

General Law Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-4 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING CONSUMER PRIVACY.

Vote Date: 3/16/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/4/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL

General Law Committee

Sen. Martin M. Looney, 11th Dist.
Sen. Bob Duff, 25th Dist.
Sen. Saud Anwar, 3rd Dist.
Sen. Jorge Cabrera, 17th Dist.
Sen. Christine Cohen, 12th Dist.
Sen. Mae Flexer, 29th Dist.
Sen. Sujata Gadkar-Wilcox, 22nd Dist.
Sen. Herron Gaston, 23rd Dist.
Sen. Joan V. Hartley, 15th Dist.
Sen. Jan Hochadel, 13th Dist.
Sen. Paul Honig, 8th Dist.
Sen. Julie Kushner, 24th Dist.
Sen. Matthew L. Lesser, 9th Dist.
Sen. Rick Lopes, 6th Dist.
Sen. Ceci Maher, 26th Dist.
Sen. James J. Maroney, 14th Dist.
Sen. Martha Marx, 20th Dist.
Sen. Douglas McCrory, 2nd Dist.
Sen. Patricia Billie Miller, 27th Dist.
Sen. Norman Needleman, 33rd Dist.
Sen. Catherine A. Osten, 19th Dist.
Sen. MD Rahman, 4th Dist.
Sen. Derek Slap, 5th Dist.

Rep. Nicholas Menapace, 37th Dist.
Rep. Anthony L. Nolan, 39th Dist.
Rep. Travis Simms, 140th Dist.
Rep. Rebecca Martinez, 22nd Dist.
Rep. Brandon Chafee, 33rd Dist.
Rep. Kara Rochelle, 104th Dist.
Rep. Nick Gauthier, 38th Dist.
Rep. Hubert D. Delany, 144th Dist.
Rep. Kate Farrar, 20th Dist.
Rep. William Heffernan, 115th Dist.
Rep. Kaitlyn Shake, 120th Dist.
Rep. Lucy Dathan, 142nd Dist.
Rep. Josh Elliott, 88th Dist.
Rep. Jennifer Leeper, 132nd Dist.
Rep. Renee LaMark Muir, 36th Dist.
Rep. Michael "MJ" Shannon, 117th Dist.
Rep. Savet Constantine, 42nd Dist.
Rep. Laurie Sweet, 91st Dist.
Rep. Marcus Brown, 127th Dist.
Rep. Sarah Keitt, 134th Dist.
Rep. Mary Welander, 114th Dist.

REASONS FOR BILL

Senate Bill 4 intends to empower Connecticut's consumers by strengthening transparency measures and enacting stronger guardrails regarding how their data may be used, sold, or transferred.

Data Brokers (Sections 1-9): Data brokers compile detailed datasets on the state's consumers, including information about their daily lives, preferences, health conditions, and other sensitive

information. The motivation to regulate these businesses came to the forefront when Minnesota's House Speaker Emerita and her husband were assassinated, and [it was subsequently revealed that](#) the alleged shooter obtained detailed information about his targets from data broker websites. SB 4 requires data brokers to register with the Department of Consumer Protection (DCP) and to comply with various data privacy provisions.

Connecticut's existing Data Privacy Act gives consumers certain opt-out rights regarding the processing of their personal data; SB 4 expands these rights in a manner consistent with California's Delete Act. It intends to give consumers greater control over their data by requiring the creation of a one-stop deletion portal. After an individual enters a request, all of Connecticut's data brokers would be required to delete the consumer's data at no cost to the consumer.

Tariff Disclosures (Section 10): These measures intend to provide greater transparency regarding factors contributing to the price of a new car. The bill requires disclosure of the estimated cost of a new car that is attributable to tariffs.

Algorithmic Pricing Disclosures (Section 11): This section aims to increase transparency by requiring disclosure when personalized algorithmic pricing is used to increase the price of certain goods and services online. It also intends to proactively address the potential impact of emerging technologies by generally prohibiting the use of electronic shelf labels (ESLs) to implement personalized price increases for in-person transactions.

