

## Data Privacy Unlocked: Legislating Data Privacy Series



**Episode 4 –  
Data Privacy Unlocked: A Conversation with  
Representative Domingo DeGrazia of Arizona**  
July 13, 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 Domingo DeGrazia from Arizona. Representative DeGrazia is the primary author of HB 2865. Representative, thank you for joining us today.</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Yeah, thanks for chatting with me.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>So, I’ve been asking all of the interviewees the same question sort of, to start, which is, you know, how... What’s the status of your bill, HB 2865, as we sit here today in early June 2021?</p>



Speaker	Statement
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	That was funny you should ask that. So, Arizona is getting into the budget phase of our legislative work, which means we've completed hearing bills. And so, the status of the data privacy bill in Arizona is essentially dead. There is very few ways it could come back, and I don't foresee any of those coming to fruition. And it's interesting that you gave the bill number because I have dropped a version of this bill for three years now and they've all met similar fates. So we'll have to see if I can drop it again next year or some updated version of it.
<b>David Stauss</b>	We're going to talk a lot about your bill and your approach to this, but what is the game plan for next year? You know, you said it was three times. Is the fourth time the charm? Or, I guess in your mind, what is your thought process for how to navigate this summer and then when the legislature opens again next year?
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	It's interesting. My approach this time around is going to be educating my colleagues at the legislature about data privacy and about some bills that are passing in other states and the need to protect our own constituents here in Arizona. That's been kind of the biggest challenge, really, is getting the lawmakers just up to speed on what data privacy is, why it's important and the many effects that it can have. And, literally, like two weeks ago on the floor of the House of Representatives, one of my colleagues stood up and said, "You know, I think my phone's probably tracking me, but there is really nothing I can do about it." And I'm like, "Come on now. Think!"
<b>David Stauss</b>	If only there was a bill for that.
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	Yeah, yeah, if only there was a bill for that. So, you know, some of it is working with stakeholders and bringing in all of the interested parties to discuss what the best option would be for a data privacy bill; but a lot of it is just getting my folks in the House of Reps up to speed and then working on the Senate as well. It's somewhat of a new topic to them.
<b>David Stauss</b>	So, we talked a little bit about this before we jumped on and started recording. Virginia passed its bill this year. Obviously California's got its bill. Yesterday, the Colorado legislature passed the Colorado Privacy Act. These... You know, now that we're at, you know, two, almost three, states, do you think that will make your life easier talking to your colleagues about



Speaker	Statement
	<p>this, since other states have jumped in? Do you think that makes it harder if there is, like, a patchwork that develops with these privacy laws? How if any, you know, any way does this impact you?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>The quality of the bills that pass out of other states, as far as it affects Arizona, it likely has an effect in terms of what the composition of those other states are, whether they're Democratic controlled or Republican controlled. Because it's such a new topic, a lot of times what my colleagues will say is, "Well, if it passed in California, we don't like California, so it's not going to go in Arizona." You know, if it passed in Virginia, "Well, we're not like Virginia, so it's not going to go in Arizona." The – Arizona follows kind of the federal model as far as letting industry regulate itself – kind of being hands off, very business friendly in Arizona, but not really imposing any regulations. So, it's an interesting task to get folks up to speed on what will not only be okay with businesses – the applicability of the bill – but also protect consumers in the end. So, yeah, we'll see. I have yet to go through the Colorado bill to see where that will fit in, but I will definitely be talking to my folks about how all of those come into play.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Would you say, I mean, as you talk with other lawmakers... You know, I talked a lot about, like, the bipartisan approach to these bills. Is it – has it been your experience in Arizona that this is something that both Republicans and Democrats can get behind? There's commonality here? Or, is it more partisan?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>No, it's actually a very bipartisan topic, and it's interesting the number of folks that weigh in. So, there are folks on both sides of the aisle that want some kind of data privacy, that understand what's... On the fringes they understand what's happening with their data going out to some nebulous, like, data brokers or, you know, just being aggregated somewhere. And it's... The data privacy bill that I've been running has gotten just fascinating amounts of support from both sides of the aisle, and fascinating amounts of pushback from both sides of the aisle and, you know, both industry and privacy folks – industry saying it's going too far, privacy folks saying it's not going far enough. So, you get to be right in the middle of the, kind of the firing squad no matter which way you point.</p>



