ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-3641
Minority (202) 225-2927

June 20, 2025

Ms. Amba Kak
Co-Executive Director
AI Now Institute
347 5th Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Dear Ms. Kak,

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade hearing on Wednesday, May 21, 2025, to testify at the hearing entitled, "AI Regulation and the Future of U.S. Leadership."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Friday, July 3, 2025. Your responses should be mailed to Alex Khlopin, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to alex.khlopin@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

Gus M. Bilirakis
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade

cc: The Honorable Jan Schakowsky, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade

Attachment —Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Debbie Dingell (D-MI)

1. As this Committee has discussed before, artificial intelligence is advancing rapidly — transforming every sector of our economy, including health care and transportation. But with this transformation come serious challenges: data privacy risks, algorithmic bias, and the growing threat of foreign adversaries exploiting our vulnerabilities.

   We cannot afford to let Americans' data be weaponized or allow AI to spread unchecked through mechanisms like deepfakes, robocalls, and deceptive ads. That's why I was proud to help lead the bipartisan TAKE IT DOWN Act this Congress, which will hold bad actors accountable for sharing nonconsensual deepfake content online and protecting survivors.

   As my colleagues know, I'll work with anyone to get good, responsible policy across the finish line for my constituents and the American people. These are nonpartisan issues.

   But as we talk about AI and innovation, we can't ignore one of the most important applications of this technology: autonomous vehicles.

   As someone who has long worked on connected and AV issues, I believe deeply in the potential of AVs — not only to save lives and improve safety, but to expand mobility, grow our economy, and strengthen American leadership in innovation and manufacturing.

   And AI is essential to the future of autonomous vehicles. But without a comprehensive federal framework, we are risking that future. We cannot cede ground to foreign competitors.

   Ms. Kak, do you agree that we need a federal regulatory framework for autonomous vehicles so that the U.S. can innovate, compete, and lead globally?

2. If we're serious about competing globally and protecting consumers here at home, we need to get serious about federal policy.

   We still don't have a comprehensive federal AV law. Meanwhile, China is moving full speed ahead, developing and deploying its AV technology with strong centralized support.

   Ms. Kak, why is it critical that the federal government play a leading role in ensuring that industry secures consumer data and protects personal information collected by the broader universe of connected vehicles?

The Honorable Jennifer McClellan (D-VA)

1. Ms. Kak, how concerned are you about the growing consolidation of influence among a handful of companies, particularly when those same companies are putting their thumbs on the scale to shape the very regulations meant to hold them accountable?

2. Ms. Kak, what does it say about the United States' credibility to lead globally on responsible AI governance if we fail to adopt strong federal standards while actively undermining state and local regulatory frameworks?

3. Ms. Kak, given the FTC's central role in protecting consumers and ensuring competition, especially in the context of Big Tech and AI regulation, how concerned are you about recent efforts to undermine the agency's independence?

4. Ms. Kak, can you elaborate on the problem of issuing such a broad AI regulatory moratorium on states, whereby states cannot regulate how state and local law enforcement use AI to investigate and prosecute crimes, how local school districts use AI in the classroom, and cannot adopt civil laws to address the use of AI to create and disseminate nonconsensual intimate images?

The Honorable Debbie Dingell (D-MI)

1. As this Committee has discussed before, artificial intelligence is advancing rapidly — transforming every sector of our economy, including health care and transportation. But with this transformation come serious challenges: data privacy risks, algorithmic bias, and the growing threat of foreign adversaries exploiting our vulnerabilities.

We cannot afford to let Americans' data be weaponized or allow AI to spread unchecked through mechanisms like deepfakes, robocalls, and deceptive ads. That's why I was proud to help lead the bipartisan TAKE IT DOWN Act this Congress, which will hold bad actors accountable for sharing nonconsensual deepfake content online and protecting survivors.

As my colleagues know, I'll work with anyone to get good, responsible policy across the finish line for my constituents and the American people. These are nonpartisan issues.

But as we talk about AI and innovation, we can't ignore one of the most important applications of this technology: autonomous vehicles.

As someone who has long worked on connected and AV issues, I believe deeply in the potential of AVs — not only to save lives and improve safety, but to expand mobility, grow our economy, and strengthen American leadership in innovation and manufacturing.

And AI is essential to the future of autonomous vehicles. But without a comprehensive federal framework, we are risking that future. We cannot cede ground to foreign competitors.

Ms. Kak, do you agree that we need a federal regulatory framework for autonomous vehicles so that the U.S. can innovate, compete, and lead globally?

Thank you Ms. Dingell for your leadership on these critical issues. Autonomous vehicles are a good example of how AI systems are showing up in the physical world and their interaction on our roads and in our communities heightens the need for frameworks. Given the extensive risks to people's safety and privacy, we agree that this is an area ripe for a strong federal framework that can set appropriate steers for the market and protect the public from harm. That said, federal oversight has been slow to come, and states have stepped up to fill the vacuum and protect their constituents from potential harm (nineteen states have laws governing autonomous vehicles). This only bolsters the argument for a federal framework that sets a high floor (not a ceiling) for privacy, safety, and security standards around autonomous vehicles. This would include independent audits for safety and reliability so that companies are not grading their own homework.