Publicly Available Information (Section 12): SB 4 intends to tighten up loopholes in existing statute by making changes to the definition of "publicly available information" used in the Connecticut Data Privacy Act.

Facial Recognition (Sections 12 and 17): These provisions respond to concerns raised about the [use of facial recognition technology in grocery stores](#) and other retail establishments in Connecticut. The bill generally limits the use of this technology to match faces to those included in a database that the establishment solely controls. It requires the establishment to disclose that they are using facial recognition on a posted sign and to provide a link or QR code directing consumers to the establishment's privacy policy. The privacy policy must include a way for consumers to (1) find out if they are included in the store's database and (2) request removal.

Employment Decisions and Profiling (Sections 13-14): These measures intend to build on protections included in the Connecticut Data Privacy Act by increasing consumers' rights pertaining to the denial of employment based on automated profiling performed using third-party personal data. The bill gives consumers the right to (1) opt out of this type of profiling, (2) know that profiling was involved in a denial of an employment opportunity, (3) correct incorrect data used to make the decision, and (4) have the decision re-evaluated.

Precise Geolocation Data (Sections 15-16): The bill provides special protections for this category of sensitive data. It bans companies from selling, sharing, transferring, or otherwise permitting others to access this kind of data.

Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs; Section 18): SB 4 intends to address the inappropriate and/or unlawful sharing of ALPR data. In order to protect Connecticut residents' privacy, the bill specifies that vendors may not sell, share, or transfer this data. It also exempts this data from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

The substitute language incorporates feedback received during the committee process to make various changes to the underlying bill.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY

[Department of Consumer Protection \(DCP\)–Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner](#) provided written comments on SB 4, primarily focusing on the bill’s provisions pertaining to data broker registration. DCP notes that they would need additional resources to support the creation of the one-stop deletion mechanism and the data broker credential, and they would need additional funding to perform associated enforcement. They express concern that the penalties for data brokers are too lenient; they recommend increasing the per-day fine and removing the yearly cap.

[Department of Transportation \(CTDOT\)–Garrett Eucalito, Commissioner](#) provided written comments focusing on the potential impact of two provisions on CTDOT’s operations.

- Eucalito comments that CTDOT uses location-based data to perform tasks such as project impact analysis, incident reporting, and operations management. He requests an exemption for “the collection of aggregate or summarized geolocation data for transportation, planning, analysis, and operational management purposes.”
- CTDOT notes that the current definition of ALPR could unintentionally capture CTDOT’s work zone speed control systems and municipal automated traffic enforcement safety devices. They request a carveout for these devices

[Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection \(DESPP\)–Ronnell Higgins, Commissioner](#) provided written comments focusing on SB 4’s provisions regarding ALPR. DESPP explains that these devices are frequently used as a vital investigative tool; at the same time, they recognize the need to enact safeguards that protect sensitive information. Commissioner Higgins informs the committee that the Police Officer Standards and Training Council (POSTC) adopted a formal, statewide policy on the use of ALPR by law enforcement. He testifies that this policy addresses data access, retention, and auditing concerns while remaining compliant with Connecticut’s Trust Act. Commissioner Higgins asks the committee to consider the extent to which the POSTC framework accomplishes the goals of SB 4. He adds that DESPP strongly supports the bill’s FOIA exemption for ALPR data, stating that the exemption protects crime victims (including domestic violence victims) from being tracked.

