



March 25, 2026

The Honorable Tina McKinnor
California State Assembly
1021 O Street, Suite 5520
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 1963 (McKinnor) - Portable screening reports: disclosure of application materials - Oppose

Dear Assembly Member McKinnor:

On behalf of the organizations listed here, we are writing to inform you that our organizations have taken an oppose position on AB 1963, your legislation that, among other provisions, would mandate that rental housing providers accept portable screening reports and would impose additional disclosure requirements related to those reports.

Resident screening is a fundamental component of responsible property management. Housing providers must retain access to reliable, comprehensive, and verifiable consumer information to make informed decisions that protect the safety, financial stability, and well-being of their residents, employees, and rental communities. Limiting or constraining the ability to independently verify applicant information introduces unnecessary risk and liability. While current law caps screening fees at \$30 plus an annual increase equal to the consumer prices index, rental property owners absorb additional costs to ensure that the documents submitted by the applicant, including driver's licenses, are not fraudulent. Unfortunately, it is too easy today to create fraudulent documents to submit along with the screening report.

We previously worked with Assembly Member Ward on AB 2559, which established portable screening reports as an optional tool—not a mandate. As signed by the Governor, the intent of that legislation was deliberate: to introduce the concept while allowing sufficient time for the market to develop the necessary infrastructure, ensure standardization, and address concerns regarding data accuracy, fraud prevention, and report manipulation. AB 2559 has only been in effect for a short period, and the marketplace has not yet matured to a point where a mandate is appropriate. Prematurely requiring acceptance of portable reports risks unintended consequences for both housing providers and applicants.

While the intent of AB 2559 appears to limit a prospective tenant from paying more than one application screening fee, California has already effectively resolved this concern through AB 2493 (2024). That bill, signed by the Governor, ensures that applicants are only charged a screening fee if their application is actually considered, and it requires landlords to process applications in the order received, based on disclosed screening criteria. It also requires refunding fees when appropriate. This framework directly addresses cost concerns without compromising the integrity of the screening process.

The Honorable Tina McKinnor
California State Assembly
March 25, 2026
Page 2

AB 1963 would also impose operational burdens and delays in the leasing process. Requiring acceptance and review for accuracy of portable screening reports will slow the application processing, create administrative inefficiencies, and ultimately disadvantage applicants in competitive housing markets.

For the reasons listed above, we must respectfully oppose AB 1963.



Debra Carlton, Executive Vice President
State Public Affairs
California Apartment Association



Indira McDonald, KP Public Affairs
On behalf of California Mortgage Bankers Association



Jennifer Svec-Williams
Vice President Public Policy & Advocacy
California Association of Realtors®



Skyler Wonnacott
Senior Director of Government Relations
California Business Properties Association
Building Owners and Managers Association



Karim Drissi
Senior Vice President of Legislative Affairs
California Building Industry Association

cc: Assembly Judiciary Committee