2. If we're serious about competing globally and protecting consumers here at home, we need to get serious about federal policy.

We still don't have a comprehensive federal AV law. Meanwhile, China is moving full speed ahead, developing and deploying its AV technology with strong centralized support.

Ms. Kak, why is it critical that the federal government play a leading role in ensuring that industry secures consumer data and protects personal information collected by the broader universe of connected vehicles?

Autonomous vehicles require vast amounts of data collection for their operations. Existing vehicles on the market have more than a dozen cameras capturing 360-degree video footage of our streets. However, rather than accept the false assertion that AV requires abandoning established privacy principles, the opposite is true. We need robust data minimization rules that ensure that companies aren't collecting and processing data beyond established purposes, and that such uses are proportionate and necessary for the safe and effective operation of their products. Moreover, transparency is a non negotiable, including in terms of sharing protocols with law enforcement agencies. In other words, there is no AI or AV-exception to established privacy frameworks and the need of the hour is to both enact a strong federal privacy law and then aid in its meaningful application to the connected vehicles space.

1. Ms. Kak, how concerned are you about the growing consolidation of influence among a handful of companies, particularly when those same companies are putting their thumbs on the scale to shape the very regulations meant to hold them accountable?

Extremely concerned. For over a decade regulators have been asleep at the wheel. And in the meantime companies have been able to amass so much economic capital and political power that they can flex in front of nation-states and shape the letter of the law. The outsized control over our information ecosystems, our payments systems, our marketplaces and healthcare and education systems – and with AI, potentially over the digital infrastructure of the future economy gives these firms tremendous power over shaping our social and economic foundations. And for all the industry rhetoric around serving US national interests, the one consistent behavior we've seen from these firms is that at the end of the day, the only thing they'll serve is their bottom line. That's what's brought them time and again in front of Congressional Committees to answer for how their misbehavior is affecting the American people. That's what brought them into the courts and has led to unprecedented fines. But those fines are a drop in the bucket compared to the amount of financial capital they have now accumulated. The need of the hour is strong government action to remind the tech industry that it's the American public that they are and must remain accountable to.

2. Ms. Kak, what does it say about the United States' credibility to lead globally on responsible AI governance if we fail to adopt strong federal standards while actively undermining state and local regulatory frameworks?

The message from the US government to the world order needs to be clear: that the race to win on AI must be focused on delivering victories, first and foremost, to the American people. To do this, we must ensure that US leadership defines the frontier through technologies that are best in class, guarantees that firms compete on the merits, and sets a gold standard for rigor, security, and shared prosperity.

3. Ms. Kak, given the FTC's central role in protecting consumers and ensuring competition, especially in the context of Big Tech and AI regulation, how concerned are you about recent efforts to undermine the agency's independence?

Federal regulators like the FTC have been consistently enforcing common sense regulation to weed out the bad apples that nobody in the tech business wants to be associated with – from data brokers that illegally profit off of our most sensitive information to deepfake AI companies whose business model is one of extraction and exploitation. I remain very concerned about the potential whittling down of enforcement capacity at the precise moment as these types of market practices are proliferating. The concerns go beyond the public, we're at risk of bad apples and skewed business models scaring away private investment who see the AI industry

as fertile breeding grounds for snake oil salesmen. We need more targeted common sense enforcement of consumer protection standards in the age of AI, not less.

4. Ms. Kak, can you elaborate on the problem of issuing such a broad AI regulatory moratorium on states, whereby states cannot regulate how state and local law enforcement use AI to investigate and prosecute crimes, how local school districts use AI in the classroom, and cannot adopt civil laws to address the use of AI to create and disseminate nonconsensual intimate images?

Precisely, the examples you provide illustrate the range of sectors and use cases in which we're seeing AI systems create new harms or exacerbate existing ones. Simply put, any moratorium on state AI laws would leave American consumers, every one of us, with *even less* protections than we have today against many of these worst forms of AI-related abuse and exploitation. Across 40 states – Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Colorado – state AGs have spoken up against this moratorium to say they need these targeted tools, they will be less able to deliver on their mission to protect consumers. And they're already significantly outflanked.

This would allow the worst incentives to proliferate in this market: scams and manipulative AI companions interactions rooted in manipulation and exploitation of vulnerabilities of our children and senior citizens; opaque AI that hits directly at people's life chances – in domains across employment, education, healthcare, criminal justice, immigration; the use of our data to hike up prices, depress wages, and rig and collude in markets they couldn't otherwise. We can't forget, each of the legal protections a moratorium could impact would have been hard fought - state lawmakers responding to egregious harms faced by their constituents and defending against armies of Big Tech lobbyists.