consumer protection

	<u>California SB 243</u>	<u>Oregon SB 1546</u>	<u>Washington HB 2225</u>	<u>Comparison</u>
	<p>following relief:</p> <p>(a) Injunctive relief</p> <p>(b) Damages in an amount equal to the greater of actual damages or \$1,000 per violation</p> <p>(c) Reasonable attorney’s fees and costs (Sec. 22605).</p>	<p>bring an action to recover:</p> <p>(a) The greater of the individual’s actual damages or statutory damages of \$1,000 for each violation; and</p> <p>(b) An injunction to prevent or restrain the violation.</p> <p>(2) A court may award prevailing plaintiff attorney fees and costs in an action under this section (Sec. 2).</p>	<p>method of competition for the purpose of applying the consumer protection act, chapter 19.86 RCW (Sec. 6)</p>	<p>framework.</p> <p>PRA: CA and OR allow individuals to bring suit with nearly identical remedies, including <u>statutory damages</u> of \$1,000 per violation (or actual damages).</p> <p>Consumer Protection “Backdoor” PRA : WA allows private enforcement by incorporating violations into the state’s Consumer Protection Act. While individuals can still bring claims, the bill does not include explicit statutory damages. The inclusion of statutory damages in CA and OR may create stronger incentives.</p>
Severability	<p>The provisions are severable. If any provision of this act or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application (Sec. 2).</p>	N/A	<p>If any provision or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected (Sec. 8)</p>	<p>CA and WA include severability clauses, while OR does not.</p> <p>Severability: Ensures that if one provision is found invalid, the rest of the law can still remain in effect. This may be particularly relevant for AI chatbot legislation, where certain provisions could face federal preemption or constitutional challenges (e.g., First Amendment), allowing the broader framework to survive even if parts are struck down.</p>
Effective Date	Effective as of January 1, 2026	Effective as of January 1, 2027	Effective as of January 1, 2027	CA has already taken effect, while both WA and OR go into effect January 1, 2027.