

Maine Artificial Intelligence Task Force

October 8, 2025

Agenda

1. Welcome (5 min)
2. Review public comments (10 mins)
3. Edits made to incorporate Task Force feedback from 9/26 meeting (20 mins)
4. Themes for the co-chair letter (30 min)
5. Break (5 min)
6. Review introduction sections (45 min)
7. Closing & next steps (5 min)

Review public comments

- 48 responses representing 8 Maine counties
- Most engagement was on Education recommendations (29), followed by Economy (14) and AI Harms (13)

Topline takeaways:

- Emphasis on understanding and engaging with existing tools and resources (ex: NEA AI Principles)
- Respondents underscored the need to involve many voices in future AI conversations

Edits to recommendations since 9/26 meeting

Gap identified by the Task Force during 9/26 meeting

Edits made



Edits to recommendations since 9/26 meeting

Gap identified by the Task Force during 9/26 meeting

Economy – clarify language around established businesses improving practices using AI; AI's ability to more quickly ID new opportunities; and data center evaluation

Edits made

Beginning on p. 3 in prep memo: clarified entrepreneurial support language in Rec #1; re-wrote Rec #2 to focus on AI for sector-level economic development; and added data center language to Rec #6



Edits to recommendations since 9/26 meeting

Gap identified by the Task Force during 9/26 meeting

Economy – clarify language around established businesses improving practices using AI; AI's ability to more quickly ID new opportunities; and data center evaluation

AI Harms – add recs around IP/creative industries and harms specific to children; re-examine “statement of intent” idea; reaffirm the ongoing nature of recommended studies; clarify the need for plain language when disclosing AI usage; and added language stressing the need for broad reach of an AI literacy campaign.

Edits made

Beginning on p. 3 in prep memo: clarified entrepreneurial support language in Rec #1; re-wrote Rec #2 to focus on AI for sector-level economic development; and added data center language to Rec #6

Beginning on p. 10 in prep memo: added “ongoing” language to Rec #2; added two areas for study in Rec #2; broadened Rec #4; and added language around reach to Rec #5

Edits to recommendations since 9/26 meeting

Gap identified by the Task Force during 9/26 meeting

Economy – clarify language around established businesses improving practices using AI; AI's ability to more quickly ID new opportunities; and data center evaluation

AI Harms – add recs around IP/creative industries and harms specific to children; re-examine “statement of intent” idea; reaffirm the ongoing nature of recommended studies; clarify the need for plain language when disclosing AI usage; and added language stressing the need for broad reach of an AI literacy campaign.

Workforce – recs should be more specific about geographic reach of existing state programs

Healthcare – match examples to appropriate recs; include workers in design and rollout of trainings; and broaden regulatory rec beyond just behavioral health

Public Sector – recs should also reflect the need for leg and judicial branches to engage with AI.

Edits made

Beginning on p. 3 in prep memo: clarified entrepreneurial support language in Rec #1; re-wrote Rec #2 to focus on AI for sector-level economic development; and added data center language to Rec #6

Beginning on p. 10 in prep memo: added “ongoing” language to Rec #2; added two areas for study in Rec #2; broadened Rec #4; and added language around reach to Rec #5

Beginning on p. 5 in prep memo: made explanatory edits to Rec #3

Beginning on p. 8 in prep memo: moved Duke example from Rec #4 to Rec #1; included workers in the list of partners for creating trainings in Rec #2; and deleted reference to just behavioral health in Rec #3

Beginning on p. 14 in prep memo: added these ideas to Rec #2

Edits since 9/26 meeting – implementation section

Changes made to reflect Task Force feedback at 9/26 meeting:

1. Incorporate the cross-cutting recs together into the implementation section
2. Pulled out themes from the implementation exercise to create five buckets of activities:
 1. Educate Mainers about AI, its potential benefits, and how to stay safe
 2. Continue to bolster protections against the harms that AI creates or exacerbates
 3. Take enabling steps that unlock long-term, large-scale opportunities
 4. Enable ongoing State engagement on AI issues
 5. Pursue innovative partnerships and funding strategies

Letter from the co-chairs

Letter from the co-chairs is intended to:

1. Draw attention to findings and key insights
2. Highlight cross-cutting findings
3. Introduce the report as the first piece that readers will see

Letter from the co-chairs

May 7, 2025

Dear Governor Mills,

As co-chairs of the Infrastructure Rebuilding and Resilience Commission you established by Executive Order in May 2024, we are pleased to deliver to you, the Legislature, and the people of Maine the state's first Plan for Infrastructure Resilience, the culmination of our work over the last year to inform and guide Maine's response, recovery, and rebuilding from extreme storms. This Plan builds upon the interim report we delivered halfway through our work in November 2024, transitioning from a set of preliminary recommendations to a full-fledged plan shaped by the same urgent and unifying theme: the State and its partners must act today to ensure the resiliency of our people, environment, and economy against future storms and climate-related impacts and to protect the Maine we love for future generations.

The stories we heard from dozens of Maine people at our listening sessions throughout the state over the past year paint a stark portrait of what our futures might look like without deliberate action and investment to improve community resilience. More than 16 months after the January 2024 storms, both coastal and inland towns report infrastructure still not fully repaired. Old Orchard Beach, according to Town Manager Diane Asanza, was still recovering from the battering of a 2022 storm when the 2024 storm hit. Commission member Shiloh LaFreniere, Town Manager in Jay, warned, "Towns are not prepared to deal with these storm impacts — they do not have the resources in house and do not know what resources are available out of house." Darren Woods, Aroostook County EMA Director, noted, "Communities and agencies are not just complaining when we identify issues and areas for resilience. We are already working hard at resilience efforts at the local level."

