



April 22, 2021

The Honorable Rep. Zack Fields
Co-Chair of the House Labor and
Commerce Committee
State Capitol Room 24
Juneau, AK 99801

The Honorable Rep. Ivy Spohnholz
Co-Chair of the House Labor and
Commerce Committee
State Capitol Room 406
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Letter in Opposition to Alaska HB 159

Dear Representative Fields and Representative Spohnholz:

On behalf of the advertising industry, we oppose Alaska HB 159.¹ We and the companies we represent, many of whom do substantial business in Alaska, strongly believe consumers deserve meaningful privacy protections supported by reasonable government policies. However, HB 159 contains provisions that could hinder Alaskans' access to valuable ad-supported online resources, impede their ability to exercise choice in the marketplace, and harm businesses of all sizes that support the economy.

To help ensure Alaskan businesses can continue to thrive and Alaskan consumers can continue to reap the benefits of a robust ad-supported online ecosystem and exercise choice in the marketplace, we recommend that the legislature undertake a study of available approaches to regulating data privacy before moving forward with enacting the onerous, and in some cases, outdated provisions set forth in HB 159. As presently written, the bill falls short of creating a regulatory system that will work well for Alaskan consumers or business.

As the nation's leading advertising and marketing trade associations, we collectively represent thousands of companies across the country. These companies range from small businesses to household brands, advertising agencies, and technology providers. Our combined membership includes more than 2,500 companies, is responsible for more than 85 percent of the U.S. advertising spend and drives more than 80 percent of our nation's digital advertising expenditures. We look forward to continuing to engage with the Alaska legislature as it considers HB 159.

I. Alaska Should Not Model Its Approach to Data Privacy Off of Outdated and Confusing Privacy Standards

Though HB 159 appears to draw many of its provisions from the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 ("CCPA"), the bill does not take into account many clarifications to the CCPA that followed its initial passage. The CCPA was amended more than five times after its enactment in June 2018, and the California Attorney General revised the regulations implementing the law four times after initially publishing draft regulations in October 2019. Many facets of the confusing and operationally complex law are still not fully tested or fleshed out. Moreover, the CCPA is not even the most up-to-date privacy law in the state, as the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 was recently enacted, yet again materially amending California privacy law substantially. Alaska should not adopt an outdated, confusing, and burdensome legal regime. We encourage the legislature to examine more up-to-date consumer protection standards that are available for regulating data privacy including the Virginia Consumer Data Protection Act ("VCDPA"), which was enacted in March 2021, before moving forward with HB 159.

¹ HB 159 (Alaska 2021) (hereinafter "HB 159"), located [here](#).

The proposal under HB 159 also would create some of the most onerous requirements in the nation, potentially depriving Alaskans of valuable online content and services. For instance, the bill would require businesses to include a “Do Not Collect or Sell My Personal Information” link on their homepages that would appear to prohibit a covered business following an opt out from “buying, renting, gathering, obtaining, receiving, or accessing any personal information pertaining to a consumer by any means, actively or passively receiving information from the consumer, or by observing the consumer’s behavior.”² Such a “do not collect” requirement, however, would prevent basic and vital Internet operations, including rendering a website to a visitor. This could result in many providers of online content and services to elect not to serve Alaskans, particularly given the threat of a private right of action which is included in the bill.

Efforts to emulate the CCPA in Alaska will significantly and disproportionately impact the ability of small and mid-size businesses and start-up companies to operate successfully in the state. A standardized regulatory impact assessment of the CCPA estimated *initial* compliance costs at 55 billion dollars.³ This amount did not account for ongoing compliance expenses and needed resource allotments outside of the costs to businesses to bring themselves into initial compliance. Additionally, that same report estimated that businesses with less than 20 employees would need to spend \$50,000 each to begin their CCPA compliance journey, and businesses with less than 50 employees would need to spend approximately \$100,000 each.⁴ At a time when our country is facing extremely difficult economic realities due to the COVID-19 pandemic and related impacts, adding significant regulatory burdens to small businesses could harm Alaska’s economy without appropriately protecting consumer privacy. Alaska should reconsider implementing outdated provisions of the CCPA, that now have been supplanted, as foundational aspects of its own privacy bill.

