

March 6, 2025

House Committee of Reference on Health & Human Services
Colorado General Assembly
200 E Colfax Avenue, Room HCR 0112
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Chair Brown, Vice Chair Lieder, and members of the committee:

The Taxpayers Protection Alliance (TPA) writes today to urge you to oppose S.B. 25-086, a bill that just passed the Senate and was assigned to your committee, which threatens to impose large and unworkable compliance costs and would endanger the privacy of both your adult and underage constituents. TPA is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to educating the public through the research and analysis about the government's effects on consumers and the economy.

S.B. 25-086 is a blunderbuss of a bill, containing many provisions — including many bad ones — that deserve to be debated separately. Taken together, the bill's proposals would create massive and, in some cases, unfeasible compliance burdens. For example, the bill's data-sharing provisions could force online platforms to disclose algorithmic information or trade secrets. Regulation never comes without tradeoffs. Although transparency is often desirable, the costs of mandating it in this case are likely to greatly exceed any benefits.

Moreover, this bill will likely push platforms towards online age verification, forcing children and their parents to offer up sensitive personal data to online platforms. Advocates of one age verification argue that it is an analogue to an offline ID check at a bar or tobacco store. However, uploading and memorializing a photo of government documents, or scanning one's face, creates a far greater threat to privacy than merely flashing an ID to a bouncer.

Given the age verification software now commercially available, the privacy and data-security dangers that would attend this process cannot be dismissed. Endangering the privacy and data security of Colorado's children — making them more vulnerable to identity thieves and other criminals — cuts directly against the intentions of S.B. 25-086's advocates. But these new dangers — although unintended — would be utterly foreseeable effects of the bill becoming law.

S.B. 25-086 would also violate the First Amendment rights of adult users forced to submit to age verification as a precondition to accessing constitutionally protected speech online. Courts have ruled time and time again that age-verification mandates — both implicit and explicit — are unconstitutional. Supreme Court caselaw on this front stretches back decades. And in the last few years alone, age-verification laws enacted in California, Texas, Arkansas, Ohio, and other states have run squarely into injunctions.

Additionally, S.B. 25-086 could significantly deter online platforms from providing their services in Colorado. By making violations of these new requirements a "deceptive trade practice" under the Colorado Consumer Protection Act, S.B. 25-086 opens up the possibility for multiple lawsuits against companies. The Consumer Protection Act grants individuals with a private right of action. This would expose platforms to insurmountable legal risk and leaves them vulnerable to frivolous lawsuits. These costs could very easily upend a platform's business model, particularly startups and small businesses, so they might be better off leaving the market and potentially geo-blocking their sites from Coloradans, depriving them of products and services that they ultimately find beneficial.

As policymakers work to create laws in the digital age, it is important to think of the second- and third-order consequences of proposed regulations. Failing to do so can produce a bill like S.B. 25-086, which in the name of

TAXPAYERS
PROTECTION
ALLIANCE

protecting children would actually put their privacy in danger. Trying to do too much, all at once, without fully considering the issues, can only hurt Coloradan users.

TPA appreciates your attention to this crucial issue and would welcome further conversations with you and your offices.

Sincerely,



David Williams
President



March 11, 2025

House Health and Human Services
Attn: Elijah Chadioun
Colorado State Capitol
200 E Colfax Ave.
Denver, CO 80203

Re: SB 25-086 – "Protections for Users of Social Media" (Oppose)

Dear Chair Brown and Members of the House Health and Human Services Committee:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), I write to respectfully oppose SB 25-086 in advance of the House Health & Human Services Committee hearing on March 12, 2025. CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.¹ Proposed regulations on the interstate provision of digital services therefore can have a significant impact on CCIA members.

