

## Data Privacy Unlocked: Legislating Data Privacy Series



### Episode 3 – Data Privacy Unlocked: A Conversation with Representative Shelley Kloba of Washington State July 6, 2021

Speaker	Statement
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>The emergence of broad state consumer privacy legislation has been one of the dominant stories in privacy law since at least June 2018, when California lawmakers passed the California Consumer Privacy Act in response to Alastair Mactaggart’s ballot measure. State lawmakers have jumped into the void created by the absence of federal privacy legislation and tackled this complicated issue. In 2021 alone, lawmakers in 26 states proposed CCPA-like privacy legislation. While the federal government may eventually pass federal privacy legislation, there can be no doubt that state lawmakers are at the forefront of developing the principles that will form the foundation of privacy law in this country. Given the importance of these issues, we decided to launch a limited podcast series, interviewing some of the prominent state lawmakers who have authored these bills. Our guest today is Democratic Representative Shelley Kloba from Washington state. Representative Kloba is the primary author of HB 1433, which is entitled, The Washington People’s Privacy Act. For reference, HB 1433 was a competing bill to the Washington Privacy Act. In addition, Representative Kloba offered, by my count, five amendments to the Washington Privacy Act when it was in the House. Representative Kloba, thank you for joining us today.</p>
<b>Shelley Kloba</b>	<p>Well, it’s my pleasure. Thank you for having me.</p>



