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11:32 a.m.
CHAIR GARZA: Good morning, everyone, the meeting will come to order. This meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights comes to order at 11:33 a.m. Eastern time on October 20th, 2023.

This meeting is taking place at the Commission's Headquarters located at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. I'm Chair Rochelle Garza. I'd like to do a roll call, so please confirm your presence when I say your name. Vice Chair Nourse?

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Here.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?
COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Here.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Present.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm here.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
COMMISSIONER JONES: Present.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Here via telephone.

CHAIR GARZA: Great. Well thank you all. Based on that roll call a quorum of the Commissioners is present. I understand the court reporter may be on the phone. Are you present as well?

Great. Is the Staff Director present?
MR. MORALES: I'm here.
CHAIR GARZA: Okay, quorum has been established. Now we're going to proceed with today's agenda, as established by myself in consultation with the Staff Director, and as posted on the federal register today.
I. APPRROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR GARZA: And today we're going to consider first, a presentation by Connecticut State Advisory Committee Chair on The Civil Rights Implications of Algorithms in Connecticut, as well as the Staff Director's Report. Are there any motions to amend the correct agenda?

COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes, Madam Chair. I move to amend the agenda to --

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones.
COMMISSIONER JONES: -- include -- thank you for recognizing me.
(Laughter.) discussion and a vote for the statutory enforcement topic I proposed called facial recognition technology in civil rights.

CHAIR GARZA: Discussion?
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is there a second?
CHAIR GARZA: Oh, is there a second? And I apologize.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I second.
CHAIR GARZA: Okay. Now we're open for discussion.

## II. BUSINESS MEETING

## A. PRESENTATION BY CONNECTICUT STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS OF ALGORITHMS IN

 CONNECTICUTCOMMISSIONER JONES: Well it's been a long day, Madam Chair, and we're not even into the afternoon. I want to thank my colleagues for their important work on this paper. Especially my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Commissioner Stephen Gilchrist, South Carolina.

This is a subject that we have been talking about since my appointment to this Commission in January of this year. It is a very timely
discussion that we would have if we were to pass this proposal.

It is one that Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis have worked on. And those of us on this Commission know that a first draft of this proposal was circulated as far back as August 24th of this year. And we asked for feedback and for input. And we incorporated feedback and input from both Republican and Democratic Commissioners on this Commission.

We made significant and dramatic, in fact, revisions based on feedback that we received from Commissioner Gilchrist, in particular, in furtherance of the bipartisanship that we have been showing on this topic since January of this year. I have engaged in negotiations with Commissioner Gilchrist. And of course have, for the entirety of that time, continue to solicit feedback from my Democratic colleagues on this Commission.

My special assistant circulated an updated concept paper on Monday, October 16th that incorporated Commissioner Gilchrist's latest and final edits to this proposal. And I had not received any feedback, any feedback from any other Republican colleague on that Commission, and for that reason it Gilchrist's support on this. And still have no reason to believe that he is not supportive of this proposal.

And for that reason would like to move forward with a vote on a bipartisan basis. This is not a favor that any Republican Commissioner would be doing to Democratic Commissioners on this commission, this is something that we met in the middle on. Literally. And if we were to adopt this proposal it would be an example of how this Commission could function in the Year 2023, despite the chaos that we are seeing a few miles away in the United States Congress.

To not move forward with this proposal, the statutory enforcement proposal would be, I think, to send a very negative message to the American people about how their tax dollars are being used. And it would further poison the well, so to speak, with respect to the kosher on this Commissioner between the Democrats and the Republicans.

It would show that bipartisanship is actually not awarded or looked favorably upon but rather there would be individuals on this Commission who would further exploit any given opportunity to create drama and to distract from the important work

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair?
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist. COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Thank you, Madam Chair. Commissioner, let me thank you so much for the opportunity to weigh in on the proposal you suggested.

I just want to say to my colleagues as well we certainly had an opportunity to chime in on how this particular important proposal has such an impact on the American people. And the timeliness of this, regarding what the Congress is beginning to engage in is certainly a great thing.

I want to commend the Commissioner also for recognizing the importance of bipartisanship because I think bipartisanship is central to everything that we do here on this Commission. I'm not going to vote for this, to amend the agenda today, because I think that when we discuss bipartisanship, bipartisanship should also exist among everything that we do. And if that's not going to be the practice of this Commission, then we need to certainly remind ourselves of the reason why we're here.

