



TECHNOLOGY  
POLICY  
INSTITUTE

## 2023 TPI Aspen Forum Fireside Chat with the State Attorneys Generals

Scott Wallsten:

We're going to have our final session before lunch and before the lunch keynote. So everybody settle down, it's going to be another great discussion. I'm going to very quickly introduce the panelists, and Brian thanked all the panelists before. And indeed we did not pay Brian Sullivan. In fact, what he doesn't know is that I'm going to hit him up for a donation later, so it'll be the exact opposite. So now we have a panel of state attorneys general, and the moderator of this panel will be Andy Kenney, who is a public affairs reporter from Colorado Public Radio. And he will be interviewing The Honorable Bridget Hill, who's the Wyoming Attorney General, and The Honorable Phil Weiser, who is the Colorado Attorney General. And I apologize for being so brief with everyone's introductions, but I'll keep moving. Thanks.

Andy Kenney:

Thanks so much for having me. This is a fireside chat, we've been puzzling over what that means without a fire. I think it's that I have to be a little bit nicer to you guys than I'll be to Phil during his next election forum. I thought we'd take this time to really talk about what role the states can have in regulation, what it means for states to take a stronger stance against multinational companies, what power they really even have. Let's start with a softball, though. I'm curious about what I call your internet vintages. Mine is that we probably got the CompuServe CD in the mail and I think I remember using Dogpile, the search engine, which combined Yahoo, Lycos, Alta Vista into one. We thought that was the best. So what does your internet vintage, Phil?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Well, so I think I'm actually a little older than you, so I similarly was there at the dawn. And for me, and I've met many people here in this room working at the antitrust division of the Justice Department 1996 to '98 at the dawn of the internet. And one theme that is apropos of this conference, you think back to that time, the levels of optimism and unvarnished hope for what the internet would bring. And we look back now and we see there are a lot of more darker sides and challenges. I know we'll probably talk about teen mental health and other issues, so my vintage was that utopian idea when there was the conversation, would there be any regulation of the internet at all? You remember John Barlow's Declaration of Independence on the internet.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

And my vintage ... Well, if I can just talk a little bit before vintage, I show up to college, I don't like to age myself this way. So I was a child, I want to say prodigy, but I show up to college and they assign me an email account. And I'm from a little town in Wyoming and you don't need email there. And they assign me an email account and say, "Do a password." And I said, "I'm never going to use this." And I just hit some keys. And I show up to college, that was at freshman orientation, and sure enough, they want me to use this dang thing called email. And I had to go get a password reset and it was this whole thing. So I'm that vintage, but my first internet was mostly Yahoo. But again, child prodigy, I'm not actually that old.

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

At least you didn't say your password was password. That's what I thought you would say.

Andy Kenney:

Well, it's password123. So now it's very much become both of your problems. Let's start with Google, because Wyoming and Colorado have both been involved in these various antitrust suits, Colorado much more so, involving Google. Phil, how would you define, first of all really broadly, what is the role of the states in pursuing this kind of regulation and why not leave it to the feds?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

The National Association of Attorneys General had their second meeting ever here in Colorado. It was, I believe, 1906, and the issue was the problem of the trusts. The formation of the National Association of Attorneys General and the idea of multi-state litigation started with antitrust law. Like over 100 years ago, concentration in our economy, particularly in the tech sector now, is a public policy concern. We just heard in the last panel about privacy. People are worried about what data is being collected about them, how's it being used. We'll talk about artificial intelligence like we did this morning. So the short answer is our job, my job is to represent the people of Colorado. And the people of Colorado, when they are thinking about technology, often have a series of concerns about what's happening in the tech sector. They expect their attorney general to act. And one theme that I know we'll talk about in this panel is states, and state attorneys general, in many ways they're actually better positioned to act than the federal government is.

