

## Testimony for the Colorado Senate Judiciary Committee by Michal Luria, Research Fellow at the Center for Democracy & Technology

Feb 19, 2025

Madam Chair, Mr Vice Chair, and members of the committee. My name is Michal Luria and I am a Research Fellow at the Center for Democracy & Technology (CDT), a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for digital rights.<sup>1</sup> In my research, I engage with young people to understand their experiences online and bring their voices into the policy conversation.

I thank you for the opportunity to respond to SB25-086, Protections for Users of Social Media.<sup>2</sup> CDT commends the effort to protect children online and is supportive of looking for ways to take action. In order to do so effectively, I would like to bring to your attention some key points that our and others' research highlight about young people's use of social media.

Youth choose to use social media primarily to connect with peers and community,<sup>3</sup> feel accepted, and find social support,<sup>4</sup> as well as to unlock their creativity, explore their views, and express themselves online.<sup>5</sup> These are all healthy and age-appropriate parts of their development. But research has also pointed to some of the risks involved in the use of social media.<sup>6</sup> The bill suggests that social media platforms should present notifications to people under 18 to help them understand the impact of social media on developing brains and on their health, based on "peer-reviewed scholarly articles" (6-1-1602). The problem is that research on the impact of social media on children is limited, and contradictory.<sup>7</sup> As a result, the effectiveness of such notifications remains uncertain, raising questions about their ability to accurately inform young users. Not only that, without a clear scientific consensus, these alerts may oversimplify issues and fail to provide meaningful guidance.

Further, this proposal prioritizes the measurement of time spent online over how that time is spent. Evidence shows that exposure to risk is complex, and does not directly map onto time

---

<sup>1</sup> Learn more about the Center for Democracy & Technology at [cdt.org](https://cdt.org).

<sup>2</sup> Colorado Senate Bill 25-086 "[Protections for Users of Social Media](#)" introduced in the Colorado Senate Judiciary Committee.

<sup>3</sup> Luria, M. and Scott, C. F. (2023). [More Tools, More Control: Lessons from Young Users on Handling Unwanted Messages Online](#). Center for Democracy & Technology.

<sup>4</sup> Vogels, Emily A., and Risa Gelles-Watnick. 2023. [Teens and Social Media: Key Findings from Pew Research Center Surveys](#). Pew Research Center.

<sup>5</sup> boyd, danah. 2010. [Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications](#). Chapter from *A Networked Self*, edited by Zizi Papacharissi.

<sup>6</sup> The U.S. Surgeon General's Advisory. (2023). [Social Media and Youth Mental Health](#).

<sup>7</sup> Valkenburg, Patti M., Adrian Meier, and Ine Beyens. [Social Media Use and Its Impact on Adolescent Mental Health: An Umbrella Review of the Evidence](#). *Current Opinion in Psychology* 44 (April 1, 2022): 58–68.



spent online.<sup>8</sup> Overall, researchers agree that “screen time” is an inaccurate proxy for harm and recommend a shift to types of activity on social media platforms,<sup>9</sup> for example, time spent actively engaging with peers online can have a different impact than passive content consumption.<sup>10</sup> One way we have identified to enhance safety on social media platforms is to equip young users with more tools and levers to navigate online risks — empowering them to protect themselves while maintaining their sense of agency.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, we agree that social media platforms should make data more available for research. In a recent symposium with top researchers of child safety online hosted by my organization, the immense gap in knowledge about current protection measures and their effectiveness in keeping users safe was consistently raised as an issue.<sup>12</sup> With some social media companies recently turning away from data-sharing programs,<sup>13,14</sup> this gap is set to widen rather than be filled. Colorado has an opportunity to help fill that gap by passing legislation to help vetted researchers study in a privacy-protective way critical questions related to how policymakers, platforms, and families can work to keep children, and all users, safe online.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

---

<sup>8</sup> Jensen, M., George, M. J., Russell, M. R., & Odgers, C. L. (2019). [Young adolescents' digital technology use and mental health symptoms: Little evidence of longitudinal or daily linkages](#). *Clinical Psychological Science*, 7(6), 1416-1433.

