

From: Mansur Ali Khan, Skyline High School.

To: House Committee on Technology, Economic Development, & Veterans.

Date: 04/20/2026

Chair and members of the committee,

As a High School researcher working on AI safety legislation, I bring the voice of youth and AI safety researchers to the Washington State House Committee.

The topic of regulating AI is close to me and the youth. Across numerous conversations at school, I have seen the implications of AI Chatbots as a common topic, ranging from knowledge gaps to mental health.

Additionally, in the last two years, having attended major AI conferences, moderated an international panel on AI safety, had discussions with EU, UK, Singapore, and Australian AI Safety Committee members, and deliberated with Rep. Callan on the AI chatbot specific bill HB 2225; it is clear that AI Safety and risks of its unregulated deployment are severe to say the least.

I will now testify for three things:

1) Why Washington, 2) Why SB5984, and 3) Where next.

Why Washington:

Analysis of global regulatory efforts show the EU, China, UK, Singapore among many others have pursued forms of oversight to minimize the misuse of AI, while the United States has been largely absent.

My research reveals that only 4.23% of AI bills in the Congress reached a terminal state, almost 2% lower than other bills. Moreover, in 2024 alone, US states saw 151 bills related to AI misuse which is more than all AI related bills presented in US Congress in the last 7 years. This places the task of AI regulation to individual states like WA - as states have both: clear authority and localized committees. Our WA state, as one of the largest tech hubs, is uniquely positioned to act and set de-facto standards for AI legislation, especially in consumer protection laws, such as SB5984.

Why SB5984:

In 1950, computing pioneer Alan Turing proposed a test to determine whether machines could convincingly imitate human conversation. Today, that question is no longer theoretical. Modern AI chatbots can engage in fluid, continuous and human-like dialogue, though not always safe and reliable. These chatbots seem to be designed to keep users engaged and prolonged interactions may

break the user's connection to reality. The ChatBots have also been shown to be affirming the users' thoughts [2], including those related to self-harm [3]. SB 5984 addresses these existing risks by putting safeguards in place to protect young people, while still allowing students to benefit from AI as a tool for learning and academic support.

Where Next:

To bridge this critical gap between AI development and regulation, I make two recommendations:

First, Artificial intelligence (AI) requires governance that adapts continuously to address unpredictable risks. Since policies can't be continuously audited and improved, affirmation clauses and real-time monitoring can help detect and circumvent risks from the outside. Such as using labeling and disclaimers (ex: those proposed in SB5984), help restore the user's connection to reality circumventing self-harm risks. These disclaimers are also used by Singapore's AI Verify toolkit (process 1.1.3) [4] along with continuous monitoring such as red-teaming that helps achieve continuous adaptation.

Second, AI's risks fare from individual self-harm to geo-political and economic melt-downs. Since these risks evolve rapidly across multiple domains, static regulation is insufficient, it needs authority and adaptability. In future, I urge you to build a statutory review mechanism through a designated oversight agency that should have authority to update rules via expedited rulemaking.

I believe we have an opportunity to set a standard, one that retains benefits while protecting our youth.

I support SB5984.

Thank you.

References:

[1] <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=OCn2y7QDTB>

[2] <https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/preliminary-report-on-chatbot-iatrogenic-dangers>

[3] <https://theweek.com/tech/ai-chatbots-psychosis-chatgpt-mental-health>

[4] <https://go.gov.sg/aivtf-pdf>

Acknowledgement:

This document benefited from the feedback of Matthew Randazzo & Jai Jaisimha.