Labor and Public Employees Committee
JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: SB-1484
Title: AN ACT IMPLEMENTING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE PROTECTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES.
Vote Date: 3/20/2025
Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute
PH Date: 3/11/2025
File No.:

Disclaimer: *The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Labor & Public Employees Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

The reason for this bill is to regulate the use of Artificial Intelligence in the workplace, to ensure that it is used in a manner consistent with the protection of employees' rights. Specifically, the bill aims to ensure that AI is not used to discriminate against or unfairly monitor workers. Due to the rise in usage of Artificial Intelligence over the last several years, many companies have rolled out AI as a tool to improve efficiency, and there are concerns that these models could unfairly impact workers.

The substitute language: expands prohibited “electronic monitoring” to include obtaining employee data from a third party, requires an employer’s notice about electronic monitoring to be in English and an employee’s primary language, defines a “substantial factor” under the bill, specifies the qualifications someone must have when overseeing a high-risk AI system, allows for civil law suits for the AI violations, and makes AI use a mandatory subject of collective bargaining for public employees.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

External Affairs Division, Judicial Branch: The Judicial Branch of Connecticut requested that the term "state agency" be defined to clarify whether the Judicial Branch would be covered by this bill.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Ed Hawthorne, President, Connecticut AFL-CIO: Mr. Hawthorne explained that while he supports the bill, certain provisions in it should be strengthened. He expressed that legislation that protects workers from artificial intelligence should establish guardrails against harmful workplace usage of AI, ensure that workers' voices are heard in AI research and development, increase transparency in AI applications, and model best practices for AI use among other things. He applauded the provisions increasing transparency in how and when employers use AI and electronic monitoring, yet he suggested a few additional provisions to strengthen the bill. Among these suggestions were adding an enforcement mechanism, making the use of AI in public work a mandatory subject of collective bargaining, requiring that the notice of monitoring be visible to employees, adding gender identity to the definition of algorithmic discrimination, broadening the definition of a consequential decision, clarifying the definition of a substantial factor within the definition of high-risk artificial intelligence systems, and defining human oversight over AI systems.

Zak Leavy, Legislative and Political Coordinator, AFSCME Council 4: Mr. Leavy expressed his support for this bill and his gratitude to the committee for looking into how to protect workers from artificial intelligence. He went on to explain that overreliance on artificial intelligence puts people at risk of discriminatory or unfair decisions. He requested that the committee include language to require that the use of artificial intelligence in labor-related decision-making be determined through collective bargaining and to establish an enforcement mechanism.

Stuart Savelkoul, Chief of Staff, AFT Connecticut: Mr. Savelkoul explained that while he supports the intent of this bill and most of the language, certain provisions in the bill should be changed to reflect the realities of the modern workplace. He noted that the definition of electronic monitoring is limited to collection of information on the employer's premises; given the number of people working from home, he recommended removing that section of the bill. He also pointed out that the language regarding human oversight of high-risk artificial intelligence systems is potentially exploitable and should be removed. Finally, he urged the committee to establish an enforcement mechanism as part of the bill and to mandate that certain uses of artificial intelligence be deemed mandatory subjects of collective bargaining.

Crystal Weise, Policy Manager, AFL-CIO Technology Institute: Ms. Weise expressed her support for this bill but recommended that the committee make a few changes to its language. She stressed the importance of keeping workers involved in the process of developing technology and policies regarding that technology, as workers can easily be adversely impacted by new technologies. As such, she explained that any legislation seeking to protect workers from artificial intelligence should include strong protections for workers and consumers against bias, transparency regarding AI use, broad definitions of the systems covered, ensuring tat consumer protections include workers, strong accountability and enforcement protocols, liability provisions, and mandatory collective bargaining around the use of AI. Based on these principles, she recommended that the committee clarify language regarding electronic monitoring and obtaining data from a third party, the reoccurrence assessments of employee performance, the notice of monitoring and its visibility to employees, algorithmic discrimination and gender identity, consequential decisions, high-risk artificial intelligence systems and substantial factors, and the authenticity of human review of artificial intelligence; she also requested that the committee include an enforcement mechanism in this bill.

Stacey Zimmerman, Deputy Director, SEIU Connecticut State Council: Ms. Zimmerman expressed her support for this bill, commending it as a good first step towards protecting workers from employer surveillance. She also noted that the proactive regulation of artificial intelligence would go a long way in ensuring that the future implementation of AI systems will be conscientious of workers.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Paul Amarone, Public Policy Associate, Connecticut Business and Industry Association: Mr. Amarone explained that while he appreciates the intent of this bill, the administrative burden that the bill would saddle onto businesses would impose substantial costs, especially on small businesses. He pointed out that many small businesses do not have the resources to conduct impact assessments into third party contractors, maintain risk management programs, or document artificial intelligence decision-making processes. He presented the example of a small business looking for a new employee: that business would have to write an impact assessment for any social media advertising or job posting site that they wished to utilize, any algorithm used to determine an ideal salary, any AI software used to analyze resumes and writing samples, and any other automated systems used along the way. He also expressed concerns with allowing the Labor Commissioner to bring civil penalties to employers that violate the provisions in the bill.

Connecticut Hospital Association: The Connecticut Hospital Association expressed its opposition to this bill and its belief that the requirements laid out in the bill are unwise and create unwarranted barriers to the use of artificial intelligence technology. The Association pointed out there is no evidence that current workplace surveillance laws are insufficient and asserted that the section of the bill regarding employer surveillance is not based in reality. The Association also claimed that both the sections in this bill and the entirety of SB 2 are too hard on free enterprise and stated that it instead supports the Governor's proposal for a bill on artificial intelligence, SB 1249.

Raymond Rodriguez, Firefighter: Mr. Rodriguez opposed the bill for reasons largely unrelated to the content of the bill.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY:

Francis Pickering, Executive Director, Western Connecticut Council of Governments: Mr. Pickering commended the committee's work in ensuring responsible use of artificial intelligence, and mention CGS Sec. 52-570d, which requires two-party consent in order to record telephonic communications. He explained that it may be worthwhile to amend this section to apply to video calls and video conferencing, as well as requiring external or third-party AI recording bots to notify all participants in a virtual meeting that they are recording and providing some sort of recourse for those who have been non-consensually recorded.

Kristina Baldwin, Vice President, American Property and Casualty Insurance Association, **Eric George, President, Insurance Association of Connecticut**, **Chris Nicolopolous, Senior Regional Vice President, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies**, **and Jill Rickard, Vice President, American Council of Life Insurers**: shared their opinions on this bill and pointed out that the insurance sector is unique in that it is subject to a notably high level of regulation. They pointed out that the National

Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) released a model bulletin on the adoption of responsible usage of artificial intelligence, and the Connecticut Department of Insurance recently released an AI bulleting based off of this model. They requested that the committee work with the General Law Committee on their legislation regarding artificial intelligence as opposed to introducing new legislation governing a narrow application of AI. Testimony was provided by:

Reported by: Sam Sims **Date: 4/4/2025**