[Freedom of Information Commission–Paula Pearlman, Managing Director and Associate General Counsel](#) submitted written testimony opposing the blanket FOIA exemption for ALPR data. Pearlman writes that prior investigations into the misuse of ALPR data were made possible by public records request.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT

[Senate President Pro Tempore Martin Looney](#) and [Senate Democrats](#) submitted substantially similar written testimony in support of SB 4. They argue that although constituents benefit from certain technological advancements, it is necessary to enact safeguards that protect constituents’ civil liberties. The testimony notes that the bill includes provisions aimed at the following:

- Regulating data brokers who sell or license personal data and allowing residents to easily request that their data be deleted
- Banning ALPR companies from selling or sharing ALPR data
- Increasing transparency regarding the use of facial recognition technology
- Requiring disclosure when dynamic/algorithmic pricing is used
- Disclosing the portion of the cost of a new motor vehicle that is attributable to tariffs
- Banning the sale or sharing of precise geolocation data

The members add that the need for stronger personal data protections was brought to the forefront when it was revealed that the individual who assassinated Minnesota Speaker Emerita Melissa Hortman and her husband, Mark, obtained their personal information through data broker websites. Ultimately, they urge the committee to support SB 4 and report it favorably.

[Senate Majority Leader Bob Duff](#)'s testimony echoes the sentiments expressed in testimony from his colleagues and adds additional details regarding the data broker, ALPR, and geolocation data provisions. Sen. Duff expresses alarm that the individual who assassinated his friend, Speaker Emerita Melissa Hortman, and her husband, Mark, was able to obtain the information he needed for "just a few dollars." He adds that he is alarmed by recent examples of the illegal sharing of ALPR data. Sen. Duff points to an incident where Flock Safety illegally shared Illinois license plate reader data with Texas law enforcement officials who sought to track a woman who allegedly sought abortion-related care. He also notes that it was revealed that the ALPR vendor Flock Safety was illegally sharing data with federal immigration enforcement officials. Sen. Duff adds that Flock Safety has contracts with police departments across Connecticut, and out of state departments have accessed Connecticut data "hundreds of thousands of times." On a related note, Sen. Duff testifies that it has been revealed that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has been purchasing precise geolocation data. In closing, he urges the committee to take action now to protect Connecticut residents' rights.

[State Representative Nick Menapace](#) testified in support of SB 4, with his comments focusing on provisions regarding data brokers. He applauds these measures, stating that they increase transparency and provide special protections for children and for sensitive information. Rep. Menapace elaborates on how Connecticut's approach aligns with other states that are seeking to increase safety and "withstand legal scrutiny while providing real protections." He argues that SB 4 does not address ideological or partisan concerns but rather pursues goals that cross party lines. Rep. Menapace asks the committee to support the bill.

[Connecticut Voices for Children \(CT Voices\)--Carmen Clarkin, Special Assistant for Strategic Initiatives and Emily Knox, Research and Policy Director](#) testified in support of SB 4. They write that the bill takes important steps toward clearer and more enforceable data privacy regulation in Connecticut. CT Voices expresses appreciation regarding the bill's increased oversight of data brokers and tightened limits on the sale or share of precise geolocation data. They applaud SB 4's disclosure provisions regarding algorithmic pricing. While CT Voices supports the intent of Section 18, which pertains to the sharing of ALPR data, they ask that the committee align its approach with HB 5449, citing that bill's clearer and more detailed definitions and safeguards. They support passage of the bill with those amendments.

[Consumer Reports \(CR\)--Matt Schwartz, Senior Policy Analyst](#) testified in support of SB 4 with targeted amendments. CR states that they strongly support the sections creating a universal data broker deletion mechanism, writing that it will provide critical protections to Connecticut residents. Their written testimony provides extensive documentation of harms related to data brokers. In response to concerns raised during the public hearing about the security of a one-stop deletion portal, Schwartz pointed to the California Delete Act and its associated encryption and data protection standards. His written testimony includes suggested amendments intended to strengthen these provisions, and he notes that CR has prepared a detailed redline document (which was not submitted as public hearing testimony). With respect to algorithmic pricing, CR argues that the bill's requirements do not go far enough, and Schwartz encourages the committee to amend the language to ban the practice altogether. CR's written testimony provides additional targeted amendments, and they ask the committee to approve the bill.