CCIA firmly believes that children are entitled to greater security and privacy online. Our members have designed and developed settings and parental tools to individually tailor younger users' online use to their developmental needs. For example, various services allow parents to set time limits, provide enhanced privacy protections by default for known child users, and other tools allow parents to block specific sites entirely.² This is also why CCIA supports implementing digital citizenship curricula in schools, to not only educate children on proper social media use but also help teach parents how they can use existing mechanisms and tools to protect their children as they see fit.³

However, protecting children from harm online does not include a generalized power to restrict ideas to which one may be exposed. Speech that is neither obscene to young people nor subject to other legitimate laws cannot be suppressed solely to protect young online users from ideas or images that a legislative body disfavors.⁴ While CCIA shares the goal of increasing online safety, this bill continues to present the following concerns:

Requirements under SB 25-086 are not administrable or well defined, creating serious compliance questions for both businesses and users.

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

¹ For more than 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than \$100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at <https://www.ccianet.org/members>.

² Competitive Enterprise Institute, *Children Online Safety Tools*, <https://cei.org/children-online-safety-tools/>.

³ Jordan Rodell, *Why Implementing Education is a Logical Starting Point for Children's Safety Online*, Disruptive Competition Project (Feb. 7, 2023),

<https://project-disco.org/privacy/020723-why-implementing-education-is-a-logical-starting-point-for-childrens-safety-online/>.

⁴ *Erznoznik v. City of Jacksonville*, 422 U.S. 205, 212–14 (1975). See also *FCC v. Pacifica Found.*, 438 U.S. 726, 749–50 (1978); *Pinkus v. United States*, 436 U.S. 293, 296–98 (1978).



concept as vague as “context,” a covered social media platform cannot know in advance whether it is complying with the law or not. Such a provision is too vague to meet the Due Process Clause’s requirements.

Furthermore, this bill contains extensive compliance requirements that will worsen user experience, compromise user privacy, and inhibit businesses’ ability to improve their products and services. The bill’s extensive mandates include requirements that users reconfirm their age every 30 minutes and extremely burdensome annual reports that go far beyond conventional transparency reports.⁵ The bill requires reporting on extraordinarily granular user information that services may not possess or retain, including users’ gender, arbitrary age classifications like 22-30 or 31-44 years old, various slim percentiles including “ninety-nine and nine-tenths”, and data at narrow bands like “one-hour increments” and “thirty-minute increments”.

By forcing businesses to collect and retain information they would not otherwise keep, this provision further jeopardizes user privacy—for all users, but especially minors. The bill requires websites to not just take down but keep down accounts (“prevent the user from operating, registering, establishing, or opening an account or profile”), effectively requiring businesses to monitor their consumers more intrusively. Sites are also required to keep a staffed hotline on search warrants for continuous availability, including 24-hour turn-around time.

If enacted, SB 25-086 may result in denying services to all users under 18, curtailing their First Amendment rights and ability to access information and support.

The extensive mandates discussed above could incentivize businesses to simply prohibit minors from using digital services rather than face potential legal action and hefty fines for non-compliance. The First Amendment, including the right to access information, is applicable to teens.⁶ Moreover, requiring businesses to deny access to social networking sites or other online resources may also unintentionally restrict children’s ability to access and connect with like-minded individuals and communities. For example, children of certain minority groups may not live in an area where they can easily connect with others that represent and relate to their own unique experiences, so an online central meeting place where kids can share their experiences and find support can have positive impacts.⁷

As explained above, CCIA believes that an alternative to solving these complex issues is to work with businesses to continue their ongoing private efforts to implement mechanisms such as daily time limits or child-safe searching so that parents can have control over their own child’s social media use.

⁵ Compare §§ 2.6-1-1604, 2.6-1-1605 with Virginia Consumer Data Protection Act, Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-580 (2025) and Connecticut Data Privacy Act, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-529b (2024) (preserving compliance accountability through far less invasive measures).

⁶ See, e.g., *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 874-75 (1997).

⁷ *The Importance of Belonging: Developmental Context of Adolescence*, Boston Children’s Hospital Digital Wellness Lab (Oct. 2024), <https://digitalwellnesslab.org/research-briefs/young-peoples-sense-of-belonging-online/>.

Age verification requirements for online businesses are currently being litigated in several jurisdictions.