II. HB 159 Should Not Include a Private Right of Action

As presently drafted, HB 159 allows for private litigants to bring lawsuits by deeming violations of the bill to be unfair or deceptive acts or practices under the Alaska Consumer Protection Act.⁵ We strongly believe private rights of action should have no place in privacy legislation. Instead, enforcement should be vested with the Alaska Attorney General (“AG”), because such an enforcement structure would lead to strong outcomes for Alaskans while better enabling businesses to allocate funds to developing processes, procedures, and plans to facilitate compliance with new data privacy requirements. AG enforcement, instead of a private right of action, is in the best interests of consumers and businesses alike.

A private right of action in HB 159 would create a complex and flawed compliance system without tangible privacy benefits for consumers. Allowing private actions would flood Alaska’s courts with frivolous lawsuits driven by opportunistic trial lawyers searching for technical violations, rather than focusing on actual consumer harm. Private right of action provisions are completely divorced from any connection to actual consumer harm and provide consumers little by way of protection from detrimental data practices.

Additionally, including a private right of action in HB 159 would have a chilling effect on the state’s economy by creating the threat of steep penalties for companies that are good actors but inadvertently fail to conform to technical provisions of law. Private litigant enforcement provisions and related potential penalties for violations represent an overly punitive scheme that would not effectively address consumer privacy concerns or deter undesired business conduct. A private right of action would expose businesses to extraordinary and potentially enterprise-threatening costs for technical violations of

² HB 159, Sec. 45.49.290(7).

³ California Attorney General, *Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment: California Consumer Privacy Act Regulations* at 11 (August 2019), located at https://www.tellusventure.com/downloads/privacy/calif_doj_regulatory_impact_assessment_ccpa_14aug2019.pdf.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ HB 159, Sec. 45.49.130; Alaska Stat. §§ 45.50.471 – 45.50.561.

law rather than drive systemic and helpful changes to business practices. It would also encumber businesses' attempts to innovate by threatening companies with expensive litigation costs, especially if those companies are visionaries striving to develop transformative new technologies. The threat of an expensive lawsuit may force smaller companies to agree to settle claims against them, even if they are convinced they are without merit.

Beyond the staggering cost to Alaska businesses, the resulting snarl of litigation could create a chaotic and inconsistent enforcement framework with conflicting requirements based on differing court outcomes. Overall, a private right of action would serve as a windfall to the plaintiff's bar without focusing on the business practices that actually harm consumers. We therefore encourage legislators to remove the private right of action from the bill and replace it with a framework that makes enforcement responsibility the purview of the AG alone.

III. The Data-Driven and Ad-Supported Online Ecosystem Benefits Alaskans and Fuels Economic Growth

Throughout the past three decades, the U.S. economy has been fueled by the free flow of data through the Internet. Alaskans, like all consumers across the country, have benefitted greatly from this Internet ecosystem. One driving force in this ecosystem has been data-driven advertising. Advertising has helped power the growth of the Internet for years by delivering innovative tools and services for consumers and businesses to connect and communicate. Data-driven advertising supports and subsidizes the content and services Alaskans expect and rely on, including video, news, music, and more. Data-driven advertising allows Alaskans to access these resources at little or no cost to them, and it has created an environment where small publishers and start-up companies in the state and elsewhere can enter the marketplace to compete against the Internet's largest players.

Transfers of data over the Internet enable modern digital advertising, which subsidizes and supports the broader economy and helps to expose Alaskans to products, services, and offerings they want to receive. Digital advertising enables online publishers to offer content, news, services and more to Alaskans for free or at a low cost. In a September 2020 survey conducted by the Digital Advertising Alliance, 93 percent of consumers stated that free content was important to the overall value of the Internet and more than 80 percent surveyed stated they prefer the existing ad-supported model, where most content is free, rather than a non-ad supported Internet where consumers must pay for most content.⁶ The survey also found that consumers value ad-supported content and services at \$1,403.88 a year, representing an increase of over \$200 in value since 2016.⁷ HB 159, if enacted, would disrupt this crucially important ad-subsidized Internet model, which consumers have expressed that they value and would not want to see replaced.

