Chair Lieber, Vice Chair Knopp, and Members of the Committee,

I fully support the intent of this bill, it is necessary and otherwise an excellent bill except for the severe misuse of the term "artificial intelligence." This term is wrongly defined in the bill, which both makes Oregon look foolish and could make it more difficult to create laws regarding actual AI in the future.

Please do not make laws that define terms to mean something different than what they really mean, even when the scope of the definition is limited to one section of a statute.

I am writing as somebody with a degree in computer science and over 20 years of professional experience.

The intent of this bill is 100% necessary, but it 100% misuses and misdefines the term "artificial intelligence." While the term AI is often difficult to define, and there can be many definitions, the definition used in the bill is not one of them. The term "digitally manipulated" would be appropriate and accurate. For example, if somebody created an image using Photoshop, without any AI or anything similar to AI, it would fall within the definition of this bill.

Further, while the -2 and -3 amendments improves on this misuse of the term AI, it still gets it wrong. It defines the term "synthetic media" instead, however, this definition includes, "intentionally manipulated with the use of artificial intelligence techniques or similar digital technology." The "similar digital technology" is ambiguous and does not include everything it should. For example, if somebody uses Photoshop to create an image of somebody doing something illegal, that is digital manipulation, but the digital technology is NOT similar to AI and therefore would still be legal under this bill, and not difficult for a moderately skilled Photoshop user to accomplish. I'm sure these amendments are well intended, but they create massive loopholes that are trivial to exploit.

We need to outlaw the use of digitally manipulated images, video, and speech that portrays people doing or saying things they did not in reality. This bill accomplishes that. It also stokes fear-mongering, misunderstanding, and will have the long-term unintended consequence of making it more difficult to regulate the use of AI.

Other uses of AI are still legal, as they should be. For example, using an AI language

model like ChatGPT to help write copy or do research. Such a use would fall under the term AI in real life, but not in this bill, another source of confusion caused by the bill's wrongly defined terminology.

Unfortunately, if this bill is passed without fixing the terminology, it will become known as the, "Oregon doesn't know what 'artificial intelligence' means bill." An easy fix would be to replace the term "artificial intelligence" with "digitally manipulated." I do not know if it is within your rules, and I'm sure it's especially difficult in a short session, but if it is feasible then I strongly urge you to fix the terminology. If you want to keep the term "artificial intelligence," it would still be accurate to say "artificial intelligence and digitally manipulated" and then replace the terms in the body of the bill, or to include (but not exclusively) the term "artificial intelligence" in the definition of digitally manipulated.

"You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means."
        -Inigo Montoya, The Princess Bride