

Joe Hayes

From: Judy Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 11:50 AM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: Senate Bill 64

To whom it may concern, I am opposing parts of Senate bill 64 concerning the synthetic media & election. Really, sign sizes? You won't be able to read them maybe a reconsideration would be in order.

Best regards
Judy Miller

Joe Hayes

From: Ruby Shorey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 11:49 AM
To: Senate State Affairs
Cc: Tyler Slater
Subject: Senate Bill 64
Attachments: Batman.MP4; Santa Ad.MP4

I am in agreement with Barbra Haney on this matter and want Scott Kawasaki to know that I and others in District 32 do not agree with provisions in this bill....

I am forwarding her letter to you in support of what she wrote as you can add my name under hers!

Thank you

Ruby Shorey
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

Subject: Senate Bill 64
To: <Senate.State.Affairs@akleg.gov>

Dear State Affairs Committee members:

I am writing as a private citizen regarding the serious problems with 2 provisions of Senate Bill 64

While many of the provisions of Senate Bill 64 are fine, there are a few problematic provisions to which I object- synthetic media and the signage issue

Synthetic Media

Line 8 page 22 prohibits the use of synthetic media in election material- particularly the disseminating piece is a bit problematic. I understand that a person may want to make it illegal to manipulate an image of an opponent- but making it illegal to share an image (disseminating) is a bit harsh on a trusting public.

Furthermore, what this whole section is aimed at is quite petty. In the May 7th special election, some AI images of Stuey (family guy cartoon character), and other fictitious entities (the Grinch, Santa Claus, Sponge Bob Square Pants, & Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer) were used to encourage voters to vote NO on the May 7th election. Voters in the North Pole commonly use Christmas type memes and cartoon characters in their local politics. Clearly, these are not real entities, and it is a bit insulting to the voter to state that it is an AI image. It is rather a bit obvious. Consider some of the issues attached to this email.

But there are things less obvious- for example, what if someone air-brushes their image, or enhances the lighting on an image that they use on election media so they don't look so old, or fat, or whatever. Is that synthetic? What about the meme attached? Is that synthetic?

Are images the only thing that can be synthetic? What about someone who makes up a synthetic issues, like a Hadukavich tax? And what about using legislative photos in campaigns? Will that be held to the same standard? How about the use of office funds for legislative picnics? Will that be held to the same standard?

Furthermore, what if the synthetic media is used with the permission of the owner? For example, what if Sen. Geisel herself made a meme whereby she is depicted as a Joan of Arc type figure saving the state?. It is still "synthetic." How would the "harm" be shown? Would a "harmed" person have to show that the meme won or lost the election? Or is this just a way of generating apoc fines?

Also, how is "harmed: defined? Is the person "harmed" the person who lost the election? Are we going to start fining people for using Cartoon Characters, Abe Lincoln Memes, and Classical Art memes? It seems to me that this bill is more an effort to squash age old political humor and a violation of the first amendment rather than serious election reform.

This section of the bill is not ready for prime time and will present a serious chill on political speech. It will be subject to first amendment litigation if it is passed.

Signage Issue

A second provision is on page 25 lines 22 specifies 32 square feet as a limiting factor on political signs. Beer signs and other similar advertisements are allowed 66 square feet rather than 32 square feet. Are not election signs more important than signs informing the public on which beer to consume or what pull tabs to request?

By limiting the signs of only political messages and not other messages, you are really stating that getting drunk and playing pull tabs is more important than participating in elections on property taxes or local governance. Restricting the size to 32 square feet means the limiting factor would be a 6 foot by 5 foot or 8 foot by 4 foot. At 660 feet from the easement for drivers driving at 55 miles per hour, that would be the equivalent of a ten inch font on a piece of paper. Federal law is 66 square feet, and that is sufficient for most political messages.