And so I'm excited about the opportunity to, at some point in the very near future, have the
opportunity to support this proposal. And I look forward to that. As well as my other colleagues on the Commission.

But I want to thank Commissioner Jones for allowing me to weigh in on the proposal and to make the edits that he accepted without reservation. And I look forward to, at the appropriate time, to support this proposal going forward. So, again, thank you, Madam Chair, for allowing me to speak.

CHAIR GARZA: Okay. So I understand that this is a proposal for a statutory enforcement report, which we have not voted on as of yet. I would like some more information from the Staff Director about timing?

MR. MORALES: Thank you, Madam Chair. In the normal course of Commission work the statutory enforcement report is done preceding year. Usually around June. At this time we're in the middle of October, so we've exceeded the ability to do a statutory report by at least three months at this point.

Generally they have to be published by the end of the fiscal year, and that would be the end of September. And this is for the 2024 statutory enforcement report, so we're behind several months.

And I would remind Commissioners that continuation of postponing the selection of a report only puts further jeopardy of the ability to publish the report. It takes at least 45 days to put together a timeline and a research paper component to this.

We still have to schedule and have a briefing for this. It was, I thought, and it was believed that we could potentially have a field briefing for this. And then also it takes a round, two rounds of drafts and re-drafts and reedits from Commissioners to come back to Commissioners. And come back to the Staff in order to complete the work.

There is a component of the rebuttals and the surrebuttals and statements that Commissioners adhere to as well that adds an additional 90 days total, potentially, to the end of the reports. So further delay means that there is the highly, it's highly likely we won't be able to complete a report in 2024.

And that's one of your, one of
Commissioners in our Commission, myself included, our statutory requirement is to at least do one statutory enforcement report. We don't have one for 2024 at this time. So thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Staff Director.

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just want to comment briefly here. I hope briefly. The commission, I've been on the Commission for more than a decade and we have followed a procedure that seems to have had dropped off the face of the earth this year.

And that procedure usually requires, at some point notices sent out for Commissioners to make proposals about topics that we might want to address. And Commissioners write what we generally call blurbs. Very, very short proposals. Just a few sentences.

And then at a meeting that is properly scheduled we rank our choices. We send in our votes beforehand. And the Staff Director has the Staff put together a chart showing which topics have gotten the most support. And from there we make decisions about whether or not to do full scale concept papers.

And then we get a sense of where the Commission, where the majority want to go. And we've done pretty well with that procedure. That procedure didn't happen this year, and it should have.

Nevertheless, we did get two proposals. One of them, Commissioner Jones's proposal, which was
not something that interested me in particular, but I've done reports before that didn't interest me in particular. And sometimes, and it may happen this time, once we get rolling I find it's really very interesting. And I'm hoping that's what's going to happen with Commissioner Jones'.

And so I'm not, not against that, but we are a 4-4 Commission. We have four people who I would have considered generally left of center, and four people who are generally right of center. And it's clear that to make things work we need to work in a very bipartisan way.

And my impression was that we were going to adopt both reports. The one proposed by Commissioner Kirsanow and the one proposed by Commissioner Jones. And that doesn't seem to be happening.

And I very much would like to vote in favor of both, both proposals. I consider both of them to be generally moderate. And I'd like to be able to adopt them.

I'd be happy to adopt them today. I understand that some members of the Commission feel they have not had a chance to look at Commissioner Kirsanow's proposal, and would like some extra time to
do that. And I've got no problem with that.
And I've got no problem with telling the Staff to go ahead and start working on Commissioner Jones's proposal so that we buy ourselves a few extra days. The Staff can go ahead and work on it because I think this is going to go through. And then we would vote for Commissioner Kirsanow and Commissioner Jones's proposal at the same time.

So you might want to ask, why is it that the conservative commissioners are concerned that these two proposals should be voted on at the same time? It's because we've been burned in the past and we don't feel that we can take the chance by allowing this to go through today by itself.

Again, we're very happy to allow the Staff to go ahead and start working on Commissioner Jones's, or both, because I think, again, they're both going to get through. These are generally moderate proposals.