<sup>9</sup> Odgers, C. L., & Jensen, M. R. (2020). [Annual research review: Adolescent mental health in the digital age: Facts, fears, and future directions](#). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 61(3), 336-348.

<sup>10</sup> Burke, M., Marlow, C., & Lento, T. (2010, April). [Social network activity and social well-being](#). In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1909-1912).

<sup>11</sup> Luria, M. and Scott, C. F. (2023). [More Tools, More Control: Lessons from Young Users on Handling Unwanted Messages Online](#). Center for Democracy & Technology.

<sup>12</sup> Luria, M. & Bhatia, A. (2025). [The Kids are Online: Research-Driven Insights on Child Safety Policy](#). Center for Democracy & Technology.

<sup>13</sup> CDT joins Letter [Urging Meta to Maintain CrowdTangle](#), Election Integrity Efforts in Advance of Historic Year of Elections. (2024). Center for Democracy & Technology.

<sup>14</sup> CDT Joins Coalition for Independent Technology Research [Calling on Twitter to Maintain API Access for Researchers](#). (2023). Center for Democracy & Technology.

Madam Chair and members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony with you. I am here with Young Invincibles as one of their young advocates. My name is Khoa Nguyen. For my background, I am currently completing my MD at the University of Colorado School of Medicine and my MBA at the University of Colorado Denver Business School. Short of applying to residency and obtaining my MD, I have fulfilled all graduation, curricular, and licensure requirements expected thus far for the MD. I am here today to encourage you to **pass** the bill: SB25-086 - Protections for Users of Social Media.

Social media is a powerful tool that enhances communication, improves socialization, provides educational opportunities, and allows self-expression and identity formation. However, in its current state, social media is also a double-edged sword with detrimental, negative impacts on youth. In fact, per the National Institute of Mental Health, nearly one in five U.S. adults live with a mental illness, and the prevalence of mental health problems among youth is alarming. The NIMH has also identified the widespread use of social media as a contributing factor to this growing youth mental health crisis [1]. Per the Mayo Clinic, excessive social media use (especially at nighttime), can also disrupt healthy sleeping patterns, causing inadequate rest and contributing to mental health challenges [2]. Likewise, the Surgeon General has also described further adverse effects, including body dissatisfaction (body image issues), low self-esteem, self-harm, social comparison, and exposure to cyberbullying [3].

Despite these clearly negative effects of social media, evidence has emerged over the past several years indicating that certain social media companies have been aware of the potential negative impacts of their platforms on youth mental health but have failed to fully disclose this information to the public. In 2021, internal documents leaked from Meta illustrated that the company had conducted studies showing Instagram's adverse effects on teenagers, particularly adolescent girls [4]. Findings indicated that Instagram exacerbated body image issues and, in some cases, contributed to mental health struggles. Likewise, per the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, over 1,400 school districts have filed lawsuits against social media companies for their role in declining youth mental health [5]. Additionally, despite this lack of transparency, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine reported inadequate oversight, with companies even attempting to restrict researchers from accessing their data [6]. These issues clearly demonstrate the need for further regulations and enactment of protections for users on social media, especially with regard to our youth.

This issue hits me very close to home. In my personal life, I like to think that I have the best sister ever. She is bright, intelligent, and kind. Despite the guidance and advice from my parents and I about social media, it was inevitable that she would become further exposed to social media. Over the years that we grew up, I have watched my sister's views, identity, and thoughts, shape, evolve, and be influenced by social media. She likes to watch beauty channels on social media. More recently, she has expressed a desire to seek corrective aesthetic rhinoplasty to "improve" her nose. She has made comments including, "I hate the way my nose looks," to "My nose is too big and it bothers me". In my experience working with patients that have undergone

rhinoplasty, she has one of the best noses. Distinctively, this personal case demonstrates the detrimental effects that unregulated social media can have on our youth. It emphasizes the need for enacting regulations and protections for users on social media, and to hold social media companies more accountable about their data, their actions, and their policies.