Seriously, these two bill provisions are specifically aimed at a particular campaign whereby voters rejected a property tax increase by wide margins, increased voter turnout, and had fun doing so in the process. Nobody was [harmed.No](#) serious person was going to approve a property tax increase when the borough had already set aside the \$33 Million required local contribution for an animal shelter replacement program (aka puppy palace) rather than funding schools.

We have more serious matters, such as the recent provisions by the EPA to obtain a rating to sell one's home in the FNSB (18 AAC 50.081) when there are only two people qualified to do these ratings rather than legislating cartoon characters and political signs in borough elections.

Sincerely,

Barbara Haney, Ph.D.
520 North Freeman Road
North Pole, Alaska 99705

Joe Hayes

From: Audrey Mauer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 7:47 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Cc: Tyler Slater
Subject: Senate Bill 64

Hello,
I am in agreement w Barbara Haney's email of Tuesday, February 4, 2025, with regards to Senate Bill 64 (copied below).

I would like Scott Kawasaki to know I am in District 32, and I do not agree with the "provisions" in this bill, namely "Synthetic Media" and "Signage Issue".

I am copying her email below, as I am in support of what she wrote. Please add my name under hers.

Respectfully,
Audrey Mauer
1275 Rangeview Drive
North Pole, Alaska 99705

----- Forwarded message ----- From: Barbara Haney <barbarahaney100@gmail.com> Date: Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 11:13 AM Subject: Senate Bill 64 To: <Senate.State.Affairs@akleg.gov> Dear State Affairs Committee members: I am writing as a private citizen regarding the serious problems with 2 provisions of Senate Bill 64 While many of the provisions of Senate Bill 64 are fine, there are a few problematic provisions to which I object- synthetic media and the signage issue Synthetic Media Line 8 page 22 prohibits the use of synthetic media in election material- particularly the disseminating piece is a bit problematic. I understand that a person may want to make it illegal to manipulate an image of an opponent- but making it illegal to share an image (disseminating) is a bit harsh on a trusting public. Furthermore, what this whole section is aimed at is quite petty. In the May 7th special election, some AI images of Stuey (family guy cartoon character), and other fictitious entities (the Grinch, Santa Claus, Sponge Bob Square Pants, & Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer) were used to encourage voters to vote NO on the May 7th election. Voters in the North Pole commonly use Christmas type memes and cartoon characters in their local politics. Clearly, these are not real entities, and it is a bit insulting to the voter to state that it is an AI image. It is rather a bit obvious. Consider some of the issues attached to this email. But there are things less obvious- for example, what if someone air-brushes their image, or enhances the lighting on an image that they use on election media so they don't look so old, or fat, or whatever. Is that synthetic? What about the meme attached? Is that synthetic? Are images the only thing that can be synthetic? What about someone who makes up a synthetic issues, like a Hadukavich tax? And what about using legislative photos in campaigns? Will that be held to the same standard? How about the use of office funds for legislative picnics? Will that be held to the same standard? Furthermore, what if the synthetic media is used with the permission of the owner? For example, what if Sen. Geisel herself made a meme whereby she is depicted as a Joan of Arc type figure saving the state?. It is still "synthetic." How would the "harm" be shown? Would a "harmed" person have to show that the meme won or lost the election? Or is this just a way of generating apoc fines? Also, how is "harmed: defined? Is the person "harmed" the person who lost the election? Are we going to start fining people for using Cartoon Characters, Abe Lincoln Memes, and Classical Art memes? It seems to me that this bill is more an effort to squash age old political humor and a violation of the first amendment rather than serious election reform. This section of the bill is not ready for prime time and will present a serious chill on political speech. It will be subject to first amendment litigation if it is passed. Signage Issue A second provision is on page 25 lines 22 specifies 32 square feet as a limiting factor on political signs. Beer signs and other similar advertisements are allowed 66 square feet rather than 32 square feet. Are not election signs more important than signs informing the public on which beer to consume or what pull tabs to request? By limiting the signs of only political messages and not other messages, you are really stating that getting drunk and playing pull tabs is more important than