Speaker	Statement
<b>David Stauss</b>	I know our listeners are avid followers of state privacy law, but as just sort of a threshold issue, if you could kind of acquaint us to where your bill stands. I believe the Washington legislature has closed for the year, but maybe you can just kind of bring us up to speed.
<b>Shelley Kloba</b>	<p>Yes, you are correct. We have adjourned. That was back at the end of April, and at that point in time, that was the first session of our two-session term. So, every bill that was introduced will – if it did not pass – will automatically reconstitute back at the point where it left off. So, this is potentially a bill that can come back. I have a lot of stakeholder work in front of me yet, so it may be something completely different or, you know, have the bones of what was brought forward in 1433.</p> <p>So, that remains to be seen. But going back to a little bit of groundwork about our session this year – and I’m sure other legislatures struggled with the very same thing – we were 100% virtual. We never – well, we met the first day in our Olympia capitol to change our rules to allow for a virtual session, and then we were, you know, joining from our homes and our offices. Given those restrictions, or those conditions I guess is the best way to say it, we really focused on four main issues – sort of buckets of issues in our legislature this year. And one was, you know... So we had police reform, criminal justice. We had climate change, COVID response and economic development and revitalization. So, those were really...formed the theme for what we wanted to get done. And, as you can tell, privacy is a little bit outside of those buckets. But we did have a few things that we felt like were just really important that didn’t fit. And I think privacy is definitely important and timely.</p> <p>So, given the nature of the session that we had in front of us, the committee that both my privacy bill and the other one went through was criminal justice. And so that one, as you can imagine, was swamped with all of our bills about transforming policing and public safety. So, given that they had a lot of really big important bills with some controversy to them, the committee chair early on decided that he really only wanted to devote one hearing to privacy. And so, the choice was to do the bill that was sponsored by Senator Carlyle that is an evolution of what he has brought the last three years. I dropped my bill knowing that it was not going to get a hearing in the committee. But, I wanted to make sure that policymakers had a variety of policy choices that they could look at, contemplate and, you know, so we have a menu to choose</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>from in a really crucial, big, gnarly issue like this. I think it deserves a lot of discussion and the opportunity to look at different options. So, that was why I brought mine forward. And it did, in fact, through the hearing and afterwards, it was definitely a part of the conversation. Various elements – and I’m sure we will go through those in a little bit – but they were part of the conversation. And then, so, the Senator Carlyle bill passed with flying colors through the Senate, and then when it came to the House, it ran into a variety of roadblocks. Given that, I think – again, I wasn’t spending a whole lot of time watching the Senate hearings, but I think – we spent a lot more time really looking at the bill and trying to determine, Is this the right step forward? So, as it turned out in the end, the Washington Privacy Act, the Carlyle Bill, did not advance to the floor of the House.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>It’s fascinating what you just mentioned about the bill history and your impetus for proposing your bill. Was your concept this year, and even going forward, to work with the Washington Privacy Act structure, but try to add your pieces of your bill that you thought were important to the WPA? Or, is it to push your bill freestanding – or both, I suppose?</p>
<p><b>Shelley Kloba</b></p>	<p>You, know, I mean, bills get introduced and we expect that they will change over time through the amendment process to, you know, as we try to achieve consensus and get something that we can get to a “yes” on. And so, I really understood from the beginning that the Washington Privacy Act was kind of at one end of the spectrum, and that at the opposite end of the spectrum on a lot of measures, the People’s Privacy Act, my bill. And it was kind of based on the fact that in the past years, the Washington Privacy Act would come over to the House, and, you know, the House committee that it went through would amend it so that they, you know were, uh... The Senate version and the House version were divergent and we couldn’t get to any compromise. And I thought, well, what are we going to do different? You know, I don’t want to repeat the same process, so how about this? How about we start from opposite poles and we see if we can move to the middle? And, you know, it was worth trying it that way. I think it was made clear that the status quo is not good enough, and that definitely Washington Privacy Act, had it passed the first time it came out, would have been, you know, fairly earthshaking in terms of, you know, bringing some GDPR-style privacy regulations to the American consumer. However, in the year since, we’ve seen so much evolution that companies are voluntarily taking on with their</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>privacy policies. I mean, I sort of have a freakish hobby of reading privacy policies, and I see them, you know, changing. And I see the evolution of them, and they are starting to, by and large, adopt just about everything in the Washington Privacy Bill voluntarily. And so, locking into place sort of “yesterday’s law” didn’t seem like something I was interested in.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>That’s interesting. You had mentioned... I mean, obviously our listeners and readers are well-versed in the history of the Washington Privacy Act for the past three sessions not being able to get across the finish line. It just seemed from afar and from what I’ve read that the private right of action is an issue that is just central to the debate of whether or not it gets passed or not. Is that your point of view? Maybe even more generally, enforcement: Is that a stumbling block for why it can’t get passed? Or, are there just more fundamental issues about approach to privacy opt in versus opt out – those types of things – that sort of stand in the way?</p>
<p><b>Shelley Kloba</b></p>	<p>I think originally it was just broad-based concerns about enforcement. How are we going to enforce this in a way that makes sure that the consumer is at the center of this process? And, you know, between not having the opportunity to exercise your rights, which to me seems kind of antithetical to every other way that we grant people rights, they’re meaningless unless you have an opportunity to exercise them. And if you are, you know, wronged – someone has taken advantage of you or not followed the rules – then you should have some recourse for that. And it was very obvious that the Washington Privacy Act is less interested in that, let’s say. And so, I think that was one of the big things – private right of action as a subset of enforcement, but definitely giving our attorney general the tools that they need to be able to go after offenders. And this bill just didn’t prove to have what people thought it needed. The attorney general’s office, actually themselves, had testified that it’s not – it was not a pro-consumer piece of legislation in their assessment. And they really did, you know, legislators got behind that and really stood firm on needing to have strong enforcement tools for our attorney general’s office.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Is there – in looking forward to next year when the legislative session opens again – is there, in your mind, a compromise position that the two sides could take? I thought that there was some talk of compromise positions this year with respect to maybe</p>



**Speaker****Statement**

having a prior right of action, but making it for injunctive relief – I think was one of the things that was talked about. And there's also, you know, not to exclude it, but the right to cure, I know is another aspect as well – whether companies should have the right to cure violations on being put on notice. Here in Colorado, we have a bill that's been moving through the legislative process and they're going to put a right to cure, but sunset it after two years, which I think is a good compromise position. I shouldn't opine on it – it's a compromise position. I think, looking from the outside in, you know, if it is a stumbling block, I guess the question is, do we – do you anticipate being able to find compromise on that issue, or is it an all-or-nothing approach on it?