As you noted upon the delivery of our interim report, "Storms know no politics. They don't care if you are a Republican, Democrat, or Independent. They will flood our homes and businesses, wash out our roads and bridges, and threaten the health and safety of our people."

The nonpartisan nature of infrastructure resilience has remained consistent throughout our deliberations. Maine, like all states, depends on federal funding and coordination for disaster preparedness and hazard mitigation, and on significant funding for recovery and rebuilding in the wake of disasters. As we finalized this Plan for delivery, high-ranking officials in the federal administration publicly proposed the elimination of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), from which the Maine Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) and regional emergency management agencies receive the bulk of their funding. At the same time, FEMA announced the termination of the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grant program, a critical resource, with no replacement at the time of termination. Such sweeping and unprecedented policy reversals fundamentally complicate this work.

Despite these significant headwinds, this Plan remains urgent and critical. Maine must anticipate scenarios in which states bear greater responsibilities and costs for hazard mitigation, emergency preparedness, and disaster recovery.

The Plan we deliver to you and the people of Maine today aims to go beyond a compilation of recommendations that sit overlooked on a shelf. It identifies agencies, organizations, and partners accountable for implementation and sets forth timeframes for action, ranging from immediate steps to a decade in the future. We included metrics to track the overall progress of the Plan to inform decision makers and the public. This Plan charts a path to a stronger, more resilient Maine by strengthening infrastructure and reducing disaster risks; improving disaster preparedness, response, and recovery; and sustaining Maine's momentum through strategic investments.

To that end, the Plan recommends that the new State Resilience Office tracks activity and reports the plan's progress. It also recommends that you as Governor establish an entity whose purpose is to receive those reports and monitor implementation of the Plan's strategies and actions.

Without relentless focus and attention, Maine risks losing the meaningful momentum it's gained since the devastating storms of December 2023 and January 2024, which prompted the creation of our Commission. Your Administration and the Legislature committed an historic \$60 million for storm relief for working waterfronts, infrastructure projects, and business recovery, and, more recently, an additional \$39 million through the newly passed LD 1 to help Maine communities, homeowners, businesses, and emergency response personnel better prepare for and withstand severe storms.

These investments will help to protect our communities against the havoc of future storms, from days-long power outages that disrupt lives and economic activity, washed out roads that impede heating fuel deliveries and emergency responders, flooding that puts drinking water systems at risk of contamination, and much more.

These investments will save lives, will save taxpayers money, and strengthen our economy. According to a recent study released by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, every \$1 spent on climate resilience and preparedness saves communities \$13 in damages, cleanup costs, and economic impact. By that measure, the more than \$100 million that Maine has already committed will save over \$1 billion in the coming years.

While that figure is impressive, it pales in comparison to the financial scale of Maine's infrastructure and resilience challenge. The state and communities will likely need billions in investments over the decades to come to adequately prepare for the increasingly frequent and intense storms in our future. Philanthropy also has an essential role to play in catalyzing innovation, filling funding gaps, and supporting community-led resilience efforts. This is a daunting reality, but one we face together as a state unafraid to acknowledge the challenges of today and to anticipate the challenges of tomorrow.

In closing, we along with all of the Commission's members extend our gratitude to the many individuals who contributed to the Commission's work. This includes the many participants in the listening sessions, the officials who hosted us around the state, the numerous experts who presented to the Commission, and staff from the Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and the Future and the Maine Emergency Management Agency.

We thank you, Governor Mills, for this opportunity to lead the Commission and deliver a plan for a more resilient Maine.



Linda Nelson, Economic and
Community Development
Director, Town of Stonington



Dan Tishman, Principal and
Chairman of Tishman Realty &
Construction

Co-Chairs, Infrastructure Rebuilding and Resilience Commission

Letter from the co-chairs

Letter from the co-chairs is intended to:

1. Draw attention to findings and key insights
2. Highlight cross-cutting findings
3. Introduce the report as the first piece that readers will see

What areas are valuable to highlight?

Potential areas to highlight:

- AI has quickly become a **ubiquitous part of the way that Mainers work and live**, with usage continuing to accelerate.
- AI offers considerable **promise for Maine, but not without risks**.
- AI **literacy is foundational** to both maximizing AI's benefits and mitigating its risks.
- Maine has **opportunities to become a national innovation leader** in AI.

Break – Return at 3:05pm

Review introduction sections

1. Introduction – Why focus on AI?
 1. Defining AI
 2. This AI moment
 3. State of Maine actions to date
 4. Federal policy context

Do these sections successfully set the stage for readers to be able to engage with recommendations?

Review introduction sections

1. Introduction – Why focus on AI?
 1. Defining AI
 2. This AI moment
 3. State of Maine actions to date
 4. Federal policy context
2. Task force process

Have we successfully reflected the Task Force process?

Review introduction sections

1. Introduction – Why focus on AI?
 1. Defining AI
 2. This AI moment
 3. State of Maine actions to date
 4. Federal policy context
2. Task force process
3. Topic-specific introductory text
 1. Economy
 2. Workforce
 3. Education
 4. Healthcare
 5. AI-related Harms
 6. Public Sector

In the topic you focused on, does this text effectively summarize the key learnings that shape the subsequent Task Force recommendations in this area?

Adjourn

Next Meeting:

Friday, October 24, 12p-2p