I support SB25-086 to enforce ethical standards within social media usage and amongst social media companies. I am encouraged by the bill's measurement of the following:

1. Requiring social media companies to publish and update policies for each social media platform owned or operated by the social media company.
2. Requiring social media companies to submit to the department of law an annual report that includes information concerning published policies and violations of published policies.
3. Requiring social media companies to annually make publicly available a report that includes certain data concerning how minor users use the social media platform.
4. Requiring social media platforms to include a function that provides minor users information about their engagement in social media.

We must protect our Colorado youth's mental health through social media regulation. I implore every committee member here today to **pass** SB25-086. Thank you for your consideration. I am happy to answer any questions.

#### References

1. <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/mental-illness>
2. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/tween-and-teen-health/in-depth/teens-and-social-media-use/art-20474437>
3. <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/sg-youth-mental-health-social-media-advisory.pdf>
4. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/facebook-knows-instagram-is-toxic-for-teen-girls-company-documents-show-11631620739>
5. <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/education/2025/01/28/seeing-tie-between-youth-mps-joins-other-school-districts-in-lawsuit-against-social-media-companies/77852238007/>
6. <https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2023/12/to-minimize-harms-and-maximize-benefits-of-social-media-to-adolescent-health-new-report-recommends-setting-industrywide-standards-new-protections-against-harassment>

**Colorado SB 25-086**

**OPPOSITION TESTIMONY**

February 19, 2025

**Colorado Senate  
Senate Judiciary Committee  
Attn: Juliann Jenson  
Colorado State Capitol  
200 East Colfax Ave  
Denver, CO 80203**

**Subject: Opposition to SB 25-086, "Protections for Users of Social Media"**

Dear Chair Gonzales and Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

NetChoice is a principles-based trade association that works to make the Internet safe for free enterprise and free expression. In line with that mission, we are also dedicated to advancing policy that will effectively protect children and families online. However, for several reasons, SB 25-086 falls short of this goal. We respectfully ask that you **oppose** SB 25-086 because the bill:

- Violates the First Amendment;
- Burdens users of all ages trying to access common online services;
- Would unintentionally endanger users, particularly children.

As further outlined below, this bill would immediately invite constitutional challenges. In fact, the Supreme Court has already struck down similar laws after finding they violated First Amendment rights to receive information and to free speech. Federal courts have recently halted several similar state laws as well.

While certainly well intended, SB 25-086 presents several practical issues in addition to its constitutional concerns. The bill would force companies to either exit the Colorado market, or harvest and store sensitive information about all users, including children. Data derived from this information would then be disclosed to the government and general public, further empowering bad actors online.

## SB 25-086 violates the First Amendment

Congress passed the Communications Decency Act in 1996. The law was an attempt to restrict the access of minors to obscene content on the internet. The legislation criminalized the “knowing” dissemination of “obscene or indecent” material or knowingly sending messages “that, in context, depicts or describes, in terms patently offensive as measured by contemporary community standards, sexual or excretory activities or organs” to those under the age of 18.<sup>1</sup> It created safe harbors for those who made good faith attempts to restrict minors’ access to such content.<sup>2</sup>

The law was quickly enjoined and then struck down as unconstitutional. The federal government lost on appeal to the Supreme Court in the 9-0, landmark case, *Reno v. ACLU*. The Supreme Court held that the broad nature of the restrictions, their punitive nature, and their attachment to a medium which enjoys full First Amendment protections, among other issues, were enough to rule that the Communications Decency Act was violative of the First Amendment.