**Shelley Kloba**

I am still definitely interested in finding some sort of compromise within the realm of consumer-focused legislation. It is the people who are at the heart of this. And we have seen over many years in this country a variety of privacy types of legislation – they're at the federal level – and ultimately that, I think, would be the best solution, that we approach it federally. But, I am very much a believer in the sort of gardens of democracy whereby states are kind of the real-life labs of where you try out different approaches so that that can inform what happens at the federal level.

And, you know, take for instance HIPAA. I was a healthcare provider in a very, very small office at the time that was being rolled out. And I can remember, you know, having some lead up to it where, you know, we would start being informed that, you know, at such and such a date you will have to have your entire office policy in alignment with these privacy policies. And there were courses you could take in how to come into compliance, and there were, you know, there was an on-ramp, and it was a fairly long on-ramp if I'm remembering correctly. And you've studied a little more from a different perspective than I do and can probably correct me on that. But I think it is entirely reasonable to give companies some time to try to get these positions or these policies in place, and to give them a little bit of a grace period once, you know, date certain you have to have these policies in place, and you have to be following them. But we're going to expect that there are going to be some snafus. You're going to miss something. You're going to, you know, not have something lined up or in place or what have you. And so, I think it's entirely reasonable to do that for some period of time – two years, one year. You know, our attorney general's office was looking for a one-year sunset on the privacy policy, and, you know, I think that's a dial we can turn in terms of



**Speaker****Statement**

how long that is. But I do feel like it's reasonable to allow some time for companies to get those things in place.

What I would worry about is having it, you know, in perpetuity because then there's not really any meaning to it. You know, having our attorney general write you a letter as a company to say, "Stop doing that." I mean, in order to even do that, the attorney general has to go through a lot of time and energy investigating a claim that a company is in violation. And once they're done, they send the letter and the company hopefully stops, because there's no real teeth – "Hey, stop that," says the attorney general, and the company magically will do so. And there's a lot of trust involved in that assumption, and that's fine, and I'm sure it'll work that way. However, there's no reimbursement to the attorney general for all of that work and research, etc. And so, if it were a matter of their collecting all that information to pursue a case against the company, then, you know, the damages would reflect the work and the legal fees and so on for the company. With a simple right to cure that goes into perpetuity... It just – it doesn't make sense to me. So, I think there is – going back to your question – I do think there is a...some room for some compromise in there. I think the principles are sound on both sides. The companies need time and consumers need protection, and the attorney general needs an appropriate tool. I think those things are fairly agreed upon. It's just, you know, the devil is in the details.

**David Stauss**

For sure. One of the aspects of this issue that's sort of fascinated me in the last year is... I mean, Mactaggart in California brought his second ballot measure, the California Privacy Rights Act, and that ballot measure allows for the creation of the California Privacy Protection Agency. So, a new government agency – a data protection authority, a U.S. version of a data protection authority – has that been something that's been considered? Debated? When I've talked with other lawmakers in your position from other states, they've said, "Well, yeah, but Dave, that costs a lot of money." You know, those types of things, has been their response. But is that something that's been discussed at all in Washington?

**Shelley Kloba**

I think we've had kind of the beginnings of a discussion. Another bill that I had was, would have created a data broker registry and created a specific B&O tax category for the sale of data. And while it would, you know, the funds that it would generate would go into our general fund, I do think that that could be one way that you could pay for – whether it's the attorney general's office that has a



Speaker	Statement
---------	-----------

specific data privacy branch or an entirely different agency – I think that that is a place where some of that funding could come from. So, that bill had a few issues mostly with the way that I wrote it, and so that will be coming back as well. But I think that that really is a valid thing. It's like you're asking for a regulatory body that needs to be funded appropriately to get the job done that you're asking them to do. And absolutely, yes, that does take money. So, I think there's a reasonable nexus to taxing the sale of data so that you can pay for the policing of the sale of data or the sharing of data.