Andy Kenney:

Bridget, how about you? How have you approached this question? I know that Wyoming's been much less involved in these Google suits. Do you see a role for Wyoming in antitrust?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Thank you. Yes, I do. I do. The important thing for Wyoming is, in case you all missed it, we're a very small state. We have less than a little under 600,000 people in our whole state. Half of you probably live in cities with more people than that. And so we're very small in terms of our citizens, but like Phil, our citizens expect to be protected as well. And my role in protecting our consumers is the same as his. We're just a little less active because we're smaller. What is good for us, though, is we have people in other states, and for instance Phil in Colorado, that will let us partner with them when we're taking on these suits. It oftentimes feels like we're a small player, but not when we collaborate with these larger states, not when we're able to pull together with them and take a look at those issues.

Andy Kenney:

Well, it's an interesting overlap. Two states that are both roughly rectangular, although we won't get into how many sides Colorado actually has. What is it, do you know, Phil? 130 something?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

It's a good trivia question. I do not know the answer.

Andy Kenney:

So one of those Google suits I believe goes to trial quite soon. You've been prominently involved in that. It's also been narrowed significantly. They dropped some of the questions and really

focused it on Google's centering of its own search engine among some other provisions in its own products. So at this point, what would a victory in that suit look like and mean?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

The short story here is that when you build up a dominant position, if you act in ways to protect your dominance that is not competing with someone on the merits but is basically creating obstacles that they don't have a fair chance to compete, you can violate section two of the Sherman Act. The Microsoft case a generation ago was a important reminder that the antitrust laws apply in the digital age. One of the things that Microsoft did there that we have the same concern about Google is, are they locking up basically channels by which the product can be distributed? In the case of Google, there are a number of agreements obviously with those who produce and who are part of the whole wireless food chain. So if you're a customer of Apple, you probably have Google as your default search engine because there is a whole lot of money being paid to keep them there.

And the question that this case will decide is, has Google taken steps that are, in the words of antitrust law, predatory, preying on others, preventing competition on the merits? And that's what the judge will be able to decide. There's another claim in the case involving the acquisition of Google and the management of an advertising platform that has made it harder for Microsoft to compete. The win is a ruling on the merits, that the antitrust laws were indeed violated and they need to be protected. And that will then occasion the need for relief. There'll obviously need to be separate proceeding there, but it's very much like what we saw a generation ago in Microsoft, and this is something that all companies need to be looking at. When you're in a dominant position, there are ways that you can't act that if you're just an upstart with very little market share, you are free to act.

Andy Kenney:

So Microsoft settled, and it is debatable how much impact that settlement had in the end, but then they ultimately did not maintain what I would call monopoly position. So did that Microsoft settlement end up mattering and will any kind of Google win end up mattering, or is the market really going to do much of the changing for you?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

The Microsoft opinion by the DC circuit was unanimous, that it violated antitrust laws. And as a matter of setting plain what the requirements of antitrust law is, the opinion is a masterpiece. I'm a little intimidated on this because I'm looking at Carl Shapiro, who has written extensively on the Microsoft remedies, paths taken, paths not taken. It is fair to say, Andy, that is a matter of great debate. What I will say as at least a first order approximation is the judgment that a company violates the antitrust laws leads them to be more careful in ways they otherwise wouldn't have been. And I do believe it's fair to say Microsoft's behavior as a company, even if the remedy wasn't all that Carl might suggest it should have been, still could have had an impact.

And of course there's an irony here. Many have observed that the rise of Google in an environment that it was more free to operate may actually owe a debt to the Microsoft litigation that kept Microsoft, let's call it in a more mindful posture, where it might have been less likely to do things that could have and would have undermined Google had it not been for that litigation.

Andy Kenney:

So Phil argues here that the suit helped to shape Microsoft's behavior essentially for the better and, for better or for worse, resulted in the combination of companies we have now. Bridget, I'm not sure how much the typical voter knows what the Attorney General does, period, but how much do you find that they associate you or AGs in general with ... Sorry, Phil, it's just true, with ...

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

I'm shocked to hear that.

