

AI and Public Records Compliance

Tools, Limits, and Legal Risk Filters

WAPRO Fall Conference | October 16, 2025 | Lynnwood, WA

This session is designed to be compliance-first, example-rich, and practical. Everything you need is in the slides.



What You'll Get from This Session



Risk Assessment Checklist

Comprehensive evaluation tool for internal AI implementation with clear pass/fail criteria



Sample Internal AI Policy

Ready-to-modify template that addresses key compliance requirements for immediate agency use



Use Case Grid

Risk-level guidance for common AI applications in public agencies with contextual notes

Additional resources include PRA alignment guidance with real-world examples and panel-style discussion aids to facilitate implementation.

💬 Ask questions at any point. Live Q&A at the end.

Learning Goals



This session will help you:

Differentiate Risk Levels

Identify potentially problematic AI applications versus safe use cases in your agency

Understand Disclosure Liability

Navigate the complex legal implications of AI-generated content under public records laws

Implement Internal Controls

Apply practical safeguards to reduce legal exposure without restricting innovation

Create Agency-Specific Guidance

Develop customized protocols using the templates and frameworks provided

PRA Compliance: The Baseline

Public Records Act applies to:

- **All business conduct materials** - Any content used to conduct agency business, regardless of its format or creation method
- **Tool-independent coverage** - The law is technology-neutral; AI-created content is not exempt
- **Full process documentation** - AI prompts, responses, drafts, summaries, and metadata if used in agency decisions

⚠ **If it influences a public record, it may become one.** This includes the entire chain of AI interactions leading to a decision.



PRA Red Flags in AI Usage

AI-written PRA responses

Allowing AI to draft responses to public records requests without thorough human review creates significant legal exposure

Missing documentation chain

Failure to preserve the complete prompt/output sequence undermines transparency and compliance obligations

Automated redaction

Using AI for redaction without comprehensive human review risks both over-redaction and inadvertent disclosure

Metadata manipulation

Stripping or altering metadata during AI-assisted editing destroys potentially disclosable record elements

Unsupervised public sharing

Releasing AI outputs to public or press without proper review and signoff procedures

Inadequate retention planning

Lack of clear protocols for preserving AI-generated content according to retention schedules

AI Use Case Grid: Safe vs Risky

Evaluate potential AI applications against this risk assessment framework before implementation:

Use Case	Risk Level	Notes
Drafting internal memos	Low	Requires human signoff before finalization; retain prompts and outputs
Email sorting/triage	Low	No new record creation; applies existing categorization
Writing PRA responses	High	Requires robust policy, legal review, and documented approval chain
Redaction	Very High	Should never be final; requires comprehensive human verification
Case summaries	Medium	Acceptable with documented input/output and supervisory review
External statements	High	Requires multi-level approval, audit trail, and formal authorization

Note: Risk levels reflect both compliance vulnerability and potential for public disclosure challenges

Legal & Operational Safeguards



Controls you can adopt immediately:

- **Human verification** - Require signoff on all external-facing AI output
- **Comprehensive documentation** - Save prompts and AI responses as part of the official record
- **Clear labeling** - Mark experimental AI use clearly in internal documents
- **Data protection** - Prohibit sensitive information in prompts (names, case details)
- **Retention compliance** - Maintain all content according to agency schedules
- **Approved tools only** - Restrict use to platforms vetted by IT and legal

Internal Risk Checklist

🧠 Use this evaluation tool before implementing any AI application in your agency:

Question	Yes / No	Action Guidance
Is this output part of an official record?	___	If yes, full documentation chain required
Does it require retention under PRA?	___	If yes, implement specific retention protocol
Can you export both prompt and output?	___	If no, select different tool or document manually
Was human review part of the process?	___	If no, add review step before implementation
Is the use consistent with existing agency policy?	___	If no, update policy or reconsider application
Could this be defended in court or during an audit?	___	If no, document reasoning or abandon use case

⊗ If 2 or more "No" answers, pause and reassess. Consult with legal counsel before proceeding.



Internal Policy Sample (Use As-Is)

[Agency Name] – Internal AI Use Policy

Scope: Applies to all staff using generative AI during agency work.

1. No AI output may be published or disclosed without human review
2. No sensitive data may be entered into AI systems
3. AI use must be documented (prompt, output, related decisions)
4. AI-generated content may be considered a public record
5. Retention and disclosure rules still apply
6. Experimental use must be labeled clearly

✓ This template is drop-in ready. Adjust terminology to match your agency's internal language and governance structure.

