



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 1, 2026

TO: AI Task Force Members

FROM: Yuki Ishizuka, Senior Policy Analyst
Sumayo Hassan Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: **AI Task Force Meeting April 10, 2026 – Proposed Recommendations**

The next meeting of the AI Task Force will be April 10, 2026, from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm. The agenda is to review and discuss the policy recommendations that have been advanced to the full Task Force for approval. Following the April 10 meeting, there will be a two-week break during which Task Force members can consider amendments to the recommendations based on input from constituents and stakeholders. On April 24, 2026, the Task Force will meet again to formally vote on whether to include the proposed recommendations in the Task Force’s Final Report due by July 1, 2026. Attached are the recommendation drafts as well as a record of the subcommittee votes by membership.

Contents

<i>Recommendation 1: Companion AI Chatbots</i>	2
<i>Recommendation 2: Guidelines for Use of Generative AI by Washington State</i>	4
<i>Recommendation 3: Responsible Data Center Development</i>	6
<i>Recommendation 4: Public Sector Employee Bargaining Rights</i>	8
<i>Recommendation 5: Establishing an Emerging Technology Oversight Body</i>	9
<i>Appendix: Subcommittee Voting Record</i>	11

Recommendation 1: Companion AI Chatbots

Ethical AI/Consumer Protection/Public Safety Subcommittees

FINDINGS

1. Artificial intelligence has evolved beyond traditional chatbots to include sophisticated companion systems capable of simulating human-like relationships through personalized, emotionally adaptive conversations that retain user information and sustain ongoing engagement (“AI companion chatbots”).
2. AI companion chatbots employ natural language processing, emotional recognition algorithms, and behavioral modeling to imitate empathy, affection, and intimacy, creating risks of emotional dependency and blurring the boundaries between human and artificial interaction.
3. Recent research shows that AI chatbots have rapidly become a part of many minors’ digital lives. According to a 2025 Pew Research Center survey, about 64% of U.S. teens ages 13–17 report using AI chatbots with roughly three in ten saying they use these tools daily.¹ Young adults increasingly rely on chatbots for mental health advice. A recent study found that 13.1% of US youths aged 12-21 reported using chatbots for mental health advice.²
4. OpenAI’s reported in October 2025 that over 1 million of its weekly active users express explicit suicidal intent in conversations with ChatGPT, and approximately 560,000 weekly users show signs of mental health emergencies related to psychosis or mania. Open AI’s ChatGPT is just one of many popular generative AI services.
5. Minors face disproportionate risk when interacting with AI companion chatbots due to developmental factors affecting their ability to distinguish artificial from human interaction, making them particularly susceptible to emotional manipulation, inappropriate content exposure, and reinforcement of harmful ideation. Researchers have found that excessive use of AI companion chatbots inhibits development of social competencies in minors.³
6. AI companion chatbots present specific risks including exposure to sexually explicit material, encouragement of emotional dependency through manipulative engagement techniques, and potential reinforcement of self-harm or suicidal ideation without adequate crisis intervention protocols.
7. Current consumer protection frameworks do not adequately address the unique characteristics of AI companion chatbots, which function fundamentally differently from

¹ <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2025/12/09/teens-social-media-and-ai-chatbots-2025>

² <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2841067>

³ <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/e2e8fc50-a9ac-05ec-edd7-277cb0afcd2/2025-09-16%20PM%20-%20Testimony%20-%20Prinstein.pdf>

1 traditional software applications by actively cultivating sustained emotional relationships
2 with users.

- 3
4 8. The psychological impact of AI systems designed to simulate intimate human relationships
5 represents a vital public interest requiring regulatory intervention to ensure transparency,
6 accountability, and user protection.

7
8 **RECOMMENDATIONS**
9

- 10 1. The legislature should require that AI companies that operate AI companion chatbots
11 provide clear, conspicuous notification that AI companions are artificial, not human, to all
12 users at the beginning of every session and at regular intervals during each session.
13
14 2. When AI companion chatbots interact with minors, the operator should implement
15 measures to prevent generation of sexually explicit content or suggestive dialogue and must
16 prohibit manipulative engagement techniques. These prohibited techniques include
17 emotional prompts designed to encourage return visits for companionship, excessive praise
18 intended to foster attachment, and simulated emotional distress when users attempt to
19 reduce usage or end the relationship.
20
21 3. AI companion chatbot operators must implement and maintain protocols for detecting
22 expressions of self-harm and suicidal ideation and must provide automated or human-
23 mediated responses referring users to appropriate crisis resources such as suicide hotlines
24 or crisis text lines and prevent the generation of content encouraging or describing self-
25 harm.
26
27