When the federal Communications Decency Act was passed, there was an effort to sort the online population into children and adults for different regulatory treatment. That requirement was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court as unconstitutional because of the infeasibility.⁸ After 25 years, age authentication still remains a vexing technical and social challenge.⁹

Recent state legislation that would implement online age verification or estimation measures is currently facing numerous constitutional challenges, and numerous federal judges have placed laws on hold until these challenges can be fully reviewed, including in Arkansas, California, Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah.¹⁰ CCIA anticipates that these forthcoming rulings may clarify which age determination requirements are Constitutionally permissible. CCIA therefore recommends that lawmakers permit this issue to be more fully examined by the judiciary before burdening businesses with legislation that risks being invalidated and passing on expensive litigation costs to taxpayers.

The proposed regulations would impose duplicative responsibilities on businesses without tangible consumer benefits and raise concerns about free expression and safety.

SB 25-086 would require companies to compile and submit annual reports about their policies and user violations, an obligation which courts have also found to raise First Amendment concerns.¹¹ Additionally, many digital services already voluntarily and regularly publish detailed transparency reports on their websites.¹² The Digital Trust and Safety Partnership (DTSP) has developed a set of best practices for enhancing trust and safety online, and assesses its partners' adherence to these practices. DTSP partners are expected to commit to transparency, content moderation disclosures, and other detailed safety recommendations.¹³

Further, it is not clear who would have access to these required reports. Although they are supposed to be submitted to the Attorney General, "may be made available to the public at the Attorney General's discretion." The designs, algorithms, and features that would be required to be disclosed under this bill are considered proprietary information, containing trade secrets and other kinds of intellectual property. Without a further definition of who would be receiving these reports and how they would be maintained, provisions may be both overly prescriptive

⁸ *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 855-57, 862 (1997).

⁹ Jackie Snow, *Why age verification is so difficult for websites*, Wall St. J. (Feb. 27, 2022), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-age-verification-is-difficult-for-websites-11645829728>.

¹⁰ See, e.g., *NetChoice v. Bonta*, No. 24-cv-07885, 2025 WL 28610 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 2, 2025); *NetChoice v. Bonta*, No. 22-cv-08861, 2024 WL 5264045 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2024); *NetChoice, LLC v. Reyes*, No. 23-cv-00911, 2024 WL 4135626 (D. Utah Sept. 10, 2024); *NetChoice, LLC v. Fitch*, No. 24-cv-00170, 2024 WL 3276409 (S.D. Miss. July 1, 2024); *NetChoice, LLC v. Yost*, 716 F. Supp. 3d 539 (S.D. Ohio 2024); *NetChoice, LLC v. Griffin*, No. 23-cv-05105, 2023 WL 5660155 (W.D. Ark. Aug. 31, 2023); *Comput. & Commc'ns Indus. Ass'n et al. v. Paxton*, No. 24-cv-00849, 2024 WL 4051786 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 30, 2024).

¹¹ See, e.g., *X v. Bonta*, 116 F.4th 888 (9th Cir. 2024).

¹² See, e.g., DTSP, *The Safe Assessments: An Inaugural Evaluation of Trust & Safety Best Practices* 37 (July 2022), https://dtspartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/DTSP_Report_Safe_Assessments.pdf (Appendix III: Links to Publicly Available Company Resources).

¹³ DTSP, *The Safe Framework Specification 7-23* (July 2024), https://dtspartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/DTSP_Safe-Framework-Specification-7.15.pdf.



and counterproductive to the legislation’s intended goals – rather than protecting children from harmful content, they might have the unintended adverse consequence of giving nefarious foreign agents, purveyors of harmful content, and other bad actors a playbook for circumventing digital services’ safety mechanisms. CCIA recommends narrowing the type of information requested in the reports and to whom this information is shared to allow businesses to be more candid, avoid overburdening regulators and businesses, and protect potentially sensitive information.

* * * * *

We appreciate the Committee’s consideration of these comments and stand ready to provide additional information as the Legislature considers proposals related to technology policy.