participating in elections on property taxes or local governance. Restricting the size to 32 square feet means the limiting factor would be a 6 foot by 5 foot or 8 foot by 4 foot. At 660 feet from the easement for drivers driving at 55 miles per hour, that would be the equivalent of a ten inch font on a piece of paper. Federal law is 66 square feet, and that is sufficient for most political messages. Seriously, these two bill provisions are specifically aimed at a particular campaign whereby voters rejected a property tax increase by wide margins, increased voter turnout, and had fun doing so in the process. Nobody was [harmed.No](#) serious person was going to approve a property tax increase when the borough had already set aside the \$33 Million required local contribution for an animal shelter replacement program (aka puppy palace) rather than funding schools. We have more serious matters, such as the recent provisions by the EPA to obtain a rating to sell one's home in the FNSB (18 AAC 50.081) when there are only two people qualified to do these ratings rather than legislating cartoon characters and political signs in borough elections. Sincerely, Barbara Haney, Ph.D. 520 North Freeman Road North Pole, Alaska 99705

Joe Hayes

From: Aileen Cotter [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2025 11:59 AM
To: State Affairs
Subject: Bill 64

Dear State Affairs Committee members:

I'm in agreement with Barbara Haney!

I am writing as a private citizen regarding the serious problems with 2 provisions of Senate Bill 64

While many of the provisions of Senate Bill 64 are fine, there are a few problematic provisions to which I object- synthetic media and the signage issue

Synthetic Media

Line 8 page 22 prohibits the use of synthetic media in election material- particularly the disseminating piece is a bit problematic. I understand that a person may want to make it illegal to manipulate an image of an opponent- but making it illegal to share an image (disseminating) is a bit harsh on a trusting public.

Furthermore, what this whole section is aimed at is quite petty. In the May 7th special election, some AI images of Stuey (family guy cartoon character), and other fictitious entities (the Grinch, Santa Claus, Sponge Bob Square Pants, & Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer) were used to encourage voters to vote NO on the May 7th election. Voters in the North Pole commonly use Christmas type memes and cartoon characters in their local politics. Clearly, these are not real entities, and it is a bit insulting to the voter to state that it is an AI image. It is rather a bit obvious. Consider some of the issues attached to this email.

But there are things less obvious- for example, what if someone air-brushes their image, or enhances the lighting on an image that they use on election media so they don't look so old, or fat, or whatever. Is that synthetic? What about the meme attached? Is that synthetic?

Are images the only thing that can be synthetic? What about someone who makes up a synthetic issues, like a Hadukavich tax? And what about using legislative photos in campaigns? Will that be held to the same standard? How about the use of office funds for legislative picnics? Will that be held to the same standard?

Furthermore, what if the synthetic media is used with the permission of the owner? For example, what if Sen. Geisel herself made a meme whereby she is depicted as a Joan of Arc type figure saving the state?. It is still "synthetic." How would the "harm" be shown? Would a "harmed" person have to show that the meme won or lost the election? Or is this just a way of generating apoc fines?

Also, how is "harmed: defined? Is the person "harmed" the person who lost the election? Are we going to start fining people for using Cartoon Characters, Abe Lincoln Memes, and Classical Art memes? It seems to me that this bill is more an effort to squash age old political humor and a violation of the first amendment rather than serious election reform.

This section of the bill is not ready for prime time and will present a serious chill on political speech. It will be subject to first amendment litigation if it is passed.

Signage Issue

A second provision is on page 25 lines 22 specifies 32 square feet as a limiting factor on political signs. Beer signs and other similar advertisements are allowed 66 square feet rather than 32 square feet. Are not election signs more important than signs informing the public on which beer to consume or what pull tabs to request?

By limiting the signs of only political messages and not other messages, you are really stating that getting drunk and playing pull tabs is more important than participating in elections on property taxes or local governance. Restricting the size to 32 square feet means the limiting factor would be a 6 foot by 5 foot or 8 foot by 4 foot. At 660 feet from the easement for drivers driving at 55 miles per hour, that would be the equivalent of a ten inch font on a piece of paper. Federal law is 66 square feet, and that is sufficient for most political messages.