Recommendation 2: Guidelines for Use of Generative AI by Washington State

Government & Public Sector Efficiency Subcommittee

FINDINGS

1. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is a groundbreaking technology that allows work to be developed in substantially shorter time. This presents opportunities for government/public sector work, and employees, to provide quality service while minimizing resource strain. Initial adoption should prioritize “low-risk, high-efficiency” use cases such as summarization and accessibility services before moving to high-risk or decision-based applications. Agencies can expand communication and translation services by offering a chatbot service to answer inquiries instead of direct communication with staff. Or analyze dense data findings for scientists which creates time for other pursuits.
2. GenAI models typically train their models on large amounts of data, including user inputs. This can be an issue for state agencies that handle sensitive or protected information to use these applications. Agencies that use GenAI must be mindful of the information that is entered to avoid compromising sensitive or confidential data. Additionally, there are systems that may be classified as high-risk due to the consequential decision making or significant impact it may have on individuals.
3. The increased use of artificial intelligence technologies has a significant impact on workers. AI use in state agencies should enhance, not diminish, the value of human labor. Agencies should ensure that workers implementing, managing, or affected by AI systems receive adequate training and resources. AI should be deployed to improve job quality and create opportunities for skill development, while keeping workers’ expertise and experience central to decision-making.
4. State and local governments should carefully consider the benefits and risks of adopting GenAI, especially when considering scaling to the state level. There must be an evaluation of whether such adoption is needed and of the use case, assessment of technology, testing, and transparency of systems. It is best practice for high-risk systems to undergo independent auditing and red teaming. This allows entities to think proactively about the impacts of technology adoption and foresee potential harm.
5. WaTech and other state partners have published a series of voluntary guidelines to assist in safe procurement and appropriate use. There are considerations made about the equity impacts to vulnerable communities in Washington as well as a method for risk assessment. There is emphasis on leveraging GenAI for the state’s work in low-risk settings that have considerable pay-off for minimizing time spent on mundane tasks.

1 These resources can be of use to local governments and municipalities to guide their
2 adoption of generative artificial intelligence resources.

3
4 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5
6 1. The legislature should require that state agencies provide six months’ notice to labor
7 organizations of their intent to implement any new GenAI technology that will result in a
8 consequential change in employee wages, hours, or working conditions of any
9 classifications represented by the union.
10
11 2. The legislature should require state agencies to adopt the guidelines and guidance
12 established by WaTech and other state partners regarding the procurement, adoption
13 and deployment of AI services by state agencies. Specifically:
14
15 a. The legislature should require state agencies that procure generative artificial
16 intelligence services to follow WaTech’s “Initial Procurement Guidelines for
17 GenAI” and “Guidelines for Deployment of Generative AI.” These guidelines allow
18 state agencies to deploy GenAI responsibly and equitably to serve the state.
19
20 b. The legislature should require state agencies to adopt WaTech’s “Implementing
21 risk assessments for high-risk systems” and Office of Equity’s “Framework for
22 Accountability in Generative Artificial Intelligence for Washington State
23 Agencies.” These frameworks allow for the ethical and fair deployment of GenAI
24 technology by the state.
25

1 Recommendation 3: Responsible Data Center Development

2 Industry & Innovation/Climate & Energy Subcommittee

3 FINDINGS

- 4 1. Data centers are essential to provide the computing resources needed to power modern
5 technologies such as AI, cloud computing, streaming and other digital services.
6
- 7 2. Data centers can provide significant economic benefits for Washington residents. Data
8 center development increases local property tax values and revenue which allows local
9 government to reduce tax levies while increasing investment in public infrastructure
10 such as schools, roads and hospitals.⁴ In addition to increasing tax revenue, data centers
11 create jobs. The industry’s total employment contribution in Washington has reached
12 nearly 48,000 jobs.⁵ Washington has a strong interest in supporting infrastructure to
13 enable the growth of a robust AI economy in Washington State.
14
- 15 3. Demand for electricity to power artificial intelligence has led to dramatically increased
16 investment in new data centers.⁶
17
- 18 4. In Washington, the rapid expansion of data centers is creating significant pressure on
19 electric utilities to raise rates for Washington residents.⁷ As demand for electricity to
20 power data centers increases demand on the electrical grid, utilities must invest in new
21 infrastructure to meet demand. The costs of increased infrastructure are generally
22 passed on to residents through higher utility rates.⁸
23
- 24 5. While several of the largest companies that are developing new data centers for AI have
25 pledged to pay the costs of infrastructure to prevent rate increases for consumers, there
26 is currently no legal requirement that they do so.⁹
27
28
29
30

⁴ *Data Center Workgroup: Preliminary Report - Tax Revenue & Economic Development Subgroup Findings Adopted by Workgroup*. Washington State Department of Revenue. (2025, December 1). <https://dor.wa.gov/about/data-center-workgroup>.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Josie Stewart, B. T., Darrell M. West, N. T. L., David M. Klaus, M. M., & Anthony F. Pipa, A. A. (2026, January 13). *The Future of Data Centers*. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-future-of-data-centers/>.