Sincerely,

Aodhan Downey
State Policy Manager, West
Computer & Communications Industry Association



March 12, 2025

The Honorable Kyle Brown
House Committee on Health and Human Services
Room 0112, Colorado State Capitol
200 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203-1784

Re: Amend SB 86

Dear Chair Brown and members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Chamber of Progress, a tech industry association supporting public policies to build a more inclusive society in which all people benefit from technological advances, I respectfully urge you to **amend SB 86** to address challenges that could hinder the effectiveness and enforcement of this crucial measure to protect young people online.

Thank you for your attention to the critical issues harming young people, including the sex trafficking of minors – a serious and urgent problem that has no place in our society – and we commend the effort to address it through thoughtful legislation such as this bill.

While we support the bill's intent, we have concerns regarding its practical implementation and potential constitutional issues.

Practical challenges in SB 86

First, we ask you to reconsider the defined timeframe for platforms to act on requests. The requirement to determine a violation within 72 hours may pose significant implementation challenges and raise First Amendment concerns. Instead, we recommend revising the language to require action "as quickly as practicable," allowing platforms to be considerate and meticulous in their review while maintaining the bill's intent.

S. 86 needs more clarification

Additionally, we seek clarification on the necessity and feasibility of certain reporting requirements in SB 86. For example, in 6-1-1605, SB 86 mandates disclosure of "on average how many notifications were sent with respect to the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 90th, 99th, and 99.9% of minor users from 8 a.m. – 3 p.m.," raises several concerns:

- The definition of the 10th percentile of minor users is unclear and may lead to inconsistent interpretations.
- Notifications can be sent for a variety of reasons, many of which are beneficial, such as safety alerts or educational reminders, making this metric potentially misleading.
- The requirement to report "on average" is vague, and it is unclear what specific measurement is expected, which could lead to challenges in compliance.

We believe that refining SB 86's reporting provisions will improve the bill's clarity and effectiveness while avoiding unintended consequences.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to **amend SB 86**. We appreciate your leadership on this important issue and are happy to work with you to ensure that the final version of this bill effectively protects young people while remaining practical and enforceable.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. C. Marshall", enclosed within a hand-drawn oval shape.

Kouri Marshall
Director of State & Local Public Policy, Central/Southern Region
www.progresschamber.org

House Health & Human Services

03/12/2025 01:30 PM

SB25-086 Protections for Users of Social Media

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
<p>Marta Loachamin For Boulder County</p>	<p>I am Boulder County Commissioner Marta Loachamin and am testifying in support of Senate Bill Eighty Six on behalf of myself and Boulder County. I am a Latina, a mother, a former educator, a businesswoman, and an elected official. My constituents 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>But the truth is, most Americans support better regulation of social media. 8 in 10 saying more needs to be done to increase transparency, ensure privacy, and protect children, including 84 percent of Republicans and 83 percent of Democrats. [1] And 97 percent of Latino parents support strengthening safety standards required for social media platforms to make them safer for children of all ages.[2]</p> <p>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. This bill ensures social media platforms provide timely responses to warrants, and basic information to users on the platforms' policies regarding criminal activity on the platform such as illegal firearm sales and illegal drug sales.</p>

	<p>Boulder county respectfully requests your support of Senate Bill 86 and these safety and consumer protections.</p>
--	---

Testimony for SB25-086 Protections for Users of Social Media
Katie Paul, Tech Transparency Project

Dear Chairperson brown and Honorable Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about the impacts of social media on children. My name is Katie Paul and I am the director of the nonprofit Tech Transparency Project based in Washington, DC, a non-partisan research organization that investigates the influence and impact of big tech on the public.¹ I am speaking in a neutral capacity on this bill and will be presenting findings from our investigations into major platforms and what those studies have yielded.

TTP's research has found that big tech platforms have not only amplified harm to children but profited in the process. Investigations in 2021 and 2022 by TTP found widespread drug trafficking on Instagram that was algorithmically pushed to kids under 16.² Meta's platform design and algorithms make it easier for kids to contact drug dealers than to log off of the platform.