But alas, we've had trouble in the past, sometimes sort of overwhelming trouble, with getting through the proposals even once they get adopted. It's like battle, after battle, after battle to get what has been proposed actually executed. So, we don't feel that it is appropriate for something that is not on the agenda to be added when only half of the, what should be a package, is being added here.

So I plan to vote against amended the agenda. If the motion passes, $I$ intend to vote against Commissioner Jones's proposal. Although again, $I$ believe that it's going to get through in the end when it's paired with Commissioner Kirsanow's proposal.

Commissioner Kirsanow's proposal, as you know, is simply to do a report similar to the one that we did about a decade ago about the religious liberties of prisoners. I know that Commissioner Magpantay had concerns that it might be a proposal just to study Christian religions. I can assure him that that was never the intention. And if you look back at the report that was done a decade or so ago.

In fact, non-Christian religions get more attention because those are the ones where issues come up. Including novel religions. Things like the Church of the New Song. A special religion that was, I think at the time, invited by prisoners.

They had things like steak and wine for dinner a part of the religion and how prisons should deal with that sort of thing. So I, again, believe that these proposals are going to get through, but I think they need to be put through as a package. others want to be recognized.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Adams in time.
CHAIR GARZA: I'm sorry? Who is that? COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Just Adams raises his hand on the phone.

CHAIR GARZA: Okay, so Mr. Adams.
COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Perhaps Madam Chair could inquire, or the Staff Director could address, I'm curious, I remember those ranking procedures and they seem to be useful at the time.

And I'm also wondering if we might hear from the Staff Director about the idea that Commissioner Heriot had about getting the Staff going because I think Commissioner Jones's proposal is an extremely interesting one, and I'm going to vote for it when it's the question. So what about those two issues? The ranking, why didn't they happen, and what about getting the Staff moving?

MR. MORALES: That's a really great question. What happen, as you recall, the Commissioners were engaged in the effort to secure the nomination and the vote for the chair and the vice chair. So nothing was able to be accomplished because
we didn't have a chair to establish the agenda, which is required under our statute and our AI.

So we never got to the point where we could have consideration of the concept papers. And so that will take place this year because we do, or this coming year, in 2024, hopefully when we have a full slate of Commissioners and a Chair to create the agenda that was required in order to have consideration.

Lastly I'll that, you know, during the summer, because of the urgency of getting the 2024 statutory enforcement report, I was approached by Commissioner Jones and I was approached by Commissioner Gilchrist. Both of them indicated to me their enthusiasm for getting the 2024 statutory enforcement report based on something like what was supposed to be, or supposed to be presented, through the Connecticut State Advisory Committee, which was on artificial intelligence.

And so the Office of Civil Rights
evaluation took the report that everybody really thought highly of and revised it and presented it to Commissioners for their consideration for a national headquarters report for the 2024 statutory enforcement report. And my understanding, hearing from about this becoming the 2024 statutory enforcement report.

And they worked out some edits, and they worked out some revised drafts. And now we're hearing, about three weeks ago, maybe about a month ago, or less than that, it was between the two, we got a new report, request for a consideration of a report by Commissioner Kirsanow.

Which we looked at and we said, you know, from a legal jurisdiction point of view, this complies with USCCR, you know, legal sufficiency. However, there were some considerations that other Commissioners had that didn't have an opportunity to edit that potential report on religion.

So now we came today where my understanding was that we were going to have consideration of the report, and now we're at an impasse. And so, you know, this is a matter for Commissioners. But the '24, the 2024, the concept paper or the idea for the 2024 statutory enforcement report on artificial intelligence is ready to go.

So I don't know what the holdup is, but I defer to Commissioners and the wisdom and what they

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Staff Director. I believe Commissioner Nourse wants to be acknowledged.

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Thank you, Chair. In my experience, in my short experience on this Commission, I have not found that whatever was regular order has become regular order. And that is because there has been a long delay taken in even electing a chair.

So I'm hoping moving forward we can establish some procedures. So what has happened in every meeting that $I$ have been at does not happen again.

And what every meeting has done is we have had assurances as to $X$. We come in here and then there is not $X$. Or we want a package or we want something. So that is not bipartisanship.

To me it is not proper procedure. It would not pass, you know, a smell test in a court of law, and I would like us to get some procedure moving forward so we do not waste our time and the American public's money.