As a result of this advertising-based model, U.S. businesses of all sizes have been able to grow online and deliver widespread consumer and economic benefits. According to a March 2017 study entitled *Economic Value of the Advertising-Supported Internet Ecosystem*, which was conducted for the IAB by Harvard Business School Professor John Deighton, in 2016 the U.S. ad-supported Internet created 10.4 million jobs.⁸ Calculating against those figures, the interactive marketing industry contributed \$1.121 trillion to the U.S. economy in 2016, doubling the 2012 figure and accounting for 6% of U.S. gross domestic product.⁹

⁶ Digital Advertising Alliance, *SurveyMonkey Survey: Consumer Value of Ad Supported Services – 2020 Update* (Sept. 28, 2020), located at https://digitaladvertisingalliance.org/sites/aboutads/files/DAA_files/Consumer-Value-Ad-Supported-Services-2020Update.pdf.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ John Deighton, *Economic Value of the Advertising-Supported Internet Ecosystem* (2017), located at <https://www.iab.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Economic-Value-Study-2017-FINAL2.pdf>.

⁹ *Id.*

Consumers, across income levels and geography, embrace the ad-supported Internet and use it to create value in all areas of life, whether through e-commerce, education, free access to valuable content, or the ability to create their own platforms to reach millions of other Internet users. Consumers are increasingly aware that the data collected about their interactions on the web, in mobile applications, and in-store are used to create an enhanced and tailored experience. Importantly, research demonstrates that consumers are generally not reluctant to participate online due to data-driven advertising and marketing practices. Indeed, as the Federal Trade Commission noted in its comments to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, if a subscription-based model replaced the ad-based model, many consumers likely would not be able to afford access to, or would be reluctant to utilize, all of the information, products, and services they rely on today and that will become available in the future.¹⁰ It is in this spirit—preserving the ad supported digital and offline media marketplace while helping to design appropriate privacy safeguards—that we provide these comments.

* * *

We and our members support protecting consumer privacy. We believe HB 159 would impose new and particularly onerous requirements on entities doing business in the state and would unnecessarily impede Alaska residents from receiving helpful services and accessing useful information online. We therefore respectfully ask you to reconsider the bill and instead convert it to a study so Alaskans can benefit from the legislature's careful consideration of approaches to data regulation that benefit consumers and businesses alike.

Thank you in advance for consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

Dan Jaffe
Group EVP, Government Relations
Association of National Advertisers
202-269-2359

Alison Pepper
Executive Vice President, Government Relations
American Association of Advertising Agencies, 4A's
202-355-4564

Christopher Oswald
SVP, Government Relations
Association of National Advertisers
202-269-2359

David Grimaldi
Executive Vice President, Public Policy
Interactive Advertising Bureau
202-800-0771

David LeDuc
Vice President, Public Policy
Network Advertising Initiative
703-220-5943

Clark Rector
Executive VP-Government Affairs
American Advertising Federation
202-898-0089

¹⁰ Federal Trade Commission, *In re Developing the Administration's Approach to Consumer Privacy*, 15 (Nov. 13, 2018), located at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/advocacy_documents/ftc-staff-comment-ntia-developing-administrations-approach-consumer-privacy/p195400_ftc_comment_to_ntia_112018.pdf.

STATE PRIVACY AND SECURITY COALITION

April 22, 2021

Governor Mike Dunleavy
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 110001
Juneau, AK 99811

Representative Ivy Spohnholz
Co-Chair, House Labor and Commerce Committee
1500 W. Benson Blvd.
Anchorage, AK 99503

Representative Zack Fields
Co-Chair, House Labor and Commerce Committee
1500 W. Benson Blvd.
Anchorage, AK 99503

RE: Alaska House Bill 159

Dear Governor Dunleavy, Representatives Spohnholz and Fields and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of the State Privacy and Security Coalition, a coalition of 30 leading communications, retail, automobile, and media companies and eight trade associations, we write to respectfully express our concerns with Alaska House Bill 159.

At the outset, we appreciate the sponsor's clear efforts to draft a bill that promotes increased consumer control over individuals' data while balancing the ability of businesses to comply. As the process moves forward, we hope to maintain open lines of communication through a broad-based effort that includes affected stakeholders as the sponsor's and the committee works through the issues that will inevitably arise in striking this balance.

We evaluate state privacy legislation through two criteria: increasing consumer transparency and control and operational workability. It is important that any legislation provide increased consumer transparency while still allowing businesses of all sizes and complexity to understand and implement its mandates. While this bill is advertised as an anti-big tech bill, in reality this bill would hit small to medium sized businesses particularly hard, just like the California privacy law on which it is based.