Andy Kenney:

How much do you find that they associate you with digital technology, with these kinds of questions, and is it something that you think AGs should promote more as their role to the public?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

That's an interesting question, and I think it depends a little on the AG that you are, and not just how you personally view these things, but also the AG you are in your state. One of the things that is very different between Phil and I is Phil is an elected AG and I am an appointed AG, and there are only seven appointed AGs in the United States, and I happen to be one of them. And so my role is a little less public, if I could say it that way. I think it's still an important role, in a lot of ways it is similar to Phil's, but it's less public in terms of interacting with the public in terms of telling them what my priorities are. My priorities are set by statute in terms of defending the law. My priorities are protecting our consumers, which is set by statute.

My priorities in some ways are influenced by the governor that appointed me. And so those things are a little bit different based on the AG that you are and the field that you operate within your own state. And so if you were to ask me that, the Wyoming AG, do people want to see me out there taking on technology and do they believe that should be something that is first in my priority list? I would say not necessarily unless they've seen it somewhere else. So for me it would be, have they seen that as a priority from my legislature? Have they seen that as a priority from my governor, the elected officials that have indicated that's a priority? Now, that doesn't mean it's not a priority for me and it doesn't mean that that's not something I look at in my role protecting our citizens, but you see it in a very different way within Wyoming.

Andy Kenney:

One interesting thing about Wyoming is that your governor is one of quite a few who have decided to limit the use of TikTok on, I believe it's all state devices. Does that include universities?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

That's correct. No, I don't understand that, to implicate the University of Wyoming.

Andy Kenney:

In other states, in particular in Texas, that has faced a legal challenge on the basis that at universities they need access to TikTok to fully exercise their first amendment rights, to have research, more broadly to connect to global internet. And understanding that maybe it's not quite the situation in Wyoming, do you worry about a similar challenge in Wyoming? And how would you respond to that, how do you describe that balance between free speech and, say national security, state security?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Well, that's a tricky question. And I think we'll see it play out here very soon in terms of what that balance would be. When you think about free speech, regardless of who's looking at it, free speech and the first amendment is government controlling free speech. And then you think about some of this content moderation going on currently in the discussions about content moderation. Internally I think as Americans, and maybe this is just Bridget speaking, we feel some unease about that. Even if it's not government, we feel a certain amount of unease because we want people to be able to say whatever it is they're going to say. That's one of the things this country was based upon.

At the same time, in our roles as government and our roles as AGs, we've got to be looking after our citizens and our consumers, and especially our children. You've heard that on some of the panels already that you've been a part of today, that that will be a very hard balance to shake out. But the first amendment, to use a lack of a better word, is very sacred. And I hope that doesn't offend people, but it's something sacred in this country. And so I think the battle's yet to come, but I do know that it's something to be taken very seriously in terms of moderating what people say.

Andy Kenney:

Bridget, I assume you're anticipating that battle at a national level, or have you run into some trouble already in Wyoming?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

National level is what I was speaking of there.

Andy Kenney:

Very good.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

We hadn't necessarily encountered that in Wyoming yet.

Andy Kenney:

Phil, you're aware that your own governor has quite a TikTok presence. I don't know if you're on there too. Do you have a lurker account?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Our office has used TikTok for our Safe to Tell program, which is about protecting students and getting the word out about student safety. I don't have a personal TikTok account. I am, along with Bridget, investigating TikTok and Instagram for algorithms that harm teen mental health. And I would just agree with what Bridget said about the first amendment, and I'd even add what section 230 was designed to be is something important. But the algorithms that promote content is not the same as just providing a, someone mentioned last panel a bulletin board where people can post. Because algorithms can and do influence what content people consume in ways that can be quite profound.

A year ago or so, Francis Haugen from then, I'm not sure the name has changed, but now Meta, said if you're a girl on Instagram and you're looking how do you lose weight, the algorithms will show you content around self-harm and around suicide. That's a actual decision being made by a company that is different, I believe, than what section 230 was designed to protect, which is,

when you create a space for a marketplace of ideas, let people have at it. But when you're actually promoting certain content, that's something different.