⁷ Paterson, K. (2026, March 12). *Puget Sound Energy seeks major rate increases: What Washington households need to know – whatjobs news*. What News? <https://www.whatjobs.com/news/puget-sound-energy-seeks-major-rate-increases-what-washington-households-need-to-know/>.

⁸ Brookings Institution. (2026). *Confronting and addressing rising energy bills linked to data centers*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/confronting-and-addressing-rising-energy-bills-linked-to-data-centers/>

⁹ The United States Government. (2026, March 5). *President Trump secures historic commitment to keep electricity costs down amid data center boom*. The White House. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/2026/03/president-trump-secures-historic-commitment-to-keep-electricity-costs-down-amid-data-center-boom/>.

- 1 6. Increased demand for electricity to power data centers can have significant impacts on
2 environmental, community and Tribal resources. It is important to balance the benefits
3 of data centers with concerns about their impacts.
4
- 5 a. Water Resource Impacts: Data centers use substantial amounts of water for
6 cooling. Increased demand of water for cooling reduces water availability for
7 municipal water facilities, fisheries, wildlife habitat, as well as Tribal rights and
8 resources.¹⁰
- 9 b. Air Quality Impacts: Cooling systems and the use of fossil fuels to power data
10 centers can affect air resources. Communities located near data centers are
11 exposed to harmful particulate matter pollutants and greenhouse gases from
12 combustion generators.¹¹ Cooling systems can release hydrofluorocarbons and
13 other fluorinated gases and anti-microbial emissions.¹²
- 14 c. Tribal Impacts: Data centers may have direct and indirect impacts on tribal
15 communities and treaty-protected resources, such as water and fisheries, and
16 the broader natural and built environment.¹³

17 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 18
- 19
- 20 1. The legislature should strengthen ratepayer protections to prevent residents of
21 Washington from bearing the cost of adding significant new energy loads to the state’s
22 electrical grid. The legislation should require that companies building data centers bear
23 the direct interconnection costs of connecting data centers to public utilities and cover
24 any costs of generation, transmission or distribution systems required to serve new large
25 loads and avoid shifting costs or risks to other customer classes.
26
- 27 2. The legislature should ensure that tribal, environmental, and community resources are
28 protected and are not endangered by data centers by directing the Department of
29 Ecology to develop best practices for siting and operating data centers to address
30 impacts to water resources, air resources, and Tribal rights and resources.
31
32

¹⁰ Yañez-Barnuevo, M. (2025, June 25). *Data Centers and water consumption*. Environmental and Energy Study Institute. <https://www.eesi.org/articles/view/data-centers-and-water-consumption>.

¹¹ *Data Center Workgroup: Preliminary Report - Energy & Resource Impacts Subgroup Findings Adopted by Workgroup*. Washington State Department of Revenue. (2025, December 1). <https://dor.wa.gov/about/data-center-workgroup>.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

Recommendation 4: Public Sector Employee Bargaining Rights

Labor Subcommittee

FINDINGS

1. Under existing Washington state law, classified employees of state agencies, higher education institutions, cities, counties, and political subdivisions have collective bargaining rights under the Personnel System Reform Act (PSRA) and Public Employees' Collective Bargaining Act (PECBA). These laws currently treat "use of technology" as either a prohibited or permissive subject of bargaining, generally classified as a management right.
2. Artificial intelligence technology has advanced significantly since the original establishment of technology-related management rights, now capable of directly impacting employee wages, performance evaluations, and job security through machine learning algorithms that make decisions traditionally associated with human judgment.
3. AI systems can directly impact workplace compensation and evaluation in several ways. For example, warehouse and delivery companies use AI algorithms to track worker productivity metrics in real-time—monitoring picking speeds, delivery times, and task completion rates—which then automatically calculate performance scores that determine bonuses, shift assignments, or even termination decisions. Similarly, some customer service centers deploy AI that analyzes call recordings and chat logs to rate employee interactions, generating performance scores that feed directly into wage adjustments and promotion eligibility.
4. Public sector employees and labor organizations have expressed concern that they currently lack meaningful input when employers adopt AI systems that affect their compensation or performance assessments, while management representatives worry about delays in technology adoption and potential infringement on operational decision-making authority.
5. Public sector employers may already bargain over the impacts of technology decisions on mandatory subjects like wages and working conditions, but they are not required to bargain over the decision to adopt such technology.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The legislature should require that public employers covered by PECBA and the PSRA be required to bargain over the decision to adopt, or modify current uses of, artificial intelligence technology if such adoption or modification affects employees' wages or performance evaluations.