In fact, big tech companies are best placed to respond to the bill's difficult operational burdens to manage and account for and obtain consents for disclosures of personal data and to scale the cost of setting up a mandatory 800 telephone number. Mainstream Alaska businesses would find the law much more difficult to comply with. House Bill 159 would place particularly difficult consent requirements around using other businesses to help provide services that involve

STATE PRIVACY AND SECURITY COALITION

personal data, such as accounting, IT and other services that small to medium sized businesses often struggle to provide. Additionally, the bill would also create high hurdles to using personal data to innovate in providing better service, and thereby put in-state businesses at a disadvantage. House Bill 159 also contains a very confusing right to opt-out of collecting personal data, a right found in no other state privacy law that would frustrate consumers. This is because almost all consumer services involve some collection of personal data – for example, to take a consumer order or to deliver a product. Consumers who exercised this right would in many cases simply lose service.

This bill includes multiple provisions that have the unintended consequence of weakening consumer privacy. For example, House Bill 159 strongly incentivizes the combination and storage in one place of all personal information a company holds so that it can comply with consumer rights requests. This both increases vulnerability of personal information to hacking and fraud and it creates a perverse anti-privacy incentive actually to use this data that is more easily retrievable in order to offset the heavy investment required to centralize data.

No other state that has seriously considered or has passed omnibus legislation (including a host of blue states) has decided that a private right of action is an appropriate enforcement mechanism for the hard to understand and very complicated operational requirements under House Bill 159. Compliance with House Bill 159 would require implementing costly, highly technical, and complex processes. Operators should not be subject to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars in discovery costs for good faith, technical violations and should not have to defend shake down lawsuits.

In a post-COVID-19 landscape, when consumers and businesses are trying to get back on their feet, there are more streamlined, cost-effective approaches to enhance consumer data privacy. We would welcome a dialogue with you as the session progresses and look forward to seeing the next iteration of the bill. Please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Maya A. McKenzie
General Counsel
State Privacy & Security Coalition

Alaska Bankers Association

ELECTRONIC MAIL

April 23, 2021

Representative Ivy Spohnholz, Co-Chair
Representative Zack Fields, Co-Chair
House Labor & Commerce Committee
State Capitol, Room 3
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: Amend Alaska Consumer Data Privacy Act

Dear Representatives Spohnholz and Fields:

The members of the Alaska Bankers Association respectfully request your support for amending HB 159, which proposes to establish a framework for controlling and processing personal data in Alaska, as Alaska's financial institutions are already subject to comprehensive federal regulation in this area.

We agree the State of Alaska has a role in helping to protect the privacy of its residents; however, any new legislation and regulation must recognize and not conflict with existing federal law. The key federal law in this area is the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) and its implementing regulations, which impose substantial requirements on financial institutions to protect consumer data. The GLBA requires financial institutions to disclose their privacy policies allowing consumers to make informed choices about privacy protection. Consumers are informed if their financial institution shares or sells their personal financial data, either within the corporate family or with an unaffiliated third-party. Consumers have the right to "opt out" of such information sharing with unaffiliated third parties. The law also forbids financial institutions from disclosing their customers' account numbers for marketing purposes.

The members of the Alaska Bankers Association urge you to exempt financial institutions from HB 159 as they are already subject to comprehensive federal regulation under GLBA.

Thank you,

Michael Martin

Michael Martin, President
Alaska Bankers Association

cc: Members of the House Labor & Commerce Committee
Office of the Governor
Department of Law – Civil Division

Enclosure: GLBA Exemption Amendment

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE
TO: HB 159

I. Page 11, Line 23:

(5) financial institutions or data subject to Title V of the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. § 6801 et seq.)

II. Page 12, Lines 25-27:

(2) personal information collected, processed, sold, or disclosed under ~~15 U.S.C. 6801—6827 (Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act) and related regulations or under~~ 18 U.S.C. 2721 et seq. (Driver's Privacy Protection Act of 1994) and related regulations.