AI is a huge issue. It's a huge issue for every American. And facial recognition is an
important topic, in part because of its capacity to follow us everywhere. Do we have any privacy anymore? So I commend Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Gilchrist for pushing this forward.

But my experience is that the rules that I thought were there by the time $I$ come into the Committee Commission are not there. So we need to work on those. And I hope we can do so moving forward.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Commissioner Jones?

COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes. I would just echo the statements of the Vice Chair, and to give further definition to that.

In addition to this proposal itself being a bipartisan proposal, one that would not have necessarily been my first choice, in fact it would not have been my first choice, but for a desire to reach bipartisan consensus.

It was only within the past 72 hours, approximately, that we heard from staff, confidential assistants, staff assistants, and maybe one or two members on the Republican side, that perhaps there would be a desire to pass the personal proposal at the same time as this bipartisan facial recognition
proposal. That is not the collaborative spirit that I think anyone on this Commission, who had already planned on voting for this thing on Friday that we've been working on all year would expect.

So I think, unless it's unclear, it's been said both in private conversation, and I think possibly on the record today, I don't think a single one of the Democratic Commissioners has a categorical objection to the idea of studying religious freedom in the prison context under RLUIPA.

But we need to be afforded the opportunity to engage in a substantive discussion about the proposal. And why would the passage of that proposal be a condition for passage of another proposal that is bipartisan that Commissioner Gilchrist and I have been working on all year, and that is recently, as a few days ago, was not being objected to by other Republican Commissioners in conversations with one or more Democratic Commissioners on this Panel.

This is not a favor. Passing this AI proposal is not a favor to the Democrats on this Commission. The proposal itself is a compromise.

And so I just reject Commissioner Heriot's framing of it. I know it's convenient because of the position ultimately that some of the Republican

Commissioners, or all of the Republican Commissioners have staked out, but I do think it's important for the record to be accurate that the position of the Republicans on this Commission apparently is, we're not going to do this bipartisan thing unless we get our proposal in the current form that it's in despite the fact that there has not been real engagement in getting that to a bipartisan condition. Yes.

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay, I understand you want to speak?

COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. So I come to this Commission as an appointee from the United States Senate, and the Senate had recently had a very bipartisan, all 100 members invited to a briefing and discussion on AI, and facial recognition and implications of this for our country.

There are serious civil rights concerns that are there. They're discussing it in a bipartisan, or actually a total -- a tripartisan because it's all members of the United States Senate.

We, as the Commission on Civil Rights, are authorized, there's a congressional statute, to advise the United States Congress on civil rights issues in America. This is an issue that the United States is support of this proposal to fulfill our obligations, both to the American people, to the Congress in our mission.

And we'll see, I do, personally I do not really understand many of the issues. I want to learn like Commissioner Heriot. I do not know where we will end up, but we have to work on these issues, to explore these concepts and provide them to the American people, to the Congress and to the Senate from which I was appointed. So I support this proposal very much. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Well, thank you. Thank you for that, Commissioner Magpantay. I have not opined yet, I have been reserving my comments.

I was very, very, very excited at the prospect of Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Gilchrist working together. This is exactly what I want to see as Chair of this Commission, bipartisan work. And the fact that they were working on a project that is so important, that could have such a deep impact on the American people, especially around facial recognition and how these technologies are being used and potential discrimination involved around them. In fact, we're having, we had on the
agenda the Connecticut State Advisory Committee that had done something similar in this vein, and I was excited to hear from them, although they may not be able to speak given the delay in time.

I do want to express my disappointment that this is not something that my colleagues on the other side are supportive of anymore, it appears. I realize that we have -- we have specific deadlines that we have to meet.

We owe a duty, not just to this Commission but to the American public, to issue a statutory report. And I have serious concerns that if we do not vote on this today that there will be further delays in getting this done.

It was already recapped how we got to this point. I don't need to recap that for folks. This is where we're at right now. Moving forward in the future $I$ do want to make sure that we implement the process that has existed in the past, but that was just impossible to do this year because my chairship was delayed until later in the year.

So moving forward --
VICE CHAIR NOURSE: July.
CHAIR GARZA: Moving forward I would very much like to continue with that process. I've had I did not hear any aversion to this.