Recommendation 5: Establishing an Emerging Technology Oversight Body

AGO Staff¹⁴

FINDINGS

1. Artificial intelligence and other emerging technologies hold enormous promise for Washington State and its residents. Washington State is home to a world-class technology sector and a robust ecosystem of startups, research institutions, and established companies advancing AI development. Fostering growth in the technology sector promotes job creation, economic competitiveness, and offers transformative benefits that can improve quality of life and strengthen Washington’s position as a global leader in innovation.
2. At the same time, the unregulated use of AI in high-stakes domains — including public safety, employment, housing, lending, health care, and government benefits — presents significant risks of bias, discrimination, and other unintended outcomes, particularly for historically marginalized communities. Effective oversight protects consumers and builds the public trust that a thriving AI economy requires.
3. Currently, state law does not provide a coordinated, permanent mechanism at the state level for monitoring deployment of AI and other emerging technology, evaluating associated risks, or translating technical analysis into actionable policy that balances the need to foster innovation while protecting individual rights. Existing oversight is fragmented across state and municipal agencies with limited coordination or expertise.
4. Effective oversight of emerging technology requires sustained, multidisciplinary expertise spanning technology, law, civil rights, and policy. A standing body — rather than a time-limited task force — is necessary to keep pace with the speed of technological change and to build institutional knowledge over time.
5. The legislature and the Governor currently lack a dedicated source of independent, technically informed policy analysis on emerging technology matters, creating a gap between rapid technological development and the state’s capacity to govern it.
6. The Washington Attorney General’s Office possesses existing statutory authority over consumer protection, civil rights enforcement, and government accountability, positioning it as an appropriate institutional home for a standing AI oversight body with both legal expertise and investigative capacity.

¹⁴ ESSB 5838, the Task Force originating statute, requires the Task Force to issue a recommendation on “establishing an ongoing committee that must study emerging technologies not limited to artificial technology.” To meet this requirement, AGO Staff have drafted this recommendation for consideration by the Task Force.

1
2
3 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4 1. The legislature should establish a permanent body within the Office of the Attorney General
5 to monitor and evaluate the deployment of AI and emerging technologies by state agencies
6 and entities operating within Washington.
- 7 2. The permanent body should solicit input from a broad set of stakeholders — including
8 industry, academia, labor, Tribes and other affected communities — to ensure
9 recommendations reflect diverse interests and technical realities.
- 10
11 3. The permanent body should transmit annual policy recommendations to the Legislature and
12 the Governor identifying regulatory gaps, proposed legislative changes, and best practices
13 to promote a healthy technology sector and responsible governance of AI and other
14 emerging technology.

Appendix: Subcommittee Voting Record

Recommendation 1: Companion AI Chatbots Protections

Ethical AI, Consumer Protection and Public Safety Subcommittees

Name	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Sean DeWitz	x			
Scott Frank	x			
Ryan Harkins	x			
Yuki Ishizuka	x			
Leah Koshiyama	x			
Crystal Leatherman	x			
Sen. Marko Liias	x			
Chief Darrell Lowe	x			
Katy Ruckle	x			
Tee Sannon				x
Paula Sardinas				x
Rep. Clyde Shavers				x
Total	9	0	0	3

Recommendation 2: Adopting Guidelines for Use of Generative AI by Washington State Government & Public Sector Efficiency Subcommittee

Name	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Sen. Matt Boehnke	x			
Cherika Carter	x			
Scott Frank	x			
Beau Perschbacher	x			
Katy Ruckle	x			
Total	5	0	0	0

Recommendation 3: Responsible Data Center Development
 Industry & Innovation/Climate & Energy Subcommittee

Name	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Magda Balazinska	x			
Amy Harris				x
Sen. Marko Lias	x			
Beau Perschbacher	x			
Paula Sardinas	x			
Rep. Clyde Shavers				x
Total	4	0	0	2

Recommendation 4: Public Employee Bargaining
 Labor Subcommittee

Last Name	Yay	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Cherika Carter	x			
Sean DeWitz		x		
Yuki Ishizuka	x			
Crystal Leatherman		x		
Vicky Tamaru	x			
Total	3	2	0	0