The study found that while it only takes two clicks for a teen to find and connect with a drug dealer on Instagram, it takes five clicks to log out of the platform. Instagram's automated technologies also undermine the company's own efforts to address drugs. For instance, while Instagram banned hashtags for popular drugs like #mdma, its

¹ Tech Transparency Project: <https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/>

² Dec. 7, 2021. "Xanax, Ecstasy, and Opioids: Instagram Offers Drug Pipeline to Kids"
<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/xanax-ecstasy-and-opioids-instagram-offers-drug-pipeline-kids>

At a Senate Commerce Committee hearing in Dec. 2021, Sen. Mike Lee (R-UT) questioned Instagram CEO Adam Mosseri about TTP's research showing how easily teens can access drugs on Instagram.

<https://www.lee.senate.gov/2021/12/sen-lee-grills-instagram-ceo>

Sen. Josh Hawley (R-MO) wrote to Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg on Jan. 12, 2022, regarding TTP's report on teen access to drugs on Instagram.

https://static.foxnews.com/foxnews.com/content/uploads/2022/01/V2_2022-01-12-LETTER-Zuckerberg-Teen-Drugs_JDHsigned.pdf

May 17, 2022. "Spot Check: Instagram's Drug Pipeline for Teens"

<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/spot-check-instagrams-drug-pipeline-teens>

A June 2022 Federal Trade Commission report to Congress, "Combating Online Harms Through Innovation," cited TTP's research on Instagram's role as a drug pipeline to kids.

https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/Combating%20Online%20Harms%20Through%20Innovation%3B%20Federal%20Trade%20Commission%20Report%20to%20Congress.pdf

Reps. Lori Trahan (D-MA) and Jay Obernolte (R-CA) cited TTP reports on kids' access to drugs on Instagram and Facebook in a bipartisan letter, as they sought President Biden's support for an international center for cross-platform research.

https://trahan.house.gov/uploadedfiles/international_research_center_final.pdf

search auto-fill feature would recommend alternative hashtags for those drugs—driving kids directly toward dealers.

The problem isn't just platform design. Meta also **profits** from pushing drugs to kids. A series of TTP investigations found that Facebook routinely approved ads pushing pill parties, alcohol, gambling, vaping, and extreme weight loss to kids under the age of 18.³

Meta's primary business model relies on advertising, and the company does little to implement safety when it comes to ads. In July of last year, TTP published a report that found that Meta has run hundreds of ads for deadly drugs like cocaine and fentanyl.⁴

³ May 4, 2021. "Pills, Cocktails, and Anorexia: Facebook Allows Harmful Ads to Target Teens" <https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/pills-cocktails-and-anorexia-facebook-allows-harmful-ads-target-teens>

July 27, 2022. "Facebook Restricts Ad Targeting for Kids" – In response to TTP's May 2021 report, Meta began restricting ad interest targeting for teens.

<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/facebook-restricts-ad-targeting-for-kids>

At a House Energy & Commerce consumer protection hearing on July 28, 2021, Rep. Lori Trahan cited a TTP report about how Facebook allowed ads for smoking, pill parties and extreme weight loss to target children as young as 13 across the U.S.

<https://www.congress.gov/117/meeting/house/113972/documents/HHRG-117-IF17-Transcript-20210728.pdf>

Oct. 1, 2021. "Facebook's Repeat Fail on Harmful Teen Ads"

<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/facebooks-repeat-fail-harmful-teen-ads>

Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA), in a letter to Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg on Oct. 4, 2021, highlighted TTP's report on harmful Facebook teen ads.

https://www.markey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/final_markey_letter_pdf_-_fb_teen_ad_targetting.pdf

Sen. Mike Lee (R-UT) discussed TTP's report on harmful Facebook ads that target teen users, at a Senate consumer protection hearing on Oct. 5, 2021, with Facebook whistleblower Frances Haugen.

https://x.com/TTP_updates/status/1445419721084526592

A March 2022 Congressional Research Service report, "Children and the Internet: Legal Considerations in Restricting Access to Content," cited TTP's research on how Instagram allows drug-related content to target teens. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47049>

A July 2022 report commissioned by the UK Department of Digital, Culture, Media, and Sport on the state of the online advertising market highlighted TTP's research on harmful Facebook ads targeting teens.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/110740/9/DCMS_-_OAP_support_-_Final_report_-_Accessible_for_publication_-_28.9.2022.pdf