Speaker	Statement
David Stauss	Sounds like a lot of fun.
Domingo DeGrazia	It's fascinating. And you see that play out with the Washington Privacy Act that they were running over a period of years, where they got pushback from, you know, left and right and took a long time to get to their conclusion.
David Stauss	Yeah, and I mean it's fascinating, right? Because in Washington, as you know, you know, this is year three they couldn't get it passed. But now Virginia and Colorado have taken versions of the Washington Privacy Act and got that passed. So, it's almost like this whole, like, "what Washington makes the world takes" type of a thing. I was... When I grew up in New Jersey there was, like, the logo of Trenton, New Jersey: "What Trenton Makes the World Takes," right? And so, it's sort of Washington with privacy law right now. Completely irrelevant, but....
Domingo DeGrazia	<p>That's alright. I think that's actually on point, you know, because... So, when I was drafting this version of the data privacy law, what I started with is, I was looking at GDPR. And the assumption was that GDPR would roll out and touch the entire world because it's essentially world applicable. And so, I started with GDPR and some of the fundamental principles that are contained therein: old-school FIPS, like, from the '70s – Fair Information Practice Principles...bringing that into the context of what California did, the provisions they added, the language they used, the definitions they used. And then, looking at the Washington Privacy Act to see what they included or left out or how they defined the world.</p> <p>And the reason I did all of that is because I have kind of a low level of confidence that the federal government, that the Congress, is actually going to pass a privacy act. Like, they can't get out of their own way right now. I've been... I was really excited years ago to see new federal bills come up and then I'd get disappointed to watch them die or just linger, just go away. And after a while I just kind of gave up. I'm like, these folks, you know, they're not moving on this anytime soon so it's up to the states. So, what I wanted to do was create a bill that would mesh with other states and be as minimally impactful on the corporations that operate worldwide, but also give the folks in Arizona some privacy protection and some level of confidence that businesses are doing the right thing. And that's – you get into a really heavy push-pull – is where do</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>you set the limits? Who is it going to apply to? But there is a way to do this that doesn't impact businesses, that does protect consumers.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>You know, let's talk about that last topic that you were just alluding to. What is your take on applicability? I mean, these, you know, CCPA is \$25 million. It's got some other thresholds. The California – I'm sorry – the Colorado/Virginia model is, like, 100,000 consumers and then excluding, you know, types of consumers. What's your point of view on what the right metric is for applicability?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yeah, I think... I'd like to say that Virginia took parts of my bill because I set the threshold at not really what's best for the consumers, but what I think we can get passed in Arizona. Now, there's that other dividing line that you have to decide on. What's great for consumers might not be something that you can pass. So, I had to set a limit on what I thought I could get through the legislature. So, I set it at \$25 million or more in worldwide revenue, or information on 100,000 Arizonians, or 35 percent of gross revenue from data aggregation. And I see that some states are actually going up to 50 percent of revenue from data aggregation. But that's the threshold that I can live with that won't impact the smaller companies that haven't come up with a privacy by design idea that they weren't made that way. And it would, it would capture businesses that are likely already operating under GDPR or CCPA. It would mesh right into that and have as minimal footprint on those companies as possible.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>You know, one of the other topics that seemed to divide people as well is the concept of, like, opt in consent versus opt out. And so... And CCPA predominantly being a, you know, a notice, an opt out regime, now with the Colorado/Virginia/Washington approach being, like, opt in for sensitive personal information, but opt out for everything else. What's your viewpoint on that model? What do you think is the right model?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yeah, I believe it should be informed consent. Let consumers do whatever they want as long as they know and have the opportunity to opt out. And so, Arizona is automatically opted in for just about everything now, but we should get closer to notification on the front end before data is being collected. And then, if the consumer is okay with it, then they can opt in to it</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>being used or processed or just taken by the company. So, I don't know how far I can get with that idea in Arizona. It's... Because Arizona is coming from the completely opted in to everything standpoint, you know, sometimes you have to work incrementally, so we'll see how far we can get.