**David Stauss**

Again, it's one of these fascinating issues you guys keep on raising in Washington, right, this idea? I don't think I've heard of any other state approaching that, that taxation of the sale of data to fund the policing of it.

Two other aspects I wanted to ask about your bill – there's many aspects of your bill I think are fascinating, but two other aspects – one being the straight opt-in approach. Carlyle's bill, the Washington Privacy Act, started as not opt in originally, and then this year it morphed into the opt in for the collection of sensitive data. Your bill, though, if I've read it correctly, would just be straight opt in. So, talk to me about that, the importance of that in your mind on the approach to privacy.

**Shelley Kloba**

Well, like I said in the beginning, it has been interesting to watch the Washington Privacy Act evolve over time. And I really recognize that that was a big jump to even contemplate opt in at all. And the notion that sensitive data needs more protection than random, you know, smaller bits of data, I guess, is an interesting idea. But the reality that we know is that with enough tiny pieces of unimportant otherwise seemingly non-sensitive data, you can put together a picture of a person that really kind of comes into focus like a pointillist painting, where all these little random dots don't mean anything. You zoom out with enough of the dots and suddenly there's a picture there. And so, you can derive through someone's shopping habits and their locations that they typically frequent and, you know, where their home computer seems to be located... You can figure out what someone's race is. And so, these things then can be used to make decisions about a person that would violate, you know, their civil rights. And so, I appreciate that that concept was touched on in the Washington Privacy Act. But I think where we disagree is what is considered sensitive data. And, I think if you have enough of it, anything is sensitive data.



Speaker	Statement
	<p>And I think that... I had some validation when the CEO of Apple came out with his, the way that they will deal with apps now, and that apps must be, have the privacy baked in. And the customer can choose to share their data, but the assumption is the data will not be shared. And, you know, that was earthshaking for me. I was like, "Somebody gets it! Oh, my gosh!" And I think some research that I've seen has shown that only 4 percent of people are exercising that option to opt in to the sharing of their data. And so, that tells me that people really care deeply about their privacy and having someone look over their shoulder with every single activity that they do when they're online – whether it's on their phones or on their home computers or laptops or whatever device they have – the fact that someone can, you know, track them across the internet from website to website, from app to app, collecting information that's not necessary or crucial for the functioning of that transaction that you're doing. I think people have a fundamental issue with that. And the Apple policy really just lent total credence to that. So, I feel like we are on track. We're on to something. This is what people really want. And that has always been, to me, the focus of any privacy bill. It has to work for consumers.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>Well, and to your point... I mean, it's fascinating because now Apple is running commercials on tracking technology. I'm not sure if you've seen it. I first saw it....</p>
<b>Shelley Kloba</b>	<p>Well, I did see it yesterday. And, I mean, I was just nearly standing up in my living room cheering, because I'm like, "Yes, they get it! They get it!" This is what people don't like.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>Well, and who would have – who would have thought that a tech company would be running privacy commercials, right? It's sort of a fascinating place where we are in a country with our laws. You know, I don't want – I don't want to lose the thread because I wanted to ask you about one more aspect. But I think it does roll into your earlier comment, and it's relevant now in the discussion, which... You mentioned federal privacy legislation, right? And so, when I give talks on this, I tell people, "Hey, you know, if this is a football game, we're in the first quarter right now, and the fourth quarter is federal privacy legislation." Right? And everything we're doing and all the debates we're having – this is why I think it's so important to talk to individuals like yourself who are at the tip of the spear on these issues – is federal privacy legislation. So – and I sense based on what you said before that you view it that way as</p>



**Speaker****Statement**

well. Is there – but is there a belief that the federal government will eventually do something, in your mind? Do you have an idea of how long that takes to occur? You know, how many states would need to jump in before something changes at the federal level? I mean, I suppose I'm just asking you a rambling question about... Tell me everything you can talk about on this federal privacy question.