The sponsors of SB 25-086, just like Congress in 1996, are concerned with the welfare of children online. That is a laudable goal, and one that NetChoice shares. The reality however, is that the Supreme Court looks more seriously at unintended negative consequences to constitutional rights rather than well-intentioned goals. There is no question, seeing as the issues at the core of both cases are identical, that SB 25-086 would quickly meet the same fate as the Communications Decency Act.

SB 25-086 would undeniably force social media platforms to implement age verification. We echo the concerns of our colleagues at the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), who point out that many of the requirements and terms under SB 25-086 are “not administrable or well defined[.]”<sup>3</sup> As CCIA goes on to explain:

“The bill’s definitions section begins with the phrase, ‘unless the context otherwise requires,’ followed by definitions of the key terms. If the bill’s definitions can be altered based on a concept as vague as ‘context,’ a covered social media platform cannot know in advance whether it is complying with the law or not.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cornell Law school, Legal Information Institute, [Reno v. ACLU | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute \(cornell.edu\)](https://www.law.cornell.edu/USLaw/LII/LegalInformationInstitute/cornell.edu)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>3</sup> Downey, Aodhan. "Re: SB 25-086 – 'Protections for Users of Social Media' (Oppose)." Letter to Colorado Senate Judiciary Committee. Computer & Communications Industry Association, February 18, 2025.

<https://ccianet.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/CCIA-Comments-on-CO-SB-25-086-comments.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*.

The only way a platform could be sure of compliance would be to prohibit users under 18 through age verification. SB 25-086 imposes open-ended liability for not implementing perfect age verification. Moreover, Sections 6-1-1605(1)(a)(I), 6-1-1605(1)(b)(1), and 6-1-1605(2) of the bill amount to a *de jure* age verification requirement. Similar reporting provisions of a California statute were recently enjoined by a federal court in *NetChoice v. Bonta* (2024).<sup>5</sup>

Several state laws aimed at requiring age verification for online access are being challenged in federal courts on constitutional grounds. Federal judges have preliminarily blocked these laws in multiple states - including Arkansas<sup>6</sup>, California<sup>7</sup>, Mississippi<sup>8</sup>, Ohio<sup>9</sup>, Texas<sup>10</sup>, and Utah<sup>11</sup> - pending full legal review of the challenges. A similar legal challenge to SB 25-086 would bring confusion and significant cost to Colorado taxpayers. That would best be avoided.

There is an additional First Amendment concern in SB 25-086 regarding violations of a social media platforms' terms of service. Sections 6-1-1603(2)(e)(II)(B) and 6-1-1607 together diminish social media companies' editorial control over the communities they build for their users. SB 25-086 would force companies to adhere to a "number of violations" policy and, if a potential violation is reported and determined to occur, the company would have no choice but to remove the user – regardless of whether the severity of that violation merits termination. In addition, foreclosing access to social media to Coloradans *without due process* was rejected by the Supreme Court in *Packingham v. North Carolina*.<sup>12</sup> That case, it should be noted, revolved around the right of individuals convicted of heinous crimes to access online services. SB 25-086 would foreclose access to individuals who have not been charged or convicted of any crime, and is therefore unquestionably unconstitutional.

## **SB 25-086 would impact users of all ages seeking to use common and new websites**

In the unlikely case SB 25-086 survives judicial scrutiny, the bill's provision for unlimited private lawsuits under the Colorado Consumer Protection Act, including untold attorneys fees, would create

---

<sup>5</sup> *NetChoice v. Bonta* (N.D. Cal. 2024)

<sup>6</sup> *NetChoice, LLC v. Griffin* (W.D. Ark. 2023)

<sup>7</sup> *NetChoice v. Bonta* (N.D. Cal. 2024)

<sup>8</sup> *NetChoice, LLC v. Fitch* (S.D. Miss. 2024)

<sup>9</sup> *NetChoice, LLC v. Yost* (S.D. Ohio 2024)

<sup>10</sup> *Computer & Communications Industry Association v. Paxton* (W.D. Tex. 2024)

<sup>11</sup> *NetChoice, LLC v. Reyes* (D. Utah 2024)