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>Yeah, I mean, it's an interesting concept to write. Is your approach more about... I mean, some lawmakers we've talked to have said, "Hey, if isn't right, I'm not going to pass it." Other lawmakers we've talked to have taken a practical approach of saying, "I'd rather get something on the books that we can start with and progress from there." What's your take on that? What's the right approach?</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Incremental is always good because the bills and communities – they to, they tend to move over time. So, there's no final bill that's going to be perfect for everybody from now until perpetuity. So, you have to be open to the idea of changing things, especially as you get better information. And there is always some kind of strange nuance, some business that says, "Hey, you didn't consider this and it, you know, has a huge effect on us." So, what I am approaching this is through the lens of the incremental approach. But whatever bill gets passed will be the right bill at that time because it's what we can get passed. It probably won't be perfect, but I'm okay with that. I'm okay with coming back and working on it later.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>I mean, it kind of alludes earlier – to your earlier concept of federal versus state and this concept that states can kind of work through a bunch of these issues before we get to federal legislation and have to live with that for lord knows how many decades, right? What is it? I mean, what is your point of view? Not to put words in your mouth, but you talked about, you know, federal versus state before. What is your view of who needs to be taking up this mantle right now – federal versus state lawmakers?</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Yeah, that's a great question. So, it needs to be done, there's no question about that. We need to have some privacy laws on the books. If the feds are not going to do it, if Congress is not able to act or doesn't have the political will at this time, then the states have to do it. And the states are closer to the people, so I believe that the states can make a better law that better protects their constituents. It does leave open the idea of creating a patchwork from state to state that companies will</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>have to deal with. But I think what you're seeing is, as more discussion goes on year by year, states are becoming more in alignment because they're using the best language from the bills that have come before them and incorporating that in. And you really see that. When I was looking at the Washington Privacy Act from a couple years ago, they had some great, really elegant provisions that I wanted to include because they were written concisely and in a way that I think the layman could understand, but still would have the appropriate applicability to businesses. And you see that as well with some of the provisions of the California Privacy Act. Some of their provisions – because of the way it was written – some of their provisions are a little bit cumbersome and had to be either redacted or changed. And so, as we move forward, I think you're going to see a nice cohesion among the states as they start passing these privacy laws.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>Yeah, I think privacy lawyers can agree that the California Consumer Privacy Act is a difficult piece of legislation.</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Yeah, well I mean, it's history. It really shows that it's a – I don't want to say it's a bit of a wreck, but it came by in a difficult way that applying to that many people and really being kind of on the forefront of chewing through some of these issues. Yeah, just a difficult methodology to get that one passed.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>Yeah, it's – I mean this is fascinating discussion, right? Because if not for California, then would we even be having these discussions, right? But somebody had to go first, right, and sort of lay that groundwork?</p> <p>Let's talk about... You know, a hot button topic on all these bills is, as you'll know, is enforcement. You know, whether there should be AG enforcement, whether this – as it will be in Virginia and as Colorado passes and has been in California – whether it should be a private right of action, which has been, you know, the privacy advocates' push; or now, a third model, which the California Privacy Rights Act has ushered in, which is to have a data protection authority, the California Privacy Protection Agency. What's your thought? I mean, how should these bills be enforced?</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>So, you know, early on – and this is years ago – I thought that a private right of action would be the best. But as we're coming</p>



