



KANSAS HEALTH INSTITUTE

Informing Policy. Improving Health.

For additional, information contact:

Shelby C. Rowell, M.P.A.
Kansas Health Institute
212 SW Eighth Avenue, Suite 300
Topeka, KS 66603-3936
Tel. 785.233.5443 Fax 785.233.1168
Email: srowell@khi.org
Website: www.khi.org

Committee on Legislative Modernization

February 9, 2026

Creating the Kansas task force on artificial intelligence and emerging technologies to study such technologies and make recommendations to the legislature.

H.B. 2592

**Shelby C. Rowell, M.P.A.
Analyst
Kansas Health Institute**

Informing Policy. Improving Health.

The Kansas Health Institute supports effective policymaking through nonpartisan research, education and engagement. KHI believes evidence-based information, objective analysis and civil dialogue enable policy leaders to be champions for a healthier Kansas. Established in 1995 with a multiyear grant from the Kansas Health Foundation, KHI is a nonprofit, nonpartisan educational organization based in Topeka.

Chairman Turner and members of the Committee:

My name is Shelby Rowell, and I am an Analyst at the Kansas Health Institute (KHI), where I contribute to research and policy analysis related to access to care, public health infrastructure and artificial intelligence. KHI is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit educational organization that supports effective policymaking through nonpartisan research, education and engagement. KHI was founded in 1995 with a multiyear grant from the Kansas Health Foundation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide neutral testimony on House Bill 2592. KHI does not take positions on legislation. We appreciate the time to provide information for today's discussion with our policy analysis of how different states have approached the creation of state artificial intelligence (AI) advisory bodies with legislation. In this testimony, "advisory bodies" refers collectively to task forces, councils, commissions and workgroups established in statute or by executive action to study, advise or coordinate state approaches to artificial intelligence.

Since 2023, KHI has been researching and addressing the rapidly evolving AI landscape. Our work includes serving as the Region VII Public Health Innovation Hub under the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Public Health Infrastructure Grant. In this role, KHI provides technical assistance on a variety of topics related to strengthening public health infrastructure, including AI. This technical assistance includes education to support ethical and responsible AI adoption, AI governance and policy development, assessment of organizational AI capacity and literacy and identification of potential public health use cases. KHI has also conducted policy analysis to identify key themes and common provisions that are found within state AI policies. To date, KHI and its partners have delivered 64 AI-related presentations and workshops across the country. KHI has also developed an evidence-informed AI policy template and guidance to support public sector organizations in establishing AI governance structures, transparency practices and oversight mechanisms, with applicability beyond public health to other state and local government contexts.

Legislative Approaches to Structuring Artificial Intelligence Advisory Bodies

Purpose and Scope of the Analysis

H.B. 2592 would establish the Kansas Task Force on Artificial Intelligence and Emerging Technologies to study the impacts, risks, workforce implications and governance considerations associated with AI and related technologies. The information below provides brief policy analysis of 16 bills and resolutions across 13 states and territories from the 2025 legislative session. The legislation includes the establishment of AI-focused task forces, councils, commissions or workgroups charged with studying, assessing or making recommendations on AI at the statewide level. This information is based on KHI analysis of the NCSL Artificial Intelligence 2025 Legislation Tracker.

The analysis focuses on how these bodies are structured in legislation, including composition, scope and focus areas, deliverables and authority. Because H.B. 2592 has a broader scope, sector-specific AI advisory bodies, such as those limited to education or law enforcement, were not included.

Composition

Legislation typically specifies in statute both membership categories and appointment authority for AI advisory bodies, often combining legislative representation and executive branch

participation alongside technical experts. For example, legislation in Texas (H.B. 3808, failed - adjournment) would have established an AI advisory council with both legislative appointees and executive appointees, with the executive branch specifically appointing subject matter experts in ethics, AI intelligence systems, law enforcement usage of AI, and constitutional rights. Mississippi (S.B. 2426, enacted) established an Artificial Intelligence Task Force with legislative co-chairs and executive agency representation, including the state's informational technology agency and the attorney general.

Scope and Focus Areas

The AI advisory bodies are generally charged with a broad scope of study, rather than a single-issue area, including the impacts and risks of AI, governance and regulatory considerations, workforce and economic implications and the use of AI within governmental operations. In many cases, one of the core functions of advisory bodies is to provide recommendations for policy. For example, legislation in New Jersey (A 4400, pending) would direct its Artificial Intelligence Council to study AI and assess the advantages and disadvantages of state agencies procuring, developing and implementing AI.

Authority and Limitations

Across the reviewed bills, AI task forces, councils, commissions or workgroups generally would be established as advisory bodies, with formal authority limited to studying AI, reviewing or assessing its use and implications and making recommendations to inform future legislative or administrative action. For example, the bill cited in Texas (H.B. 3808, failed - adjourned) would have directed its AI Advisory Council to study AI systems used by state agencies and review automated decision systems inventories submitted by agencies, while leaving implementation authority with agencies and the legislature. West Virginia (H 3187, enacted) assigned its task force responsibility for studying AI policy, reviewing current and proposed AI use within state agencies and the workforce, and recommending best practices and potential legislation. It also established a formal relationship with agencies by requiring the Office of Technology to provide administrative and technical support and by directing the task force to identify agencies responsible for AI policy oversight.

Some bills set forth provisions allowing AI advisory bodies to request information from or coordinate with state agencies; however, they do not possess rulemaking, enforcement or implementation authority, which remains with the legislature and executive agencies. For instance, New Jersey (S 3357, pending) would authorize the advisory council to request assistance and utilize the services of state agencies as needed; however, the council's role would be limited to conducting research and issuing findings and recommendations.