**Shelley Kloba**

Well, I really – it... Our Washington legislators, both Senator Cantwell and Representative DelBene, have put forward policies. I think that just as we have seen in the states – a growing interest and motivation to get something passed – I have a general sense that that is happening at the federal level as well. I think some of this just feeds up to that next level. And so, I'm more positive, you know, in this, you know, next two years than I was certainly for the past three or four, that something might actually get done. And I take to heart the fact that in different states it's been Republicans who are fighting the fight that in my state the Democrats are fighting. And even within the House, in our particular makeup, we have 57 as the majority of our 98 legislators – 57 are Democrats. And so, we have, you know, a fairly hefty percentage. But the “no” votes on the – or the opposition, I should say – to the Washington Privacy Act isn't completely Republican; there are Democrats who have concerns over it. And even within the opposition, there's some degree of “this doesn't go far enough” and there's some degree of “this goes too far.” And there's a little bit of concern about, you know, “this cat is already out of the bag; you can't start regulating data; it is the raw materials this whole industry is built on and we can't possibly change.” Which is also why I was so heartened by Apple, because they – really, I think the significance of it is – they stopped and said, “We understand that this industry is based on data, and it doesn't have to be, and we're going to show you how it still works.” And so, I'm excited about that. But I think it's – it's heartening to me that it seems to be bipartisan, or at least it's not only one group that really feels strongly in one direction. It's a bigger conversation. And so, we did some of that this year. I'll continue on doing that over the interim with both stakeholders and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I'm kind of following the footsteps of one of our wonderful Republican representatives who retired last year who was just the most dogged privacy advocate that we had in House – a Republican colleague. And so, I think it really is interesting that it crosses both parties.