[Connecticut Police Chiefs Association \(CPCA\)](#) submitted written testimony in support of the bill's FOIA exemption for ALPR data. They note that the technology is an important investigative tool, and

they argue that the proposed FOIA exemption prevents harassment and protects individuals' privacy and safety.

[Flock Safety–Kevin Kane, Director of Government Affairs](#) provided written and spoken testimony, which he characterized as in support of SB 4 with “minor clarifications” to language regarding ALPRs. He echoed previous points stressing the importance of ALPR data as an investigative tool, and he added that Flock Safety “enthusiastically supports” legislation enacting strong privacy protections. In response to what he deems “significant misinformation,” Kane’s written testimony makes the following statements:

- He writes that customers own the data (not Flock Safety) and the customers control if and how their data is used or shared.
- Kane states that Flock Safety “does not and has never sold customer data.”
- Kane testifies that Flock has already developed filters that block any searches related to immigration enforcement or reproductive care.
- He declares that federal agencies are not part of any sort of broad data sharing network, stating that individual communities receive and then accept or reject federal data requests.

Kane requests an amendment permitting limited access to technical service and support vendors. He also argues that the language should include ALPR information gathered under any contract, not just those with DOT, DMV, or law enforcement.

[United Food and Commercial Workers International Union \(UFCW\)–Rachel Lyons, Legislative Director](#)

[United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 919 \(UFCW Local 919\)–Ivan Shang, Chris Mauro, and Mark Espinosa](#)

[United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 371 \(UFCW Local 371\)–Jose Anaya, Roberta Green, Keri Hoehne, and Jacob Serafini](#)

The above individuals testified in support of SB 4 with an amendment banning the use of Electronic Shelf Labels (ESLs). The UFCW members commend the committee’s work to address surveillance pricing, they argue that a ban on ESLs is needed in order to fully address that practice. The testimony notes that grocery prices are increasing and that food is becoming unaffordable for the state’s working families. UFCW cautions that cloud-connected ESLs could soon use AI technology to calculate individual prices for each consumer based on their perceived willingness to pay. In this scenario, UFCW argues that consumers could see discriminatory food pricing, and the cost of groceries would be driven up further. They testify that although a ban on surveillance pricing would prevent individualized pricing, ESLs would still enable retailers to quickly increase pricing based on time of day or proximity to an event. Certain pieces of UFCW testimony add that a ban on ESLs would protect grocery workers’ jobs from being eliminated through automation. They ask the committee to amend the bill to include a ban on ESLs, then pass it.

[Connecticut Food Association \(CFA\)–Wayne Pesce, President](#) testified in support of the bill’s overall goals while offering technical amendments to sections regarding algorithmic pricing and the use of facial recognition technology. With respect to algorithmic pricing, CFA requests that disclosures be limited only to price increases. They note that current language would capture various loyalty and discount programs. CFA also asks that the language include a definition of “baseline price” so that disclosure requirements would only be triggered when the price increases above that point.

[Anonymous 41, Anonymous 48, Anonymous 49, Christina D, Felicia DeDominicis, Dr. Jill Kelly, Beverly Propen, and Ted Yang](#) submitted written testimony expressing general support for SB 4.

GENERAL COMMENTS

[Connecticut Retail Network \(CRN\)–Tim Phelan, President](#) provided general comments on SB 4, expressing concern that certain provisions could unintentionally burden retailers in Connecticut.

Phelan argues that facial recognition technology should still be allowed to be used for loss prevention and safety purposes. He argues that in these situations, individuals should not be allowed to request data deletion, and he requests that the language be amended to allow data sharing with law enforcement. Phelan cautions against limiting the uses of ALPR data, testifying that some retailers use and share this data to combat theft rings. He expresses disagreement with the committee's approach to algorithmic pricing disclosures, testifying that these should only be required when prices increase. Phelan expresses additional concern that data broker provisions are too broad and lack "adequate safeguards." He encourages the committee to continue to refine the bill.