Andy Kenney:

How would policing that work, though? Is it a matter of, Phil Weiser's going to legally challenge it in court and simply force them to change the algorithm? Or do you see a role for the state in actually surfacing reports of this harmful content, of getting it to TikTok and observing? What role in moderation does the state itself play?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

So there are at least two separate roles. The first one is the classic law enforcement role. The states are authorized to enforce the Child Online Privacy Protection Act, our own state laws that protect people. And that's important work that we have to do in the digital age. I believe we have every single state in this work around teen mental health. There's a wide amount of concern. And I do think, Bridget, I don't know if you'd amend your earlier remarks, but when I go talk to people and people talk about teen mental health and the concern of social media, everyone is activated by that concern. I don't believe that this is, "Oh, Phil, you care about technology so you're interested in this." We're leading this investigation in Colorado because we have expertise, but in terms of, I'm responding to an active concern, this issue, I think I find it close to the top of the list of what people are concerned about. They're worried about kids' mental health.

There's a second issue too, Andy, I would highlight, which is, we did a report recently about social media and the distribution of fentanyl. And if you go to a lot of sites, it is as easy to order fentanyl for teenagers as it is to get a pizza. And we called out companies and said, what are their policies to prevent people from staying on a platform when they're dealing fentanyl, from cooperating with law enforcement? And so one of the roles we have as state AGs and one of the tools in our toolkit is that bully pulpit or calling people out, and we recommended legislation which we'll be pursuing this session.

We also said to any of the platforms out there, "If you want to do better, you can enter into a memorandum of understanding with us to make sure you're collaborating to address the distribution of fentanyl," which if you ask what are the two top ways young people die, it's not car accidents any more. It's fentanyl poisoning and overdoses and opioids and other drugs. And it's often dying by suicide/with using often firearms. And so as I think about protecting young people, the internet connects them to both of those.

Andy Kenney:

I want to come back to that question in a bit, but first let's turn this question on its head. We hear so much about how to regulate large international companies, but I wonder about how we approach smaller companies and their data practices. So we'll talk about some state level laws. Both your states have introduced laws about data privacy, to some extent Wyoming has a data breach notification requirement. So Bridget, what's the reaction been? And especially, are those smaller companies needing a lot of education, a lot of enforcement? I imagine Google or Facebook are pretty reactive to that stuff. How do you get like the regional HVAC company to understand how to handle a data breach?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

That's a good question. Yeah, I think this would be true anywhere in the nation in terms of smaller companies that are less focused on it. You're 100% correct that big tech companies that know how to deal with that know how to deal with that. And so in Wyoming it would be a matter

of education and an understanding of what our expectations are for those folks and how to be safe with it.

One of the things you have to think about too is our own selves. I think a little bit about this, we're going to demand some conduct from businesses, from tech companies, from little businesses, but the government requires a lot of private information from individuals, a lot of data from individuals. So one of the things that I think is important for us would be for us to keep our own house in order, and in doing that, assuring the people that the information that government has access to is secure. But in doing that, to come back full circle to your question, would be to share that with some of our smaller companies, some of the companies that need help making sure they're protecting that data and personally identifiable data.

Andy Kenney:

Just briefly, have you had to fine anybody yet over that law?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Not to my knowledge, which leads me to believe no, but there's a lot swirling around up here, so I'm going to go 99.9% no.

Andy Kenney:

Oh, maybe Wyoming businesses are really good with their data. So AG Weiser, Colorado has a somewhat broader law that's still coming online around data privacy rights. It requires companies to offer these opt-outs for data collection, I think that starts next July, and it includes some requirements around, what I can tell, business practices. It says they should generally only collect data that's reasonably related to a specific business purpose, and that strikes me as a really proactive new duty that they're doing, and a lot of that happens within the company. So how are you even going to begin as a state to make sure that companies are doing that? It seems so hard to police that.