Speaker	Statement
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>So, I really do hope – I mean, I guess I should back up one notch. I was in communication with both Senator Cantwell and Representative DelBene’s offices on, you know, kind of getting an understanding of what each of their policies looks like. And I know it was very important for Senator Cantwell’s office – the private right of action was something that was important that they saw was interesting. And I also felt like, if we pass something that doesn’t have a strong private right of action, that sends the wrong message, I think, to our federal partners about what we’re interested in because it just wasn’t reflective of what I hear among constituents.</p>
<b>Shelley Kloba</b>	<p>So, you’ve mentioned stakeholders a few times – I think, in the opening and just in response to that question there. And I think that’s, you know, something that our listeners and readers really crave, which is an understanding of that sort of, like, you know, inside baseball type aspect of it, right? It is... When you mention stakeholders, who are the stakeholders that you deal with on a regular basis? I don’t mean names, like, of individuals, but, like, types of companies. What are their concerns around this? What’s the volume of that? Are we talking, like, a couple? Or, is this many? What goes on behind the scenes? I suppose is the question.</p> <p>Yeah, I mean, we definitely hear from the large firms that deal in IT. We, you know, the social media companies, a variety of them. We have a Washington Technology Industry Association, so those will represent, you know, the full range of size of companies that are in information technology. We also hear from our Association of Washington Business so, you know, a broad spectrum of businesses. And a lot of times, one of the things that we hear is concern for small businesses who, you know, presumably are not going to have the appropriate staffing to accomplish the kinds of privacy policies that, you know, we need them to put in place and execute. And so, I’m trying really hard to be very sensitive about that with the small businesses. And oftentimes when I meet with them, I’ll say, “Well, tell me, what data are you currently collecting?” And I don’t often get a straight answer. But, as near as I can figure, you know, say, your local mom-and-pop teriyaki shop, you know, they’re going to have, maybe have a newsletter that they send out to their customers. So, they’re collecting, you know, name and email. But instead of having to create their own privacy policy, the vendor – generally speaking, they’re going to use some sort of vendor. You know, we know some of the bigger ones. And</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>because those are big companies who do have the resources, they're going to eventually be able to say, "Yes, I am, you know, our company is in compliance with the Washington policy," or "It isn't." And so, for a small-business owner, what they'll have to do is just ask the question of their vendors: "Are you in compliance?" "Yes." Boom. Done. You know, so I really – I'm actually looking forward to adding lawyers, privacy lawyers, into my stakeholder group because I really need to hear from them in terms of what does it look like to get a company to compliance.</p> <p>The other really important stakeholder group which did not come into play when this was very first introduced three years ago, but – in the Senate, slowly in the House, it started to get some attention... But some of the, like, national consumer groups like Consumer Reports and Common Sense Media – some of those – I mean, they're nonprofits and, generally speaking, don't have the resource and the reach to be able to participate in the discussions the same way that companies with very well-resourced government relations arms are able to do. I think one advantage this year with virtual is that those, you know, companies, or those nonprofits that are consumer-focused are, you know, can join in the conversation and have face-to-face conversations without having to pay the expense of flying somebody, you know, anywhere in the country where these bills are popping up. So, that has been a really important voice, those sort of national consumer advocacy groups. But then, local ones – we've had a lot of interest and effort on the part of, you know, organized groups like Indivisible chapters that are here in Washington. We've had... The ACLU has been very active. A lot of our, like, immigrant representative groups have been very interested, and I think partly because of, you know, concerns about civil rights and having those trampled upon. So, it really has been fairly broad-based stakeholder work. And again, that'll continue.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>And because I'll forget – I have a few more questions, but I'll forget to ask you – what is the plan for next year, then? Or, maybe even the summer going into next year? You've mentioned just maybe stakeholder process, amendments to your bill, those types of things. Is that in the cards?</p>
<p><b>Shelley Kloba</b></p>	<p>Yes, absolutely. I suspect that I will bring forward something that is a version of 1433, but a little different. I think I'll pare it down a little bit to some of the more crucial aspects – you know, the opt in, the private right of action – those kinds of issues that seem to be really the crux of things, and kind of jettison a few of the other</p>



**Speaker****Statement**

things, which very well may live on in a different freestanding bill of their own. I look forward to getting together in person with groups – because I think sometimes, you know, the conversation is a little bit different and a little more free-flowing – and try to come up with some reasonable compromises that people are willing to make.

Definitely, I think a part of the plan, too, is to educate my fellow legislators. I think there's a lot about consumer data privacy that is not even something... It's kind of invisible to most people. Unless they actually read the privacy policies, it's hard to understand how much of your information is being captured and, you know, bought and sold and utilized by companies. And so, even just to bring the awareness to the rest of my colleagues or, you know, ones that have yet to really dive into it. I think it's kind of one of those issues where they go, like, "Well, you know so-and-so and so-and-so are really experts on that and I'm just going to go with what they think." But, I really want to have more investment and more knowledge about the issue from my colleagues, so that will be part of the process, too.

**David Stauss**

Let me ask you – a slight change of topic, but I think it's relevant to your previous answer is... Virginia, this year, did pass privacy legislation. Essentially, they took Carlyle's bill, made some pro-business changes to the bill and passed it very quickly. And here in Colorado, we are... You know, by the time listeners hear our conversation, we'll know whether Colorado has passed the bill. But it would be, again, a version of the Washington Privacy Act that's been tinkered with from there. Does seeing other states pass privacy legislation excite you, or does it concern you to the extent that they are picking a bill that you think could still use some work on, you know, the version of the Washington Privacy Act? I mean, is there a feeling of, like, "We've got to get something done?" Or, somewhere in some jurisdiction... Is that sort of that give and take, or are you just excited to see, hey, at least states are doing something in this space? I mean, something is better than nothing?