Eric Weiner, Windsor Resident and Technologist spoke at the public hearing to highlight his research into Flock Safety in Windsor. He urged the committee to remove the FOIA exemption for ALPR data, arguing that transparency is essential to catching bad actors who use searches only to track residents.

[ACLU Connecticut–Jess Zaccagnino, Policy Counsel](#) provided written testimony on SB 4. ACLU-CT believes that the bill is a meaningful step toward protecting residents' privacy, but they urge the committee to strengthen the drafted protections. Zaccagnino requests that the bill include clearer restrictions on when and how ALPR data can be used, shared, or stored. She encourages the committee to strengthen enforcement mechanisms. ACLU-CT echoes the sentiments expressed in UFCW's testimony in support of banning ESLs.

[Connecticut AFL-CIO–Ed Hawthorne, President](#) testified on Sections 10 and 11 of SB 4. Although he appreciates the intent of requiring manufacturers to disclose tariff costs, he states that UAW members fear that manufacturers outside the US could exploit such a policy to hide price increases. Alternatively, he asks that the committee require labeling that discloses worker wages, or that gives a complete price breakdown. Hawthorne echoes previous comments in support of fully banning the use of ESLs and surveillance-based pricing.

[AFL-CIO Technology Institute–Crystal Weise, Policy and Programs Director](#) testified in support of SB 4 with amendments. She focuses on the bill's surveillance pricing provisions, encouraging the committee to strengthen associated consumer protections. Weise requests amendments prohibiting surveillance pricing in large grocery stores, banning ESLs, strengthening data protections for minors, and providing opt-out mechanisms.

[CSEA SEIU Local 2001–Jan Lawrence, President, P-4 Council](#) submitted written testimony on multiple bills under the committee's consideration. The testimony briefly expresses support for UFCW's proposed ban on ESLs and surveillance pricing.

Zephyr Teachout, Fordham Law Professor spoke at the public hearing, echoing calls to ban surveillance pricing.

[American Economic Liberties Project–Pat Garofalo, Director of State and Local Policy](#) wrote and spoke to express general support for the bill's intent but to encourage the committee to fully ban surveillance pricing and wage setting. He testifies that surveillance pricing systems can be discriminatory and invasive, relying on "intimate details" about a customer's life. Garofalo believes that the bill's current disclosures are not sufficient, as a ban is the only way to protect consumers from the negative impacts of these practices. He states that contrary to retailers' claims, a ban on surveillance pricing would not limit the ability to provide discounts. Garofalo adds a previously unheard suggestion to ban "surveillance wage setting," arguing that data-based profiling is being used to set wages in the "gig economy" and certain healthcare occupations.

[Connecticut Hospital Association \(CHA\)](#) submitted written testimony expressing general concerns about certain provisions of SB 4. They urge the committee to clarify data broker definitions and

requirements. CHA expresses broad, non-specific concerns about sections pertaining to employment decisions and “safety and security.” They urge the committee to more carefully consider the bill’s language.

[Connecticut Association of Health Plans \(CTAHP\)--Susan Halpin, Executive Director](#) writes to request that HIPAA-covered entities be fully exempt from algorithmic pricing disclosures. She requests that due to its complexity, the bill’s effective dates be pushed out to two years after adoption.

[Leading Age Connecticut and Rhode Island--Mag Morelli, President](#) testified to request that HIPAA-covered entities be fully exempt from data broker registration requirements, the accessible deletion mechanism program, and any provisions regarding the use of personalized algorithmic pricing.

[New England Connectivity and Telecommunications Association, Inc. \(NECTA\)--Anna Lucey, Executive Vice President, Legislative and External Affairs](#) provided written comments on SB 4. They argue that the definitions of “data broker” and “brokered personal data” are too broad and could unintentionally capture almost any legitimate business and its activities. NECTA’s written testimony includes proposed amendments to both definitions. If the bill is not amended, NECTA cautions that it would place significant compliance burdens on many businesses within the state. They encourage the committee to amend the bill as suggested so that it targets regulation on “true bad actors.”