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

I want to start picking up from the last panel and acknowledge that we are living in what economists might call a second best world. In the first best world, we would have, like almost every country in the world, a national data protection law. When Congress will get around to doing this is anyone's guess. It pained me hearing that prior panel talking about how Congress is so dysfunctional, for lack of a better word. Not passing a spectrum renewal law is basically malpractice, and there's bipartisan support for data privacy laws. In Colorado it passed our state senate unanimously. And more and more states are passing these laws, and I recognize, Andy, to your question, that it's going to make compliance harder. The best world is you look to the states for what the best form of a data protection law is, and I think Colorado would be my nomination, and as long as what the feds do is as good as Colorado's law, my view is, preempt me and give me authority to enforce the federal law, which is what a number of laws do. I mentioned the Child Online Privacy Protection Act as an example.

The challenge you mentioned, Andy, is real, which is, how do we enforce this law? And just like you were talking about Bridget, we're now working hard to educate businesses about what the law requires. A lot of what the law requires is what responsible businesses should be doing and many have been doing, and you're right that there are probably some less sophisticated actors. And we've had a law on data breach and data security before that we have had to find some entities for just being rank irresponsible. The way I have said this before, and if you're a basketball fan you'd say we're not interested in ticky-tack fouls, we're going to focus on flagrant

fouls. Or a tennis fan like my dad, you'd say we're not calling foot faults here. It's really about more reckless or willful non-compliance as opposed to honest mistakes of people who are trying to get it right.

Andy Kenney:

I'll ask this to both of you in sequence, but I want to know about enforcement. So on the Colorado side, have you had to change your staffing? Have you had to start bringing software developers, data analysts on board in the AG's office, and what does that look like? How many?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

We have hired tech savvy lawyers and we have looked to often more consultants when we've done technology, but I think we've done something very close to what Bridget said, that is a real valuable innovation that my chief deputy did. Our own data security tech folks for the department of law, the lawyers who represent state agencies on data privacy and data security, and the lawyers who enforce our law in the private sector all are working together in impact team making sure we eat our own dog food. We don't want to enforce requirements that we're not doing ourselves, in the sense that we need to make sure what we're doing is reasonable and administrable.

Andy Kenney:

Has that driven up your costs and your budget? How does the state handle that?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Yes, we have had to hire new people and build the infrastructure to enforce our data privacy law. It's been an investment we've made. We've been able to track some really talented professionals, and I believe it's serving the people of Colorado very well.

Andy Kenney:

Bridget, how about you? What has this looked like? How do you prepare an AG's office in a smaller population state for these new digital kind of duties?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Yeah, it's been a little bit tough. I will say this. We haven't hired more attorneys, in part because we can't hire attorneys at all, right? In case you're all unaware, the attorney market is not great right now. So we have vacancies anyway, but we haven't hired specifically technical attorneys. What we have done is try to get the attorneys we have focused on technology by sending them to trainings, getting them up to speed in that way. One of the things that Wyoming does, it's not exactly data privacy, but one of the things that Wyoming did is they're very interested in cryptocurrencies. And so they passed a law allowing for what we call special purpose depository institutions, which would be a state chartered bank that would take custody of cryptocurrencies. And so what they need then is an attorney to understand that. And so I've had to select some of my attorneys and get them up to speed on what that looks like and what cryptocurrencies are. So that's an expense in and of itself. We have been unable to hire specifically, but I see the day when we will need to do that.

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

For the lawyers here, Wyoming is a great place to live and Bridget is a great boss. That sounds like an opportunity.



Andy Kenney:

Maybe I should have gone to law school after all.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

That's right. Any lawyers in the crowd, feel free to come on over to Wyoming.