<sup>12</sup> Cornell Law school, Legal Information Institute, [Packingham v. North Carolina | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute \(cornell.edu\)](https://www.lii.org/us/supremecourt/cases/2017-2018/packingham-v-north-carolina.html)

untenable business risks for established and upstart social media platforms. These companies would face two equally problematic scenarios:

First, they could choose to cease all operations in Colorado (or never launch in the state to begin with). This would mean potentially geo-blocking Colorado IP addresses from accessing their platforms. Such a withdrawal would significantly impact both consumers and businesses in the state, particularly small businesses reliant on the targeted advertising services provided by platforms.

Alternatively, companies would need to implement stringent age verification systems requiring government-issued identification from all users, to prove they were over 18 years old. The substantial legal risk under SB 25-086 would require maintaining extensive databases of sensitive personal information, raising privacy concerns and potentially making Colorado residents more vulnerable to data breaches. The cost of implementing and maintaining such systems would be substantial, potentially making Colorado a financially non-viable market for many companies as SB 25-086 is agnostic as to the size of the platforms covered.

Under either of the alternatives discussed above, Colorado residents would face severely restricted access to common social media services, such as Facebook Marketplace, as well as new, competing platforms. The impact would extend far beyond the bill's intended scope of protecting minors, creating significant obstacles for adults conducting business, viewing local news, or simply connecting with friends and loved ones. Local businesses that rely on these digital platforms for marketing, sales, and operations would face particular challenges, potentially affecting the state's economic competitiveness.

### **SB 25-086 would unintentionally endanger users, particularly children**

While the purported aim of SB 25-086 is “to create a safer social media environment for minors,” an undeniably noble mission, several specifics of the bill are antithetical to this goal. First, as mentioned above, SB 25-086 would require social media platforms to collect troves of additional sensitive information about all users, including children.

Age verification technology remains unproven and insufficiently secure. There are countless examples of high-profile hacks of concentrated collections of sensitive data, from the federal Office of

Personnel Management<sup>13</sup> to health insurance exchanges created by the Affordable Care Act.<sup>14</sup> Concentrating sensitive data creates a bullseye for bad actors. Age verification systems create such a target, demonstrated by the recent hack of an age verification system used in Australia to verify and store the information of adults accessing physical locations with age restrictions, such as bars.<sup>15</sup> The compliance and reporting requirements of SB 25-086, including mandatory data disclosures relating to youth usage of platforms, would necessitate creating caches of sensitive data, including personal identification, of all Colorado users *regardless of their age*.

The mandatory data disclosures within SB 25-086 create two other highly troubling complications. First, the bill requires social media platforms to publicly disclose, “in a location that is easily accessible,” a treasure trove of information about their userbases, particularly the activity of kids, and how their content moderation systems work. Platforms not only have to disclose the percentage of their userbase that are known to be minors, but at which specific hours of the day kids use the platform the most. Platforms, among several other revealing requirements, must also disclose the most frequently viewed pieces of content viewed by children. SB 25-086 therefore mandates platforms create a publicly-available road map for targeting kids. It is impossible to see how disclosing such information helps more than it harms the effort to protect children from predation from any form of harmful actor.

Finally, the reporting requirements related to unlawful content would make the prosecution of criminals more difficult. SB 25-086 would require platforms to provide an annual report to law enforcement including “the five hundred posts that received the highest number of views before the posts were actioned, including copies of the posts[.]” This mandate would run afoul of the Fourth Amendment and resembles concerns raised by legal scholars about the proposed EARN IT Act at the federal level:

“Federal law requires the providers of online services to report known CSAM to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC), which generates investigatory leads for law enforcement. The law, Section 2258A, lets providers search their services for CSAM—but, crucially, disclaims any requirement that they

---

<sup>13</sup> Sciutto, Jim, “OPM government data breach impacted 21.5 million,” CNN, July 10, 2015,