**Speaker****Statement**

through the many nuances of how data privacy affects people, at least in Arizona, I'm working toward an attorney general enforced, I guess, methodology. And, yeah, it really is fascinating because you have to spin up the ability of the attorney general to be able to handle all of these different actions that might come out. Either enforcement of businesses that are acting outside the confines of the law or just protecting consumers. And one of the interesting things... Even going back to the Arizona data breach notification law, there is a provision in that law that says that if the – if a company gets breached and if the company determines after an investigation that the harm to the individual or to the consumer is not likely to result in substantial economic harm, then notification doesn't have to occur. Which almost operates to the benefit of companies that don't have good data protection because the more companies that get breached, the less any one company can say, "Well, our instance is, you know, the cause of substantial economic harm." You know, ferreting out what the economic harm would be is really difficult. I know that California is going through some writhings and undulations about the number of folks that are suing as far as data being used improperly. And those court cases are still very, very new in terms of getting any kind of resolution or any kind of case law as to the best practice here.

**David Stauss**

When I've talked with others – and I would like to pick your brain on this one – this concept of a data protection authority, this, you know, California Privacy Protection Agency... I thought, perhaps mistakenly, that that would be a model that would be pursued by state lawmakers. But as I've talked with others, they've said, "Well, Dave, the part you're missing is, it costs money to have a data protection authority spun up." And so, that's been, like, yeah, that sounds great, but I think we need to get a fiscal note that says, you know, \$5 million or something like that, right? And California can do it because of the ballot measure. Has that been sort of your thought process as well, like, there's really no other way of doing it, other than AGs because of this financial issue? Or, do you think this can be accomplished in states with data protection authority?

**Domingo DeGrazia**

Well, I think a DPA in states would be a really, really good idea. Having a dedicated office or set of folks that look at these issues specifically. Just because of the ongoing impact that misuse of data can have as far as, like, biometrics, fingerprints



Speaker	Statement
	<p>– anything of that nature – that is really, you know, it's our unique information that will be out in the open from now until forever, we have to start considering a state agency that will look at that exclusively. It's fascinating. I don't know what I could get in Arizona as far as negotiations. If it's just, like, two full-time positions at the attorney general's office or spinning up an entire office because it does, it comes with a fiscal note, and I would have to justify that, and the attorney general would have to be on board with it. And, you know, it's kind of an interesting story. A couple years ago, the speaker of the House ran a bill on biometrics. And he ran that bill in response to the attorney general making a statement that he wanted some ability to protect the consumers and needed a biometrics law. So, the speaker of the House ran this bill, got it to committee and he essentially said, "You know, I'm running this bill, but I don't really fully understand it. It's something that concerns me." But the bill ended up dying, I think, after two committees. So, the next session, I picked up the bill and I ran it because I thought, hey, the attorney general wants this and it's something that consumers need and I have some ability to articulate what's happening here with biometrics. And the AG didn't support me at all. I think it went down partisan lines and then it just died.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Yeah, I mean, you raise a, you raise a really interesting topic, right? Because if you kind of look at the states that have gotten this across the finish line... You have to kind of exclude California because it's unique, it's a ballot measure. But in Colorado and then in Virginia, there was AG support for those bills. Is that something that you've tried to work on internally? Is your... Do you think your AG would support data privacy legislation, or do you think that that's something they just wouldn't get behind?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>No, I think the AG would support it. I think the AG, if given a couple of full-time positions that would focus directly on this. They can certainly find the folks that... The number of privacy attorneys is growing and the number of folks that have interest in it is growing. So, I think we can find the talent to take up these issues. And, you know, when you're looking at the state analog to, like, the FDC and Consumer Protections and Section 5, that's already embedded within Arizona. So, we have something that's pretty close to it. This is just another subset of consumer protection. So, I am hopeful that the AG</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>will be on board. I need to start that dialog with them over the summer to make sure that this is something that they would want. But then again, you know, after next year we're coming up on another election. There will be a new AG and the temperament of the new one is anybody's guess.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Interesting. You know, you broke in our pre-meeting – you actually broke news to me, which I hadn't heard of yet, which is that Uniform Law Commission is coming out with its draft privacy legislation. Could you just kind of bring us up to speed on that based on what you know?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yeah. So, what I understand, Uniform Law Commission has gone through the drafting phase and they have at least a preliminary draft out for comment that will be a model of data protection and consumer data protection. And I think they intended to get the final version out in September. And the really interesting discussion point will be whether other states pick up the Uniform Law Commission's bill and just run it as is in their states. And there's... The nice thing about the draft bills that come out of, like, the Uniform Law Commission is that they have almost an implied acceptability for folks that don't know data privacy. They have kind of an implied vetting and value because they've already gone through this process. And I've seen Arizona, in a lot of different aspects, whether it be insurance or something like UCC, you know, just taking those uniform laws and just running them straight. So, it might be more palatable to states that haven't touched on this topic, that are not inclined to do a lot of research, and just to pick up a Uniform Law Commission bill, run it and pass it as is.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>And it's also – we've talked about this before – but it's also kind of interesting because, you know, is it, is it almost too late? Or, does it, does the fact that Colorado and Virginia have used the Washington model, you know, does that create a tension of, like, states who would pick up the Uniform Law Commission model? Other states will pick up the one that's already been enacted and then you have the opposite impact of what you wanted, which is it's not uniform if there's two different models plus the CCPA. In your mind, do you think, you know, when you look at your bill for next year, do you think you'll look to run something like the Uniform Law Commission bill? Or, something like the Colorado bill? Or, something different, unique to Arizona?</p>