Duration

Most AI advisory bodies proposed or established in 2025 artificial intelligence legislation were structured as time-limited bodies, rather than permanent entities. Such legislation commonly specified an expiration date or otherwise linked the duration of the advisory body to the completion of required reports or recommendations. Across the bills analyzed, task force duration most often ranged from 12 to 24 months, with many terminating by July 1, 2027, while the longest duration observed among this group of legislation was four years. For example, Maryland (MD 956, enacted) included a provision that would terminate the task force on June 30, 2029. Alternatively, New Jersey (S 3357, pending) would provide that the advisory council terminates upon submission of its report to the governor and legislature. While the bill does not

set a fixed report deadline, it would require the report to be submitted within one year of the council's first meeting.

Deliverables

Across the reviewed legislation, the most common deliverable was a written report summarizing findings and recommendations, which was typically required to be submitted to legislative or executive leadership. Across the bills analyzed, a key point of variation is whether task forces are required to produce a single final report or ongoing annual reports, with both approaches intended to inform future legislative or administrative action. For example, legislation in Kentucky (SCR 142, failed - adjourned) would have established a task force charged with developing findings and recommendations related to AI, including considerations related to AI development, use and policy implications for the Commonwealth, for submission to the legislature. Other legislation specified recurring reporting requirements. Virginia legislation (S.B. 621, failed) would have required submission of an annual report to the governor and general assembly. West Virginia (H 3187, enacted) required the West Virginia Task Force on Artificial Intelligence to submit an annual electronic report by July 1 to the House of Delegates, Senate and governor, and to present its findings and recommendations to the Joint Committee on Government and Finance.

Timelines

Across the 2025 legislation reviewed, bills varied in how explicitly they structured timelines for AI advisory bodies, but most included clear expectations for when information must be delivered to policymakers, either through interim milestones, final deadlines or recurring annual reports. Some bills relied primarily on a single final report deadline, such as in Kentucky (SCR 142, failed - adjourned), which would have required submission of findings and legislative recommendations to the Legislative Research Commission by Nov. 21, 2025, and in New Jersey (A 5168, pending), which would require a final report within 12 months of the task force's organization, after which the task force would expire. Other bills set forth more phased or milestone-driven timelines. For example, Texas (H 3808, failed - adjournment) would have specified a sequence of deadlines tied to appointments, initial meetings, agency inventory submissions and a final report to the governor and legislature by Dec. 1, 2026.

Early Insights from Recent State Artificial Intelligence Task Force Reports

A review of selected reports produced by AI advisory bodies offers insight into how these groups have organized their work and defined the scope of issues under consideration. Across the materials examined, common focus areas include AI governance, ethical considerations and risk assessment, as well as transparency, accountability, data governance, bias mitigation and human oversight in governmental use of AI.

For example, the [Connecticut Artificial Intelligence Working Group](#) report details a set of recommendations organized into three major areas: government use of artificial intelligence, workforce development, and a regulatory and governance framework, including actions such as developing the framework for AI use policies for schools that address the risks posed by deepfakes and clarify regulatory exemptions. Among other recommendations, the [Georgia Senate Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence](#) recommendations call for every state agency, school system, county and city to develop comprehensive AI plans and policies. The committee emphasized advancing AI planning across K–12, higher education, and workforce upskilling through public and private partnerships. The recommendations also highlight work with

appropriate state agencies to identify and support the -access to AI-enabled tools to increase efficiency in health care and improve health care outcomes. The [Colorado Artificial Intelligence Impact Task Force](#) report synthesizes stakeholder feedback on S.B. 24-205 and outlines areas for clarification, refinement and improvement. It categorizes proposed revisions to help guide continued discussions toward consensus where possible.

KHI AI Resources

- *Developing Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policies for Public Health Organizations: A Template and Guidance* — a practical framework that organizations can adapt to set expectations around transparency, data governance, human oversight and responsible AI use.
<https://www.khi.org/articles/developing-artificial-intelligence-ai-policies-for-public-health-organizations-a-template-and-guidance/>
- *Ready, Set, AI: From Groundwork to Guidelines for a Policy That Works* — an overview of foundational considerations for AI policy development.
<https://www.khi.org/articles/ready-set-ai-from-groundwork-to-guidelines-for-a-policy-that-works/>
- *Why and How Kansas Public Health Could Be Key in Shaping a Statewide AI Roadmap* — Kansas-specific context on AI policy considerations.
<https://www.khi.org/articles/why-and-how-kansas-public-health-could-be-key-in-shaping-a-statewide-ai-roadmap/>

Thank you for the opportunity to share information about policy-based AI exploration across the U.S. We are happy to address any questions you have at this time or in the future. We also would like to let you know that KHI is finalizing a detailed overview of how each state bill addresses several key categories, including: bill number and status; name of the task force or body; convening and appointment authority; membership composition; technologies covered; topics explicitly named for study; timelines and reporting deadlines; required deliverables and intended audience; authority and limitations of the task force; and its relationship to state agencies. This information will be shared with the committee by Feb. 13.

KHI Analyst Shelby Rowell can answer questions regarding AI research and policy analysis. She can be reached by phone at 785-233-5443, or by email at srowell@khi.org. For questions about KHI's *AI Policy Template and Guidance* and other KHI AI work, please contact KHI Director of Business Strategy and Innovation, Tatiana Lin at tlin@khi.org