Sens. Ed Markey (D-MA) and Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) cited TTP's research on harmful Facebook ads targeting teen users in a March 1, 2023, letter to Mark Zuckerberg, as they called on Meta to halt plans to open its Horizon Worlds metaverse to teens.

https://www.markey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/senator_markey_blumenthal_letter_to_zuckerberg_on_meta_-_030123pdf.pdf

Jan. 30, 2024. "Meta Approves Harmful Teen Ads with Images from its Own AI

Tool" <https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/meta-approves-harmful-teen-ads-with-images-from-its-own-ai-tool>

As part of a Senate Judiciary hearing on Big Tech and child safety, Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA), in written questions to Meta on Apr. 19, 2024, cited TTP's report about the company approving harmful teen ads with images from its own AI tool. https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2024-01-31_-_qfr_responses_-_zuckerberg1.pdf

⁴ July 31, 2024. "Meta Allows Drug Ads Selling Everything from Opioids to Cocaine"

<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/meta-allows-drug-ads-selling-everything-from-opioids-to-cocaine>

These ads are not simply content posted by third parties; Meta had reviewed, approved, and is profiting from these messages.

And the problem isn't limited to ads for drugs. In October, TTP found that Meta was also running hundreds of ads for weapons, in some cases amounting to international arms trafficking. These were not ads for big box stores or local gun dealers; they were illicit ads selling ghost guns, fully automatic weapons, and illegal gun parts.⁵ These ads not only help put illegal, trafficked weapons in the hands of people across the country—they also undermine the business of legitimate, licensed gun dealers.

Ads for both guns and drugs follow the same pattern: They feature an image or video of the illicit content and link to a private messaging service like Telegram or WhatsApp (which is also owned by Meta) to conduct transactions. But Meta is perhaps the most critical piece of this puzzle: The dealers buy ads from Meta to get their product in front of as many people as possible. They could not attain that reach without the help of Facebook or Instagram.

Thank you for your time.

July 31, 2024. "Meta Has Run Hundreds of Ads for Cocaine, Opioids and Other Drugs"

<https://www.wsj.com/tech/meta-cocaine-opioids-ads-dea8e0fc>

Despite TTP's July 2024 report, Meta continued to run dozens of ads for deadly substances. TTP memorialized the ongoing trafficking of drugs through Meta ads in a thread on X.

https://x.com/TTP_updates/status/1819059361504788903

In an Aug. 15, 2024, bipartisan letter to Mark Zuckerberg led by Rep. Tim Walberg (R-MI), lawmakers cited TTP's July 2024 report on meta drug ads to ask the company's CEO questions about the ongoing issue. <https://walberg.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/walberg.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/Congressional%20Letter%20to%20Meta%20-%20Illicit%20Drug%20Advertising.pdf>

In Sept. 2024, Rep. Walberg spoke to CBS and shared a copy of Meta's response, telling the media outlet that Meta's replies were to the Aug. 15 bipartisan letter were unacceptable.

<https://www.cnbc.com/2024/09/12/congressman-slams-meta-over-response-about-illicit-drug-ads-on-apps.html>

On Oct. 31, 2024, Sen. Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH) sent a bipartisan letter to Mark Zuckerberg regarding the ongoing trafficking of drugs on meta platforms through paid ads.

https://www.shaheen.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/shaheen_bipartisan_colleagues_call_on_mark_zuckerberg_to_remove_and_prevent_ads_for_illicit_drugs_on_meta_platforms.pdf

⁵ Oct. 7, 2024. "From Glocks to Ghost Guns: Meta Approves Hundreds of Ads Selling Firearms"

<https://www.techtransparencyproject.org/articles/from-glocks-to-ghost-guns-meta-approves-hundreds-of>

Oct. 7, 2024. "Everytown Recommendations to Curb Gun Sales Across Meta Platforms"

<https://everytownsupportfund.org/everytown-recommendations-curb-ads-gun-sales-meta-platforms/>