[Alliance for Automotive Innovation--Malika Butler, Director, State Affairs](#) submitted written testimony expressing concerns regarding tariff disclosures and geolocation data provisions. Butler writes that the tariff disclosures impose “an unworkable compliance challenge” and requests that the committee reconsider that section. She details the difficulties associated with estimating the portion of costs attributable to tariffs, asserting that any calculation would be speculative and would lack consistency across manufacturers. Butler raises additional concerns regarding limitations on the sharing of geolocation data. She states that emergency notification, roadside assistance, and stolen vehicle recovery systems rely on geolocation data. Butler lists other safety systems that use this data. Her testimony includes a proposed amendment aimed at addressing these concerns.

[Connecticut Bankers Association \(CBA\)--Tom Mongellow, President and CEO](#) provided written comments requesting clarification of various exemptions for financial institutions. The testimony appears to be requesting an exemption from employment-related protections, as well as from requirements pertaining to algorithmic pricing disclosures.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION

[Connecticut Business and Industry Association \(CBIA\)--Chris Davis, Vice President of Public Policy](#) testified in opposition to SB 4 as currently drafted. CBIA argues that the bill’s definitions of “data broker” and “data service provider” are too broad and could capture ordinary data collection activities. Davis states that the associated requirement to monitor the opt-out portal would be too burdensome for small businesses. In public hearing testimony, he suggested using Oregon’s definitions of “data broker” and other terms. Davis clarified that although his members were uncomfortable with the definition last year, they are now okay with it. In written testimony, Davis expresses concerns that the bill could limit uses of facial recognition technology related to safety and security. CBIA expresses agreement with previous calls to limit algorithmic pricing disclosures to price increases. Davis adds that restrictions on geolocation data sharing could prevent retailers from offering location-specific promotions. Overall, CBIA requests that the committee refine the bill’s language.

[Connecticut Restaurant and Hospitality Association \(CRHA\)--Scott Dolch, President](#) provided written testimony in opposition to SB 4. He argues that the bill will pose operational challenges and

unintentionally burden the state's small businesses, restaurants, and hotels. CRHA expresses concern that broad definitions of "data broker" and "data service provider" could undermine the operation of reservation systems, loyalty programs, delivery platforms, and event booking. They argue that hospitality businesses could then be required to register as data brokers and face added compliance burdens, including a requirement to regularly monitor the state's opt-out portal. CRHA criticizes facial recognition provisions as limiting venues' access to security and fraud prevention tools. They add that algorithmic pricing disclosures could confuse customers and limit businesses' ability to respond to seasonal fluctuations in demand. In sum, CRHA requests that the committee pursue significant refinements to the bill.

[Connecticut Council on Freedom of Information \(CCFOI\)--Katherine Revello, Member](#) submitted written testimony in opposition to the proposed FOIA exemption for ALPR data. According to CCFOI, FOIA is a key tool for journalists who have exposed misuse of this technology. They argue that information captured by ALPRs is not personally identifiable, and the proposed ban would reduce transparency and limit oversight. Revello's testimony provides supplemental examples of instances in which the FOIA assisted journalistic investigation and uncovered concerns.

[Suzanne Castillo, Media Freedom and Information Access Clinic, Yale Law School](#) testified in opposition to the FOIA exemption for ALPR data. She writes that such an exemption would prove detrimental to public accountability, highlighting that journalists often seek information about *how* the technology is used, rather than the raw data. Castillo argues that given the widespread nature of ALPR technology, public oversight is essential to the prevention of misuse and abuse. She asks the committee to remove or narrow the raised bill's exemption.