Andy Kenney:

But doesn't it point to this imbalance you all are dealing with, where there is so much money in tech and there's comparatively less money, I would say, in government? Phil, what does that mean in the long run? Do you have to find new sources of revenue? Do you just have to hope that you keep on getting a governor who is interested in technology?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

It is a formidable challenge, and I'd offer a few thoughts. The first is, we need to make sure that we're humble about what we don't know. The risk that people in government who don't understand technology adopt rules that impair innovation and undermine new and better products and services is real. If you look at the Colorado Privacy Act, we had a first order design principle not to be prescriptive in how to follow the law. We very much focused on the principles and the outcomes we were looking for and we were committed to giving companies some flexibility in how they follow that point. You mentioned a few of the requirements of the law. We don't want to suggest there's only one way to do them.

And then I think part of what I would say is we have to be opportunistic in how we hire talent to the areas that I've looked to. I'm curious, Bridget, if you've seen this, is you can get entry level lawyers building their careers, but after you teach them about cryptocurrency or data privacy, good luck keeping them, because they're going to get ...

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Amen.

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

But then you can also get people later in their careers who have made contributions, some of you here, and then think, "I want to serve," and come back and provide service in the public sector. The rewards of public service, as many of you who have done it know, are really formidable. And in this technologically advanced area, there's a real need. I don't believe, someone suggested in the prior panel, well, isn't the market going to solve everything? That is manifestly not true on multiple dimensions, starting with data privacy that we talked about. Kids' mental health was another one. So we're going to need government oversight. And the challenge we're going to have is, how do we do it right?

Andy Kenney:

I just realized there was questions coming up on the TV.

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Although not a lot of votes for them so far.

Andy Kenney:

That's right. You've got to vote for these if you want an answer. Bridget, let me ask you the flip side of the point Phil was just making. Colorado now has very different laws for data privacy than its neighbor Wyoming. Do you see a risk of balkanization? I still find websites that are not accessible to Europeans because of GDPR. So how do you counteract that concern that we're going to end up with a fractured internet where everyone has different regulations and we can't all access the same thing?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Well, first I would acknowledge that it is a real concern, especially for the tech companies, but also smaller states like Wyoming or any state really. When you think about smaller states like Wyoming, one of the things that you have to keep in mind for us is, not only do we need to protect our consumers, but whatever we do, we need to make sure that we haven't harmed our consumers in that. When you have a small population like we do, if we do something too onerous, let's say we decide we'd like our own data privacy law in Wyoming and we go about it in some way that is not thoughtful and some way that doesn't look at what other states are doing, is there the potential that tech companies say, "Well, 600,000 people, we're good"? We need to make sure that we don't harm our consumers in the meantime.

And so one of the things, how do you counteract that, was the second part of your question. One is, be thoughtful if we're going to do this. And let me just take one slight detour here. It's hard for a Wyoming person to say this, but the people better equipped for this would be the federal government. Wyoming almost never believes the federal government's better at anything. And let me stand firm on that, so that's true. But right, a national data privacy law makes some sense for this exact reason. But back to my main point, one, you have to be thoughtful. Two for us, one of the things that worked in our cryptocurrency was to invite stakeholders really to the conversation, significantly to the conversation, and listen to what they have to say. Not, "Oh, we know better and we'll give you two minutes to tell us what you think, but we already have our mind made up."

It cannot be that conversation. It has to be a conversation with people who know what the realities of it are. And so it's being thoughtful, it's involving the proper stakeholders. And then it would be, to borrow from Phil, would be, look, we're not trying to stifle innovation here or keep people from doing what their business would allow for. So it would be, not be too heavy-handed in whatever it is you're going to do, just do it in a way that's protective of the consumers and protective of ... and I agree with Phil, teen mental health is a huge deal and it's huge in Wyoming as well. So it's protective of those interests at the same time.

Andy Kenney:

Well, thanks Bridget. Can someone tell me how we're doing on time, the schedule?

Speaker 1:

Probably about five minutes.

Andy Kenney:

Okay. Well, we've brought red and blue attorney generals together today to both ask for federal intervention. I've truly achieved something.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Don't let that get out of this room. That was just for you all. I'm teasing.