I also did not hear anything about requiring this to be coupled, so I will express my disappointment that $I$ was not treated with transparency when $I$ am very much trying to move this Commission along and make sure that we are communicating and collaborating as much as possible because I do deeply believe in bipartisanship. I'm a Texan. We have to believe in bipartisanship, all right.

I believe it in deeply, and I know that we can come to compromises and we can get things done because truly I care more about getting things done than about being right. So with that, I am going to ask if there are, if there is any, I'm willing to entertain a call to question on this.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just want to make one more comment.

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot.
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And that is that there was a time that we sought to amend the agenda to talk about the crime victims report, and at that point you objected to anything being amended because the American people had not been notified that we were
going to talk about crime victims. We're in that same position right now.

CHAIR GARZA: I don't know --
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The agenda --
CHAIR GARZA: -- how helpful this is.
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The agenda does not include a discussion of this report. And instead it was sprung on us this morning. That's unusual.

I'm not necessarily against that sort of thing, but, you know, the thing is that we're a 4-4 Commission and if we want this to work, you know, I've said many times we're going to have to act like a 4-4 Commission. And that's not what I'm seeing.

CHAIR GARZA: I know. All right, well, that's not helpful. I spoke to everyone this week over the phone and this was not brought to my attention about having to couple this vote with another. And I am expressing my disappointment there.

I still am, I still believe that we can continue to work together and so I very much would like to see what we can get done. So let's go ahead and get on with this vote. We'll call it into question?

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Call the question.
CHAIR GARZA: Okay. All right. So this
is a vote on the amendment to add the statutory enforcement report on AI and facial recognition that has been proposed by Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Gilchrist. We'll start with Vice Chair Nourse?

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Aye.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?
COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Could you circle back to me please?

CHAIR GARZA: Sure. Commissioner Gilchrist?

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: No.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes.
CHAIR GARZA: Chair votes yes. And, Commissioner Adams, we're returning to you.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Thank you. No.
CHAIR GARZA: Okay. Motion does not pass. And, well let's see if our Connecticut Advisory I'm aware if he is able or has the time.

MR. MCGUIRE: I am still here. Yes, I am here, Chair.

CHAIR GARZA: Do you have sufficient time to present? I know that you had a hard stop?

MR. MCGUIRE: I do. Yes, I do. I think I can present in under a little ten minutes and then take questions before $I$ have to leave. If that's acceptable?

CHAIR GARZA: Okay. I appreciate, I appreciate you being here and I apologize for the delay.

So I want to thank you for the work that you're doing to address bias and artificial intelligence. Lawmakers around the world are discussing a myriad of solutions to govern the use of such technology.

And I do think it is imperative that we keep the civil rights concerns at the forefront. The recent advances in artificial intelligence have further elevated concerns with facial recognition technology which has garnered, obviously national attention, and has been prioritized by Congress as we all have seen.

We do take great interests as a Commission in the Connecticut report. And as you have heard, we are considering a report on this issue and how facial recognition technology is developed and utilized by federal agencies.

So I want to commend your dedication to transparency, accountability and equity, and we look forward to hearing from you, especially regarding the unanimous bipartisan recommendations that the Connecticut State Advisory Committee approved as they could be key to providing a roadmap for future where technology respects the civil rights of law. So, Chair McGuire, the floor is yours.

MR. MCGUIRE: Great. Well thank you very much for those kind remarks. And I appreciate both your and the Commissioner's work and consideration of working on this issue.

I also want to thank the Staff at the Commission who have really helped us get a lot done over the last few years that I've been Chair. Most notably Barbara De La Viez and Evelyn Bohor who have been really helpful.

This work on artificial intelligence and algorithmic bias is really my, I'm most proud of, of any of the work I've done with the SAC. We really
grapple with this issue, and did a lot to put together, $I$ think, a report that educated the legislature, and hopefully the Commission, about some of the potential up and downside of algorithms being used by government.

Here our focus was on the State of Connecticut. We get the benefit of a little bit of work that the Yale Law School Media Freedom and Information Clinic did. They did several FOI requests that showed that at least three state agencies have used or considering using AI for really important decisions. Like employment, family unification and things like that.

So we were understanding from the very start there was a potential issue here. And really dug in through a briefing that we had at our legislative office building in September of 2022. And then three subsequent virtual briefings where we heard from really impressive people from Brookings Institution, Yale Law School, as I had mentioned, ACLU, Professors from Brown and University of Massachusetts and others who really gave us the information to understand what algorithms are and what impact they can have on civil rights and civil liberties. discrimination. And interrogating some of the issues around the lack of transparency and the Government's use of algorithms.