[Chamber of Progress--Vidushi Dyall, Director of Legal Analysis](#) wrote and spoke in opposition to SB 4 unless it is amended. Although Dyall appreciates the committee's efforts to protect consumer privacy, she argues that certain provisions would have unintended consequences and need revision. While the organization supports enacting guardrails pertaining to the use of ALPR data, they believe that as drafted, the language prevents certified service vendors from providing technical assistance to communities. With respect to algorithmic pricing, the testimony echoes previous calls to establish a definition of "baseline price" and only require disclosure for price increases above that baseline. Dyall claims that the bill's approach to facial recognition would hamper uses that improve security. She states that retailers sometimes use third-party tools to spot crime rings as they move from location to location, and she cautions that deletion mechanisms could be exploited by criminals looking to avoid detection. Dyall encourages the committee to pursue targeted amendments that preserve technology's benefits while maintaining privacy protections.

[State Privacy and Security Coalition \(SPSC\)--William Martinez, Counsel](#) testified in opposition to SB 4. His main concerns include the following:

- Data brokers: Martinez argues that the proposed framework unintentionally captures routine data collection within business contexts. Consequently, many businesses would be subject to new compliance burdens. As an alternative, he suggests that the committee adopt Oregon's definitions and regulatory framework.
- Deletion portal: Martinez maintains that the proposed deletion mechanism would present a cybersecurity risk. He argues that the portal would contain significant amounts of sensitive information and become a "honeypot" for hackers.
- Facial recognition: Martinez warns that the current language could prevent uses of facial recognition technology that detect fraud and prevent crime.

In his written testimony, Martinez raises objections to various other provisions of the bill, including multiple enhancements to the Connecticut Data Privacy Act.

[Consumer Healthcare Products Association \(CHPA\)--Robbie McLuckie, State Director of Government Affairs](#) testified in opposition to the bill, stating that as drafted, it conflicts with

provisions of the federal Controlled Substances Act requiring retailers to track and monitor pseudoephedrine sales. McLuckie states that the bill would prevent Connecticut retailers from using the National Precursor Log Exchange (NPLEX) system to meet these requirements. His written testimony includes a proposed amendment that would remedy this issue.

Security Industry Association (SIA)--Jake Parker, Senior Director of Government Relations wrote and spoke in opposition to SB 4 as drafted. SIA objects to the proposed changes to the state's data privacy act and argues that associated restrictions limit the use of facial recognition technology as a safety tool. They argue that the definition of "facial recognition technology" is inaccurate and captures any system that simply detects that faces are present in an image or video. SIA lists other definitions they perceive as concerning, and they urge the committee not to advance the bill unless there are significant changes.

Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA)--Kyle Sepe, State Policy Manager, Northeast Region testified in opposition to SB 4 unless it is amended. CCIA states that the "data broker" definitions are overly broad, and in public hearing testimony, Sepe suggested that Vermont's law could serve as a model. (During questioning, Senator Maroney pointed out that Vermont is looking to update its own definitions because the bill's authors no longer consider them to be adequate.) At the public hearing, Sepe objected to other definitions within the bill, and his written testimony includes accompanying suggestions for amendments.

iBotta--David Shapiro, Chief Legal Counsel testified in opposition to SB 4. Shapiro writes that although iBotta shares the committee's goals of enhancing privacy protections, the bill would make it more difficult for retailers to offer discounts. He warns that retailers may choose to do away with such programs, leading to higher prices for consumers. Shapiro argues that the bill's language should be revised to allow consumers to voluntarily participate in discount programs, revise definitions, and reconsider the format of required disclosures.

Association of National Advertisers--Adam Wadsworth, Coordinator submitted a letter signed by four digital advertising associations that expressed opposition to the bill. The testimony contains broken and/or incorrect links to sources. Selected excerpts of the letter contain information that is unsupported by associated linked citations.

Mayer Brown--Philip Recht, Partner testified on behalf of a coalition of people search companies in opposition to SB 4. His primary objections pertain to changes in the definition of "publicly available information." According to Recht, the change raises First Amendment concerns that could invalidate the entire Connecticut Data Privacy Act. He urges the committee to strike the changes to the definition of "publicly available information."

Reported by: Betsy Francolino

Date: March 29, 2026