**Shelley Kloba**

You know, that is a question that I wrestle with almost, you know, constantly. Is something better than nothing? Or, are we selling ourselves short if we cement into place essentially current practice and we don't reach and take a look at: What's in the future? What do we need to prepare for? What – is there something better? Are we just settling for what we have now? And I think most days we shouldn't settle for anything less than, you know, consumer-



Speaker	Statement
	<p>focused legislation that gives people control over their data and rights that are – it will be remedied when something has happened to their data. I think that is really important and, I guess, in my heart of hearts, it's a little disappointing when I see states have taken it up and sort of somewhat quickly passed something that I feel, like, sells their consumers short. There are a number of different ways that, you know, a remedy can look like. There maybe are different tiers of, you know, first – what is it, legislative exhaustion or some sort of a ladder where, you know, if a company is violating your rights, first you, you know, talk to the company. If that fails, then you talk to the attorney general. If they're not willing to take it up for any number of different reasons, then you might have a private right of action of your own. It can look like that. It doesn't have to be, you know – what I think people fear, but hasn't really panned out, is – some sort of free-for-all that, you know, lawyers are going to come out of the woodwork to prosecute these cases where some breach or some violation of the laws has occurred. And so, I just am not willing to totally discount the idea of private right of action and leave it off; I think it's too important. It can look a lot of different, look like a lot of different things, but I think it's an important concept to not leave out.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>So, the last question I'll ask you... I've kept you for far longer already than I promised. Thank you for hanging in there with us. I think you and I, before we started, we both agreed we could talk privacy law all day. And that's sort of the nature of my question, which is: You're clearly incredibly well-versed in all of these issues. How did you get interested in this area and why does it appeal to you?</p>
<p><b>Shelley Kloba</b></p>	<p>You know, I'm a little bit of an accidental tourist in this. Our committee selection process in the legislature, here in Washington anyway, you know, we give a list, a ranked-order list of the committees we're interested in serving on. And I put in mine. And one of the ones that I was, I felt I should serve on even though I didn't have a whole background on it was, what we had, it was called the Innovation Tech and Economic Development Committee, partly because I felt like my community needed a voice in the tech space. We have – I'm outside of Seattle in suburbia just north of the mothership of Microsoft and Google and Nintendo. And, for instance, some of the very large companies are located just to the south of me. But I have a big biotech sector in my district. And so, I felt like we needed additional voices on that</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>committee. And so, I was selected on that committee. And, you know, you can't sit in a hearing and not learn. And, I mean, all of these topics that were before our Innovation Tech and Economic Development Committee were fascinating to me. And so, I was hooked early on. This year, we – they disbanded that and took the various portfolios and distributed them to other committees. So, that was another part of, I think, the flavor of this privacy discussion this year. We don't have a committee in the House that is dedicated to these kinds of issues. And so, that was why it happened to go to our Civil Rights and Judiciary Committee. So the – really the powerhouse of people interested in privacy – our House committee was very collaborative in the last two years about coming up with, you know, amendments and that's been disbursed to a number of different committees. So, there's no real center for the advocacy for this bill. So, I think that made it a little more challenging in addition to just the physical challenges that we had this year. Little by little, I think we're educating more people so that it's not just that one diffused group, that it's a larger group of my colleagues who understand the ins and outs of this issue and the importance of it.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>I'm embarrassed to say I did not – after having watched hours and hours and hours of committee hearings in the ITED community for the past two years – I'm embarrassed to say I did not pick up on the fact that it had been disbanded this year. You learn something new every day. I suppose that fits in, too. Well, I've completely overstayed my welcome. I asked for half an hour....</p>
<b>Shelley Kloba</b>	<p>Oh, no, like, gosh, I felt like I kept you so long! But, yeah, anytime I get to talk about my favorite issue is – the time flies. I hope it's done so for your listeners as well.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>It has for me, so I have no doubt it as for them as well. It's clear Washington residents are in great hands with you there and everything that you're doing in Washington. I'd like to thank you for joining us today and, once again, thank you for your time and for your insights.</p>