Speaker	Statement
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yeah, that's another great question. I will – in the bill that I drafted – I will roll up some of the best parts of Colorado and Virginia and just kind of keep making it better based on the newest information that we have, of what works and what doesn't. But, you know, I was considering also dropping the Uniform Law Commission bill in parallel with mine just to see which one gets more traction. There's no harm in dropping more than one on a topic and seeing which one gets across the finish line.</p> <p>Yeah, getting legislation passed is such a really strange animal and there's so many personalities involved. I don't really care if – as long as we get something on the books, an idea to work from so that we can engage in these conversations with consumers in the business community to move forward, I'm not – I don't really have too much preference which one gets through.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Yeah, and let's talk about those conversations that kind of... Another topic I wanted to ask you about, which is – and I don't need you to name names or anything like that – but sort of that, like, inside baseball conversation of, you know, who are the types of entities that come to you and want to talk about these bills and lobby for it or against it? I mean, who's knocking on your door when these bills drop?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Man, it seems like I caught flak from everybody, from every different aspect. So, big corporations, like, major worldwide corporations that are already complying with GDPR and CCPA, some of them came and said, "You know what, we don't...we are going to oppose this." But the interesting thing is, they don't oppose it outright. They'll get a proxy company, a smaller company, to come in and make all of their statements and oppose it. And those kind of things, once you get to know the players and the lobbyists, it becomes pretty clear who's doing what.</p> <p>There were some major companies, some worldwide companies, that said, "Yeah, this is great. We like it. We like how it interlocks. We're in full support." There were some privacy advocate folks, both some private entities and then just private parties that came in and said, "This doesn't go far enough. We're going to oppose it." Really, it's a really, really fascinating process and just, it's such a difficult task to make everyone happy. But I think that is, when everyone is a little bit</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>unhappy, that's kind of your sweet spot because everyone is giving up something. And the more that we're talking about it, the better the bill gets. The more amendments you can have to it, the more corrections to the nuances, the better bill that you're going to get because it includes all of the needs and all of the considerations of all the various parties. I don't want to just draft and pass a bill that's just me writing it. It has to be kind of community input. So, I'm happy for all the voices that come in.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>It's fascinating that concept you just said about everybody's got to be a little bit unhappy at the end of the day to make a good bill, right? I mean, that's probably, on this topic that's probably right. I mean, that's probably when, when you've got a good bill everybody's unhappy and everybody's happy at the same time, right?</p> <p>Are there aspects that you think have to be in a privacy bill? So, for example, you know, we've got various concepts, right? Like transparency notices, contractual provisions of transferring personal data to processors, the data protection impact assessment that's going to be in the Colorado/Virginia model. And obviously the rights – you know, deletion access, portability, opting out of sale or target advertising, or however you want to phrase those. I mean, is there something that you feel like, if this isn't in a bill, there's no point in doing it?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yes. The kind of the lodestone, the guiding star of my bill, was informed consent. Just let folks know ahead of time and let them make the choice based on being transparent about what is going to happen with their data. But I think all of those topics have to be included. Every one that you mentioned, all of those topics, have to be included. But they have to be included in a way that is easily digestible by the layman because businesses are going to have to interpret the law and apply it, and consumers are going to have read the law and be able to work with it. Whether it's deletion, or notice of what's being held, or correction – any of those topics – the end consumer is who the bill has to be written for because they're the ones that are going to be affected by it. And so, the phrasing, definitions, all of it has to be very – I don't want to say using common language – but using language that folks can just pick up and say, "Okay, I understand this. Let's run with it." Because, you know, what we saw with California, the more complicated and the longer it gets, the more that you start losing folks. And</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>when people don't understand it, they tend to oppose it more. So, the more basic and elegant and simple and straightforward you can make it, the better off it's going to be.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Yeah, that's a great point. Two other topics I want to touch on before I let you go. And thank you profusely for joining us today. You know, you and I first met through a presentation I did at the NCSL. I think listeners would be interested in sort of, like, how that committee works, your role in that committee, the role of all the lawmakers in that committee. Just to keep – and my understanding is it keeps you guys informed, lets you hear about the developments in other states, those types of things. But could you just kind of, like, backfill a little bit about what that is and your role there?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>Yeah, absolutely. So, every state obviously has its own legislature – the House and the Senate. And the NCSL is the National Conference of State Legislatures and it brings together lawmakers to talk about topics that affect the – not only their states, but the entire U.S. And I was brought in, I think, because of my, not only my work on a data privacy bill, but because I am an attorney and I do data privacy work and I am IAPP/US or CIPP/US and we're talking about the best practices to bring data privacy to the individual states. So, it's really a great forum to bring all of us together – legislators that are working on these topics – to discuss things, to figure out best practices. We were working on definitions to make sure that we have better conformity throughout the states on how the definitions apply and who they apply to. And, you know, presentations like yours are incredibly informative on just giving us a breadth of knowledge that we might not otherwise have.</p>
<p><b>David Stauss</b></p>	<p>Do you separately talk with other lawmakers about, you know, their bill, status of their bills, those types of things? Is that part of your routine, or is that not something that you do?</p>
<p><b>Domingo DeGrazia</b></p>	<p>It is. It is. I reached out – and two, three years ago, I reached out to some of the lawmakers in California and in Washington state up to Senator Reuven Carlyle and I just asked them, like, "What are you facing? What are the pitfalls and the hurdles?" I don't need to reinvent the wheel here, but it's always informative to know what traps are lying ahead. And, you know, it's like going into trial. If it's a topic that other attorneys have some specialty in, you might as well ask them how they</p>