Like I mentioned, we heard a lot of great testimony. And as we moved forward it became pretty clear that we, at the SAC, had, oh, less around really three main issues that impact the civil rights of people in the State of Connecticut. And I posit probably the country.

One was transparency. Just, the public really understanding what algorithms are, why the Government is using them and understanding how those decisions impact their day-to-day lives.

The other was finding a way to audit and validate these systems prior to being used. And we did audit them for algorithmic bias as they are used.

And then the last was around accountability. Trying to find some way for the public to, you know, essentially grieve or appeal if they believe that an algorithm used by the Government has discriminated against them.

We put out in, and I believe you all had a chance to look at these, an interim memo in January of 2023 which went a long way in shaping a piece of
legislation here in Connecticut. Our legislature runs from January to June in the odd years, so we got that memo out and kind of stacked out some positions based on our September briefing. That really did shape legislation, it ultimately passed. And I'll mention it briefly before I take questions.

We then continued to do work. And thus subsequent virtual briefings were helpful to get a robust universe of knowledge that we incorporated in our briefing report that came out in March of 2023. I think the Staff Director mentioned it.

What we really focused on was what safeguards need to be in place to prevent the Government use of AI from adversely impacting protected classes. And we leaned in pretty heavy on transparency and the need for some real meaningful evaluation.

Ultimately Senate Bill 1103, which then became Public Act 2316, passed both chambers of our legislature unanimously and was signed promptly by the governor. That's a very rare thing. We are a state that has a Democratic trifecta, but it is very rare for very meaningful legislation to have unanimous support in both chambers. I credit the work of our SAC in helping to make clear this is not a partisan

Ultimately what passed was a very, very strong first start. And it's been paled as one of the strongest state AI laws in the country. It does some very basic things, like defining what an algorithm is. And it's very broad. And that was purposely done so as quickly emerging and developing technology.

It requires starting next year the State of Connecticut to create a public inventory of automated intelligent systems used by state agencies and for what they're using them for. Currently the Yale Law School Clinic, as well as other advocacy groups, cannot really get an answer as to what agencies are using them and why. So that will solve a big problem, create a nice starting place for the conversation to continue.

It also requires the new state law that there be impact assessments done before algorithms are developed, purchased or implemented. This is important, as we know, that there are lots of thirdparties who are aggressively pitching AI systems to state governments. And now in Connecticut for a new one to come on or be developed it must first have that impact assessment looking specifically at unlawful discrimination and making clear that there can be no

Finally, there is a 21-person group that's being convened. It's a working group that is looking at, and will make more recommendations in February of next year as to what next steps we need to put in place for there to be guidelines to guide the use of AI by the state. Really looking at transparency and equity as the cornerstones of that.

So that my general overview. I'm sorry that it was somewhat rushed. I didn't have as much time as I thought I would because you are all engaged in some robust conversation there, but I'm happy to answer questions about what I presented or the memo itself.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Chair McGuire. I'm going to open the floor to questions.

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair?
CHAIR GARZA: Did $I$ hear someone on the phone? Okay, Commissioner Gilchrist.

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Thank you, Madam Chair. Chairman McGuire, let me thank you and your committee for the fine work that you did on the Connecticut report. It was actually the tool that encouraged me to consider looking at artificial intelligence as it relates to the algorithmic side of
this issue that in many ways can potentially perpetuate discrimination, and so $I$ want to just make a comment and thank you for this.

As we continue as a Commission I want to thank again my colleague, Commissioner Jones, for allowing me to weigh in on the proposal that this Commission will be presenting in short order, the opportunity to really enhance that so that we can begin to not only address the artificial intelligence side of, and facial recognition side of artificial intelligence, but also to begin looking at some of the aspects of the algorithmic part of it.

So I just wanted to commend you. I was very impressed that Connecticut moved forward in a bipartisan way to enact legislation in your state. My hope is that some of that can inform our work here on the Commission for other states across the country. So I just wanted to make a comment and thank you again for the work that you guys did.

MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for those kind
words. And I'm glad that the report is living on in different ways.