<https://www.cnn.com/2015/07/09/politics/office-of-personnel-management-data-breach-20-million/index.html>

<sup>14</sup> Mandler, C., “Following a ‘significant’ breach, DC Health Link user data is being sold on the dark web,” CBS News, March 8, 2023, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/data-breach-washington-dc-health-link-user-data-sold-dark-web-congress/>

<sup>15</sup> Kidd, Jessica, “Cybercrime detectives arrest man following alleged data breach involving more than 1 million NSW clubs customer records,” ABC News, May 1, 2024, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-05-02/clubs-nsw-cybersecurity-potential-data-breach-venues/103793584>

‘affirmatively search, screen, or scan for’ it. This limitation springs from the Fourth Amendment’s prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures, which precludes the government from having a private actor conduct a search it could not lawfully do itself. Where a private party conducts a search primarily at the government’s behest, rather than on its own initiative, it becomes an agent of the government. Those searches must abide by the Fourth Amendment’s requirements, such as that of a warrant supported by probable cause.”<sup>16</sup>

Significant pieces of evidence against harmful actors posting illegal content could be excluded at trial on Fourth Amendment grounds because of the mandated disclosure of copies of the content to Colorado law enforcement. In short, a bill intended to protect minors online from illegal and otherwise harmful content could let the most prolific and visible producers of such content walk.

\* \* \*

The problem SB 25-086 seeks to tackle is not without constitutional and practical policy solutions. Florida<sup>17</sup> and Virginia<sup>18</sup> have passed laws to facilitate specific online and social media education in the classroom. This helps arm young people and their parents with the information they need to keep their data more secure, focused on age appropriate content, and away from bad actors who would do them harm. Colorado could take steps to publicize the resources that are available to filter content or monitor and control screen time. Solutions for families and kids do not need to come in the form of government mandates.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask you to **oppose SB 25-086**. As ever, we offer ourselves as a resource to discuss any of these issues with you in further detail, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide the committee with our thoughts on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Patrick Hedger  
Director of Policy  
NetChoice

*NetChoice is a trade association that works to make the internet safe for free enterprise and free expression.*

<sup>16</sup> Pfefferkorn, Riana, Eric Goldman, Derek E. Bambauer, Ahmed Ghappour, James Grimmelmann, Thomas E. Kadri, and Brian L. Owsley. "Fourth Amendment Issues Posed by the EARN IT Act (S.1207, H.R.2732)." Letter to Chuck Schumer, Mitch McConnell, Kevin McCarthy, and Hakeem Jeffries, May 3, 2023.

<sup>17</sup> Laws of Florida Chapter 2023-36, <https://laws.flrules.org/2023/36>

<sup>18</sup> Code of Virginia § 22.1-24.1. (Effective until July 1, 2024) Internet Safety Advisory Council, <https://legacylis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?231+ful+CHAP0111+pdf>



## Board of County Commissioners

Buenas tardes Chair Gonzales,

I am Boulder County Commissioner Marta Loachamin and am testifying in support of Senate Bill 86 on behalf of myself and Boulder County. I am a Latina, a mother, a former educator, and an elected official. In one of my last invitations of Boulder County youth into the hearing room to talk about local government, students were very pointed on their belief that elected officials, including myself, must do more to eliminate gun violence. Residents in our region including Moms Demand Action members, Everytown and other orgs have repeatedly asked me to do everything in my power to prevent gun violence and I am here to request you do the same by voting yes on SB 86.

Social media is big business. Facebook alone brought in more 36 billion dollars in 2023. And just like any big dollar industry attempting to defeat regulation, social media companies will support smaller community groups to do their dirty work and fight for them against regulation. Big social media businesses, just like Big Tobacco did, will conduct “so-called research” and provide “technical assistance” to progressive groups and groups led by people of color, to make you believe there is a ground swell against regulating social media.