Speaker	Statement
	<p>handled it in trial and what to look out for. And they were very gracious. They were very helpful in letting me know what they were looking at and who was in support and who was opposing. So, yeah, I definitely try to stay in touch with my colleagues across the U.S.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>And so, last topic, then, that I'm going to ask you about. You mentioned that you practiced in this area of law, got your CIPP/US. How did you get interested in privacy law? What's your pathway to privacy and how did you get interested in running this bill?</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Right. So, I came through... Growing up, I've always been interested in technology and computers and I work with, you know, Windows and Raspberry Pi and all the microelectronics. And so, the application of technology and how we gather data is something that's been an interest of mine for years and years. Now, my wife is, she's on the cybersecurity side of things. She runs an incident response team. So, it's kind of in our household, you know, just data and information. And the consumer protection aspect is something I think that's pretty well embedded in me. And when I got elected to the legislature, it was a natural step for me to just try to protect consumers in the way that I best understand the world to be. And there really is no one else at our Arizona legislature that really fully understands this so I felt a bit obligated to start the discussion and start bringing bills on it.</p>
<b>David Stauss</b>	<p>That's fascinating. Well, Representative, we've gone much further than I thought we would, time-wise, as a credit to your deep understanding of this topic. I'd like to thank you for again joining us today. And, if you don't mind, I think we'll probably reach back out to you when the legislative session starts again next year and kind of see where things stand with your bill.</p>
<b>Domingo DeGrazia</b>	<p>Yeah, absolutely. There's so much more that we can talk about, so many more nuances. I appreciate your depth of knowledge here and just chatting with me about it. It's been a lot of fun.</p>