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: That's all, Madam Chair.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
(Simultaneous speaking.)
COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: -- had my hand raised. Thank you for that report. Can I just ask what was the response from industry with regard to the bill and the proposed, the recommendations that you had made?

MR. MCGUIRE: That's a great question. So our SAC didn't get any direct feedback from industry. The senator that was the driving force behind it, and ultimately I should say that when we released our briefing report in March we were able to have a press conference at the state legislature with both Republican and Democratic leaders.

The Democratic that spearheaded, his name is Senator James Maroney, has a track record with industry, because he has done some work around privacy rights and data privacy in the last couple of years. So he was able to bring them to the table.

And ultimately I think they recognized that trying to be a part of the solution, creating these frameworks to make sure algorithms are used fairly was the smart thing to do, so there wasn't any big pushback from industry, which I think helped lead
to that unanimous support in both (audio interference) here. I hope that was helpful.

COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Can I ask one other question? Yes. Can I ask, may I ask one other question?

CHAIR GARZA: Go ahead, Commissioner Magpantay.

COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: I'm sorry.
CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay, can you hear us?

COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes. Sorry, I'm not sure if my mic is not working well. Can you just quickly, what is Connecticut impact assessments measuring?

MR. MCGUIRE: What are the impact assessment measurements, was that the question? I'm sorry, I'm having some difficulty hearing.

COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: What, I'm sorry. What are you measuring in the impact assessments?

MR. MCGUIRE: So that 21 -person body that's been convened is going to work now on figuring out what those tools and measurements are. The big thing for us is that they are done in a way that has integrity, transparency and is also independent. So those factors are still being figured out. That's a

This law doesn't go into effect until next year. These provisions of the law. Right now the only part that is in effect is that the state is required to come up with that public safety inventory of AI tools being used by the Government. But the assessment piece and the auditing piece has not yet been solidified but will be soon. I'm happy to keep the Commission apprised of that as it develops.

CHAIR GARZA: Wonderful.
COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Thank you.
CHAIR GARZA: Well thank you so much. Thank you so much, Chair McGuire. Thank you for your service and your leadership.

I want to be respectful of your time, and I know we have some other business to get to, but thank you for taking the time to speak with us today. It's helpful for us to see these things as a larger Commission and to understand what you are seeing in Connecticut --

MR. MCGUIRE: Yes.
CHAIR GARZA: -- and what you are focused on so far, so thank you very much.

MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your support as mentioned. Take care all. going to move on to the next agenda item. Staff Director Morales, we'll hear from you for the monthly Staff Director's report.
B. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
MR. MORALES: Madam Chair, Commissioners, I want to apologize for not being able to circulate and having Staff Director's report available in time for the briefing, or for the meeting here. It was not provided to me and so hopefully I'll be able to provide it to all of you in the next coming days here.

But I would like to take a brief moment if I can to acknowledge one of our staff. I want to call attention to the fact that my executive assistant Alfreda Greene, will retire from USCCR on October 31st. Alfreda has provided over 38 years of work to the federal service. She started her career with the U.S. Postal Service, served some time at the National Labor Relations Board and then later came to USCCR.

She has worked in the Office of the Staff Director for over ten years. And directly for me for the last eight and a half years. Her service to the United States has been commendable and worthy of our recognition and honor. I want to thank her for her
many years of service to USCCR and the federal government. We wish her all the best for her retirement, and as she begins a new chapter in her life.

Unfortunately Freda could be here today, but I want to make sure that we acknowledge and thank, thank you Freda for all that you have done for me and for USCCR. I will also let you know, and Commissioners know, we have a plaque for her that we will give to her in acknowledgment of her service to the federal government and to USCCR.

So thank you, Madam Chair, I have nothing further.
(Applause.)
CHAIR GARZA: Wow, that's wonderful.
We're going to have to send her a note from all of us.
MR. MORALES: Yes.
CHAIR GARZA: Say congratulations on
retiring. I know a lot of people in my life retire, but they keep working.
(Laughter.)
CHAIR GARZA: Including in my family. So thank you, Staff Director.
III. ADJOURN MEETING

CHAIR GARZA: That concludes the business
meeting for today. Everything that has been on the agenda.

And if there is nothing further I hereby adjourn the meeting at 12:20 p.m. Eastern time. So thank you all so much.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:21 p.m.)
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