III. Page 22, Lines 9-13:

“data broker” does not include a consumer reporting agency to the extent the agency is covered by 15 U.S.C 1681 et seq. (Fair Credit Reporting Act) or a financial institution ~~to the extent the institution it is covered by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (P.L. 106-102) and~~ implementing regulations;

House Labor & Commerce Committee
Representative Ivy Spohnholz, Co-Chair
State Capitol Room 406
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: H.B. 159: Consumer Data Privacy Act

Dear Representative Spohnholz:

Thank you for your efforts to protect consumer privacy through House Bill 159. We respectfully ask that you consider a clarification relating to *business* information that may otherwise fall within the scope of this bill, but which other legislatures have recognized is both non-sensitive in nature *and* important for economic efficiency, and thus should be excluded from privacy regulation.

“Business contact information” refers to the information a person typically puts on his or her business card: company, position or title, phone, and email. Business professionals regularly share this kind of information every day without restriction, and it is not reasonably considered private or sensitive. In fact, approximately 170 million people in the United States have LinkedIn profiles where they publish this type of information online, compared with only about 125 million full-time employees. This is in addition to the millions of professionals who put their business information on company websites or other online professional pages.

Business contact information is used by thousands of Alaska businesses every day to market their products and services *to other businesses*. This is a hugely important part of the economy that many people do not see. Business-to-business (“B2B”) transactions represent approximately \$26 trillion annually in the U.S., nearly twice the transaction value of *all* consumer spending. It is important that we do not inadvertently disrupt the ability of businesses to use this vital information and thereby create unnecessary friction in our economy, especially while small businesses and startups are still struggling with the impact of the pandemic and remote selling has become even more important.

We suspect H.B. 159 was not motivated by a desire to unduly restrict the ability of businesses to share and use business contact information for B2B purposes. Therefore, we propose the following modifications to make that clear:

1. Define and exclude “business contact information” from the scope of the law

Proposed definition: *“Business Contact Information” means an individual’s name, position name or title, business telephone number, business address, business electronic mail address, business fax number, qualifications, and any other similar information about the individual.*

2. Remove “professional or employment-related information” from the definition of “Personal Information”

3. Create a small update to the definition of “consumer.”

Current definition: *“consumer” means a resident of the state, however identified, including by any unique identifier, who is physically present in the state with the intent to remain indefinitely in the state under the requirements of AS 01.10.055.*

Proposed modification: *“consumer” means a resident of the state, however identified, including by any unique identifier, who is physically present in the state with the intent to remain indefinitely in the state under the requirements of AS 01.10.055. It does not include a natural person acting in a commercial or employment context.”*

4. Expand the description of publicly available information, which is described and excluded from the definition of “Personal Information”

Current exclusion text: *does not include publicly available information that is lawfully made available from federal, state, or local government records; biometric information as described in (A) of this paragraph, collected by a business without a consumer’s knowledge is not considered publicly available information;*

Proposed modification: *does not include publicly available information that is lawfully made available from federal, state, or local government records; biometric information as described in (A) of this paragraph; information that a business has a reasonable basis to believe is lawfully made available to the general public by the consumer or from widely distributed media, or by a*

person to whom the consumer has disclosed the information, unless the consumer has restricted the information to a specific audience; biometric information as described in (A) of this paragraph, collected by a business without a consumer's knowledge is not considered publicly available information;

We believe these changes will help ensure that the focus of H.B. 159 remains squarely on protecting consumers without unduly regulating the nonsensitive information that businesses need to efficiently go to market and engage in routine business-to-business communications and transactions.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if you have any questions and/or for further discussion.

Sincerely,

Bubba Nunnery
Senior Director, Privacy & Public Policy
ZoomInfo

Cc: Representative Zack Fields, Co-Chair

ZoomInfo (NASDAQ: ZI) is a Go-To-Market Intelligence Solution for more than 15,000 companies worldwide. The ZoomInfo platform empowers business-to-business sales, marketing, and recruiting professionals to hit their number by pairing best-in-class technology with [unrivaled data coverage](#), accuracy, and depth of company and contact information. With [integrations](#) embedded into workflows and technology stacks, including the leading CRM, [Sales Engagement](#), Marketing Automation, and Talent Management applications, ZoomInfo drives more predictable, accelerated, and sustainable growth for its customers. ZoomInfo emphasizes [GDPR and CCPA compliance](#). In addition to creating the industry's first proactive notice program, the company is a registered data broker with the states of California and Vermont. Read about ZoomInfo's commitment to [compliance, privacy, and security](#). For more information about our leading Go-To-Market Intelligence Solution, and how it helps [sales](#), [marketing](#), and [recruiting](#) professionals, please visit www.zoominfo.com.