

Comment by Rich Neumeister for the Minnesota Legislative Commission on  
Data Practices, December 11, 2025

Comment on artificial intelligence.

Artificial intelligence is one of those dynamics of technology that is coming on so fast to policymakers and the public that they're scratching their heads and asking what it is? AI is being used and mentioned by the Governor as a tool to be used in fraud. Law enforcement agencies are having AI listening devices hear what discussion is happening among people than a 'report' is written. I even had a personal experience where my physician wanted to use an Ambient AI device to record our conversation.

AI is getting cheaper and better, it's becoming a part of almost everything with and without our knowledge. Artificial intelligence may bring good things, but I do know it can and will bring bad things. That is where the challenge lies for both the public and the policymaker.

The Minnesota Legislature can set specific rules, policy, and law when it comes to state and local government. Many of us over the years have learned about the role of technology in law enforcement and how the use of it can and does threaten privacy rights, due process, and civil liberty. The Legislature did set policies, but as the technology advances the laws continuously need to be reviewed.

One of my experiences in the realm of law enforcement and technology is the secrecy that police/cops and the like so craved with the deployment and use of law enforcement technology and toys.

I'm not interested to see that kind of behavior in government with the use of artificial intelligence so I suggest the following as a scheme to be placed in law.

- Mandatory disclosure of AI deployment

If any government agency such as police, social services, DMV, whoever starts using AI to make decisions about individuals (arrests, benefits, licenses, surveillance, anything), they have to tell the public within 30 days of implementation. That information must tell what the AI does, what data it uses, how it works, and what mistakes or bias it might have.

- Notice to the affected individual

If AI is used on an individual/entity such as flagging for extra screening, denies you a benefit, or puts you on a 'list', i.e. you get a clear notice explaining what AI did, and information to where you can talk to a real person.

- Independent audit and oversight

Every couple of years, an independent audit by an independent outsider has to test the AI to see if it's fair and accurate. The audits are public. If an agency breaks these rules, there should be specific penalties and the AI is turned off.

Government is not the only one racing to use AI on Minnesotans. Banks, insurance companies, health providers (my example), employers and the like in the private sector are doing the same. If we only put rules on government AI and leave the private sector to run wild, we have not fixed the problem. Conversation has started a bit in the private sector with one or two bills in the past few sessions, but it needs to be expanded.

I want to make sure these most powerful tools don't get used against us in the dark.