What to Do Next

01

Start with policy, not technology

Establish governance framework before selecting specific AI tools or platforms

02

Apply the internal checklist

Run the risk assessment protocol (Slide 8) before any testing or deployment

03

Distribute resources

Share this slide deck with legal, IT, compliance, and management teams

04

Begin with low-risk pilot

Start implementation in contained workflows like internal summaries or email organization

05

Establish review procedures

Implement mandatory human oversight for all AI-generated content, especially sensitive applications



Do not use AI for redactions or final decisions without comprehensive human review

Discussion Prompts

(Optional for Live Panel)



How many of you are already testing AI tools in your agency?

What's the biggest blocker: compliance, credibility, cost, or culture?

Who in your agency is writing policy for AI right now?

What would make you confident enough to use AI in your own role?

These questions are designed to stimulate productive discussion and identify common implementation challenges across agencies.

Resource Recap

(No Downloads Required)

Included in this Slide Deck:

- Risk Assessment Checklist — Slide 8
- Internal Policy Template — Slide 9
- PRA Red Flag Guidance — Slides 4–5
- AI Use Case Grid — Slide 6
- Operational Controls — Slide 7

For follow-up or questions:

Dara Dotson

Dara Dotson LLC

daradotsonllc@gmail.com



Case Study: HeyGov AI Meeting Minutes

The City of Puyallup uses HeyGov, a municipal government software platform, leveraging AI to streamline the creation of official council meeting minutes directly from audio recordings. This implementation saves the city hundreds of staff hours yearly, highlighting how AI can drive efficiency while demanding robust compliance frameworks.

Compliance and Operational Benefits

- **Significant Time Savings:** The City of Puyallup saves hundreds of staff hours yearly, ensuring faster turnaround and timely availability of public records.
- **Consistent Formatting:** Standardized document structure minimizes variation and ensures uniformity across records.
- **Reduced Human Error:** Lowers the incidence of manual transcription mistakes, improving overall record accuracy.

Risk Considerations & Governance

- **Essential Human Review:** Staff oversight is mandatory to verify the accuracy and context of AI-generated content against the source audio.
- **Accuracy Verification:** Implementing rigorous quality checks for sensitive decisions, votes, or legal discussions.
- **Retention of Source Audio:** The original audio recording must be retained as the definitive legal record, consistent with public record retention policies.

Implementation Insight: While AI drastically reduces transcription time, it functions best as a powerful drafting tool. Maintaining staff oversight ensures compliance and balances efficiency with the necessary accuracy for official government documentation.



Case Study: Citibot AI Chatbot – City of Puyallup

Citibot is an AI-powered municipal chatbot platform designed to enhance citizen engagement and service delivery. The City of Puyallup utilizes Citibot on its official website to provide instant, 24/7 answers to common citizen inquiries, improving accessibility and operational efficiency.

Compliance and Service Benefits

- **Improved Citizen Service:** Provides instant, 24/7 answers, significantly enhancing service accessibility and response times.
- **Reduced Staff Workload:** Automates responses to frequently asked questions, allowing city staff to focus on complex or specialized issues.
- **Consistent Responses:** Ensures all citizens receive accurate, standardized information aligned with official city policies.

Risk Considerations & Governance

- **Accuracy Monitoring:** Requires continuous staff oversight to ensure AI-generated responses remain factual and up-to-date with changing regulations or services.
- **Data Training Needs:** The chatbot must be meticulously trained on authorized city data to prevent inaccurate or outdated information dissemination.
- **Preventing Misinformation:** Needs safeguards and clear disclaimers to manage citizen expectations and prevent the spread of potentially harmful misinformation.

Implementation Insight: While Citibot drastically improves automation and citizen access, success relies on balancing instantaneous responses with robust accuracy checks to maintain public trust in official municipal communications.



Ask Ezra

Connect with the Experts

We invite you to reach out for further discussion or assistance with your agency's AI implementation and compliance strategies.

Dara Dotson

 4IR Consultant | The Future Won't Wait

Dara Dotson LLC

daradotsonllc@gmail.com

P:(564)999-7106

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/daradotson>

Dan Vessels Jr.

City Clerk

City of Puyallup

333 S Meridian

Puyallup, WA 98371

P: (253) 841-5480

dvessels@puyallupwa.gov

