

# Meeting Summary

Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence

Meeting #5

[Link](#) to Task Force on OLIS



**LPRO**  
LEGISLATIVE POLICY  
AND RESEARCH OFFICE

---

Date/Time	September 20, 10 a.m. - 12 p.m. ( <a href="#">link</a> to recording)
Attendees	Chair Newberry Senator Woods Ameeta Agrawal Justin Brookman Alan Fern Jimmy Godard Jason Kistler Kimberly McCullough Sean McSpaden Sara Tangdall Kelsey Wilson  Rose Feliciano; substituting for David Edmonson Catherine Susman; substituting for Reza Alavi
Informational Meeting Introductory Remarks	Chair Newberry opened the informational meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.  Kimberly McCullough noted she will be leaving her position, and that Ellen Flint will replace her on the task force.
Informational Meeting Workgroup Report-Outs and Discussion	<b>Methodology/Technology Workgroup Report</b>  Shortly before the meeting, task force members received the methodology/technology workgroup's <a href="#">initial list</a> of definitions and classifications. The workgroup focused on mechanics of artificial intelligence (AI) and looked at definitions from the European Union (EU), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Stanford University, and the University of North Florida. The workgroup considered Oregon's data privacy law and suggested that definitions already present in statute do not need to be redefined but could be referenced in the task force report.  The workgroup placed its definitions into four categories: general software and system concepts; AI disciplines; AI methodologies and components; and AI application concepts. The workgroup noted AI is often described as an entity performing an action, but that AI may better be described as a discipline.  Task force members commented that paring definitions down to a core group was a good idea given time constraints and that knowing more about what definitions exist in statute would help avoid duplication or competing definitions in statute.  <b>Ethics Workgroup Report</b>  The ethics workgroup reported they looked at existing ethics frameworks but paused that work to provide feedback for the applications workgroup's

---

use case list. The ethics workgroup had questions regarding how that framework helps inform its work, whether listing use cases falls within the task force’s scope, whether it duplicates work from Oregon’s State Government Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council, and how the use cases compare to those found in other legislation examined by the task force.

The ethics workgroup concurred with earlier discussion that paring definitions down would help target definitions to what legislators would find most useful, suggesting “automated license plate reader” as one example definition that could be removed from the task force’s list.

### **Applications Workgroup Report**

At the previous task force meeting, the applications workgroup provided a list of definitions and sources generated through ChatGPT. LPRO checked the accuracy of a sample (10 percent) of these definitions and found that some did not match the actual source or that definitions were amalgamated together from multiple sources. Chair Newberry discussed these findings and noted this provides an observation of how generative AI works versus a search engine and that results differ depending on variations in prompt engineering.

---

Informational Meeting  
Definition Discussion

#### **Definition Discussion**

Chair Newberry reiterated the task force’s charge of focusing on federal definitions, noting that it may be helpful to identify common terms needed to understand AI, classify definitions, and identify authoritative sources of information.

Discussion covered how to coordinate the work being done among the three workgroups and the overlap between some definitions. Members liked the idea of pointing to a federal source in the report, then to EU, state, or standards bodies after that, identifying terms of most importance, which would then allow legislators to determine which definitions make the most sense within the context of policy they are working on.

Members considered how to include definitions in the survey to stakeholders identified by [House Bill 4153 \(2024\)](#), with the idea that recipients would be asked to identify terms the task force is missing rather than engaging recipients on wordsmithing.

---

Informational Meeting  
Survey Discussion  
[\(Link to slides\)](#)

#### **Survey Discussion and Next Steps**

LPRO gave a presentation covering the types of stakeholders the task force is required to contact, the stakeholders thus far identified by the task force, the task force timeline going forward, and an outline of the task force report, including the survey.

Before this meeting, LPRO sent out a spreadsheet for members to fill out and add contact information of suggested stakeholders to contact; recipients would be able to forward the survey to members of their organizations. Members should individually send the information back to



LPRO analysts Kevin Rancik and Beverly Schoonover before the week of September 30, as the target date to get the survey out is the week of October 7, and stakeholders will ideally be notified the survey is coming in advance. The next task force meeting is scheduled for October 11, and survey responses should be compiled by the following meeting on November 1.

Chair Newberry suggested a survey of 2-3 questions and through group discussion concluded one question should focus on terms and definitions, a second question would be on the sources of these, and a third question would focus on definitions but be more open ended.

Members also discussed the challenge of including definitions in the survey while getting needed feedback. While the survey will gather feedback on what the task force is missing, members had concerns that sending too many definitions could make the survey too long and limit feedback. Oliver Droppers, LPRO Deputy Director for Policy Research, joined the meeting and pointed out LPRO's experience with surveys is that recipients may not complete it if it is too long.

Through discussion, the task force concluded that a list of 10 definitions from each of the 3 workgroups should be part of the survey. A link to a full list of definitions and/or sources could potentially be included as well; LPRO will consult with Chair Newberry on the final questions and format prior to sending the survey.

---

Public Comment	<i>None</i>
Meeting Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Link to initial list of definitions from the Methodology-Technology workgroup</a></li><li>• <a href="#">Link to LPRO presentation</a></li></ul>

---