Andy Kenney:

Don't go back to Wyoming with that. So with our limited time left, Phil, let me ask you a bigger question. You talked about regulating these algorithms and bringing these companies to bear. At the same time we see a movement with, say Bluesky and Threads toward decentralized, open graphs. What are you going to do if there's nobody to regulate? If these companies are increasingly automated, potentially out of state, out of country, is there a scenario where you have very little power to do anything because there's no one behind the wheel?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Bless you. Well, if it's a for-profit entity, even if it is abroad selling in the US, they're subject to US regulation. And I don't think they can get out of regulation by saying, "Oh, our AI is running the whole thing, so we don't have any responsibility for it." That's one of the issues about artificial intelligence that we need to be mindful about, which is, what types of activities get turned over towards an AI? And there are certain high risk activities and high impact activities. A number of state AGs in a bipartisan way filed comments with the NTIA about this challenge. So I recognize that there is a lot of uncertainty, concerns, even fears about a changing technological landscape. Can regulation work? Back to where I started with the internet, I think we've shown yes, you can regulate the internet and there's a number of different examples, some cautionary.

The question is, how is it going to be done? And the failure to do things that protect people I believe will ultimately become untenable and unacceptable. And what we really are going to have is what you might call a governance challenge. How do we do it right? Because I am both afraid that we don't do it and I'm afraid that we do it wrong. And what we need are thoughtful, engaged conversations, ideally through regular order back to the state of our national legislature to produce public policies like the Colorado Privacy Act. Just like Bridget said about stakeholder engagement, we went through a process and we ended up with a law that I believe gets this right, and on these other issues we're going to have to think hard about what it looks like there as well.

Andy Kenney:

Bridget, what should we expect to see you two working together on in the future or currently?

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

Well, it's a little non-tech related, but obviously we're always open to the ideas of the bigger states that play into tech. And so when they bring those ideas to us, we like to partner where we can. I will say this, we partner on other items as well. One of the good things about Phil is his willingness to partner with folks of a different political persuasion. The last panel talked about that. Look, can we have bipartisan people come together and talk reasonably? And I would say that we are able to do that. So some of the things you will see us working on will be outside the tech.

Phil was the president of, I just have to make a plug for him because it really made an impact on me. He was the president of the Conference of Western Attorneys General, and his initiative was what he called the Ginsburg-Scalia Initiative, which is two people, as you know, very opposed in their political views but tremendous friends. And it started a conversation about ways that we could get along in terms of recognizing we have very different political views, but are there things that we can work together on and are there ways that we can avoid the polarization, the demonization? And I spoke with some panels on Phil about that, he was very gracious to invite me, and I got to know him a little better through that. And one of the things that I think I took from that was to focus on the similarities. I think if we stopped for two minutes and

thought about, what is it that Phil generally wants? Well, it's the best for his citizens within the state of Wyoming. What is it that Bridget generally wants?

The Honorable Phil Weiser:

Yeah, state of Colorado for me, but I want the best for Wyoming too. I do, I do. I want the best for Wyoming.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

He wants the best for Wyoming too, it's both.

Andy Kenney:

They're both rectangles.

The Honorable Bridget Hill:

But what does Bridget want? The best for the citizens of the state of Wyoming. Now, we see different ways to get there. We see very different ways to get there on some occasions, but that does not mean that we can't work together in instances where we agree. And based on part of his initiative, one of the things that I do is try to find, at least one a year, and that is the bare minimum, thing where I can agree with a Democrat in terms of a legal action, a letter we're going to send. And I honestly actively look for that. And so Phil got me on one recently. Somebody else got me on one recently, and I think it's an inward turn from all of us trying to do that. And so what you'll see is probably natural resources, Colorado River is a big one that we work on constantly. But I think you'll see some of those things as well. That was a long answer to a simple question and I apologize for that.

Andy Kenney:

No, it's a good note to end on. Scott, do you think we should wrap it up there? Thank you all. Thank you.