The truth is most Americans support better regulation of social media. **8 in 10 say more needs to be done to increase transparency, ensure privacy, and protect children, including 84 percent of Republicans and 83 percent of Democrats.** <sup>1</sup> **And 97 percent of Latino parents support strengthening safety standards required for social media platforms to make them safer for children of all ages.**<sup>2</sup>

Today is an opportunity for Colorado to stand up to Big Tech, and support consumer protections. SB 86 is a first step to stemming the violence perpetuated by these industry titans that profit off of your and my data. Suicide, domestic violence and mass murders in Colorado must end. How can we eliminate gun violence if we don't create regulation of access to guns?

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://issueone.org/press/new-poll-shows-overwhelming-bipartisan-support-for-social-media-reforms/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://salud-america.org/latino-parents-worried-about-teen-social-media-use-urge-policy-safeguards/#:~:text=The%20Brookings%20Institution%20survey%20shows,apps%20and%20social%20media%20platforms.>

**Claire Levy** County Commissioner **Marta Loachamin** County Commissioner **Ashley Stolzmann** County Commissioner

Boulder County Courthouse • 1325 Pearl Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303.441.3500 • Fax: 303.441.4525  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, CO 80306 • [www.BoulderCounty.org](http://www.BoulderCounty.org) • [commissioners@bouldercounty.org](mailto:commissioners@bouldercounty.org)

Boulder County respectfully requests your support of Senate Bill 86 and these safety and consumer protections.

Sincerely,

Marta Loachamin

Boulder County Commissioner



## Board of County Commissioners

Buenas tardes Chair Gonzales,

I am Boulder County Commissioner Marta Loachamin and am testifying in support of Senate Bill 86 on behalf of myself and Boulder County. I am a Latina, a mother, a former educator, and an elected official. In one of my last invitations of Boulder County youth into the hearing room to talk about local government, students were very pointed on their belief that elected officials, including myself, must do more to eliminate gun violence. Residents in our region including Moms Demand Action members, Everytown and other orgs have repeatedly asked me to do everything in my power to prevent gun violence and I am here to request you do the same by voting yes on SB 86.

Social media is big business. Facebook alone brought in more 36 billion dollars in 2023. And just like any big dollar industry attempting to defeat regulation, social media companies will support smaller community groups to do their dirty work and fight for them against regulation. Big social media businesses, just like Big Tobacco did, will conduct “so-called research” and provide “technical assistance” to progressive groups and groups led by people of color, to make you believe there is a ground swell against regulating social media.

The truth is most Americans support better regulation of social media. **8 in 10 say more needs to be done to increase transparency, ensure privacy, and protect children, including 84 percent of Republicans and 83 percent of Democrats.** <sup>1</sup> **And 97 percent of Latino parents support strengthening safety standards required for social media platforms to make them safer for children of all ages.** <sup>2</sup>

Today is an opportunity for Colorado to stand up to Big Tech, and support consumer protections. SB 86 is a first step to stemming the violence perpetuated by these industry titans that profit off of your and my data. Suicide, domestic violence and mass murders in Colorado must end. How can we eliminate gun violence if we don't create regulation of access to guns?

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://issueone.org/press/new-poll-shows-overwhelming-bipartisan-support-for-social-media-reforms/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://salud-america.org/latino-parents-worried-about-teen-social-media-use-urge-policy-safeguards/#:~:text=The%20Brookings%20Institution%20survey%20shows,apps%20and%20social%20media%20platforms.>

**Claire Levy** County Commissioner **Marta Loachamin** County Commissioner **Ashley Stolzmann** County Commissioner

Boulder County Courthouse • 1325 Pearl Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303.441.3500 • Fax: 303.441.4525  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, CO 80306 • [www.BoulderCounty.org](http://www.BoulderCounty.org) • [commissioners@bouldercounty.org](mailto:commissioners@bouldercounty.org)

Boulder County respectfully requests your support of Senate Bill 86 and these safety and consumer protections.

Sincerely,

Marta Loachamin

Boulder County Commissioner