

Meeting Summary

Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence
Meeting #7
[Link](#) to Task Force on OLIS



Date/Time	November 1, 10 a.m. - 12 p.m. (link to recording)
Attendees	Chair Newberry Senator Woods Ameeta Agrawal Reza Alavi Justin Brookman Alan Fern Ellen Flint Jimmy Godard Sean McSpaden Sara Tangdall Kelsey Wilson Rose Feliciano; substituting for David Edmonson
Informational Meeting Preliminary Survey Results	<p>LPRO staff provided an overview of preliminary survey results, an overview of the task force process thus far, and the goals of the day’s discussion. The primary goal for task force members was to come to a consensus on draft recommendations, which the public can address during the November 15 public hearing.</p> <p>LPRO received 187 complete responses to the survey, with over 450 individuals having opened it. Respondents answered questions about each of 29 selected definitions as “acceptable,” “not acceptable,” “neutral,” or “do not know.” Roughly every 10 questions, respondents had an opportunity to provide an open-ended response without a word limit.</p> <p>LPRO staff analyzed results to identify eight terms that had relatively high “not acceptable” and “neutral” responses, based on the standard deviation from the overall response average. Staff reviewed the definitions, agreement levels from respondents, and themes from written comments for each term.</p> <p>The following terms were highlighted for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• artificial intelligence• AI system• algorithmic discrimination• bias• deepfake• distributor• fairness• trustworthy AI <p>Task force members were curious whether there were patterns of disagreement from specific industries, which might explain the source of this disagreement. Staff noted such an analysis will be complete for the final report. Members also noted overlap between terms, such as “bias” and</p>

“discrimination,” and the need for better differentiation in these cases. They also brought up applicability of federal law, such as laws regarding protected classes of people.

Informational Meeting
Draft Recommendations
Discussion

Chair Newberry led task force discussion regarding potential recommendations to the legislature, noting survey respondents brought up federal definitions and the NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) definitions, and that the NIST list would satisfy the task force charge of using federal sources. The NIST list is also a living document with regular updates. He asked members for their thoughts, keeping in mind a final document should be helpful for legislators and not immediately obsolete.

Multiple members mentioned that knowing context for terms would be helpful, particularly given the evolving nature of AI as a field and some members’ hearing discomfort with static definitions from their stakeholders. For example, knowing what policies or legislation that terms would apply to would make defining terms easier, as some terms can be context-specific, while others are more technical and have more longevity and broader applicability.

Some members also wanted to know what AI-related terms may already exist in statute, suggested that definitions be context-neutral so legislators can modify them if needed, or expressed that terms be clear and not too technical. Some members reiterated curiosity about whether there were patterns among those who did not approve of AI terms in the survey and whether respondents had provided their own sources for definitions, with one member suggesting a lot of disagreement on a term means that term is on the wrong track or should be excluded.

Other member thoughts on terms included the following:

- AI is a computer system, and its use is being regulated, not its programming.
- Legislation in other states is fluid and changing, and legislation is a negotiated process, so relying on other states’ definitions could be problematic.
- Some definitions may be too specific while other important ones were not in the survey list.
- Some definitions, such as the one for deepfake cover intent, are concepts beyond the task force’s scope.
- There are overlaps and potential hierarchies between AI terms to address.
- A resource guide and external definition source, or a list of principles instead of a list of terms, could be more useful to legislators and the task force charge.

Next steps for the task force include the November 15 and December 3 meetings.

The November 15 meeting (10 am – noon) will include an update on survey results, a public hearing, and a task force discussion on recommendations. LPRO will help the Chair with principles and considerations for the public to



address at the hearing as well as post related documentation to OLIS. The link to sign up for public comment will also be posted to the meeting date on OLIS. Written comment can be e-mailed to the task force as well.

Members then will vote on the report at the December 3 work session (3 pm – 5 pm).

Public Comment	<i>None</i>
Meeting Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Link to LPRO presentation• Link to all definitions suggested by the workgroups