Seriously, these two bill provisions are specifically aimed at a particular campaign whereby voters rejected a property tax increase by wide margins, increased voter turnout, and had fun doing so in the process. Nobody was [https://urldefense.com/v3/__http://harmed.No_;!!LdQKC6s!PvdJrGB7Oy4DQ8ocDvS7ZtpVu6H-UCOMKV5dncq9tE6B4HvmqONQDMBoV91eJ4E-bPANCufvQqD_fwqhwLFXVkusPbk\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/__http://harmed.No_;!!LdQKC6s!PvdJrGB7Oy4DQ8ocDvS7ZtpVu6H-UCOMKV5dncq9tE6B4HvmqONQDMBoV91eJ4E-bPANCufvQqD_fwqhwLFXVkusPbk$) serious person was going to approve a property tax increase when the borough had already set aside the \$33 Million required local contribution for an animal shelter replacement program (aka puppy palace) rather than funding schools.

We have more serious matters, such as the recent provisions by the EPA to obtain a rating to sell one's home in the FNSB (18 AAC 50.081) when there are only two people qualified to do these ratings rather than legislating cartoon characters and political signs in borough elections.

Sincerely,

Barbara Haney, Ph.D.
520 North Freeman Road
North Pole, Alaska 99705

Ella Cotter
1095 Brock Rd
North Pole, AK 99705
Sent from my iPad

randy@alaska.gov

I am Randy Ruedrich from District 17 Downtown Anchorage

I wish to thank the State Affairs Committee for this opportunity to testify today on SB 52, 64 70.

My Review of SB 52 found that it addresses matters covered more thoroughly in SB 70.

Therefore, I will comment on SB 64 and 70 today in the interest of saving time.

- 1) The changes to the Regional Rural Education Attendance Area Board elections are constructive and justified.
The DoE will have more quality time to focus on these elections in the odd year of an election cycle.
Removing this annual election in the even year between the primary and general elections eliminates that third election.
- 2) I concur with the voter registration changes that should reduce the inactive voters on the Alaska Voter Roll
- 3) Sec 15 changed the length of the EV period by eliminating the last five days. This change is harmful to our voters and voter Turnout. If 15,000 to 20000 citizens cannot vote in that 5 day period, these voters may be in the lines on Election Day.
Secondly these voters are coming out at a convenient time to vote. Work schedules may not allow them to vote on Tuesday.
This change is harmful and should disappear. Voter suppression should not occur.
- 4) Since Federal law is changing, I support the change that requires all Absentee by Mail and online ballots be returned to the DoE by the end of Election Day.
Over 96% of ABM ballots are returned by 2 days after E D. I find this change to be very manageable.
I recommend that the bill require all AIP Ballots must be returned to DoE by the end of Election Day also.
Clerks returning A-I-P ballots the following week is absolutely unacceptable.
- 5) Managing voting operations in small rural precincts is difficult. Any version of mail ballots must be a last resort to ensure an option to vote exists.
Allowing for shorter time slot for voting may be the best answer.
However a distribution of ballots to every registered voter ignores the fact that many voters may have change their mailing address without informing the DoE.
The ANC Muni Mail in process sends out a notice to confirm proper delivery annually.
Approximately 40000 cards are returned as undeliverable/voter has moved.
With the challenges of rural mail delivery, the solution is not obvious but some filter should be applied the mailing list to protect election integrity.
- 6) Re: SB 64: Disagree with Sec 2 reference returning to the person's residence.

This requirement is totally unreasonable. For example I lived in Europe and the Middle East for more than 5 years and maintained my Alaskan registration. When I went to Europe, I sold a 4 bd south Anchorage house. When I returned, I rented a downtown two bed room apartment.

My return did occur as expected. The same residence is highly improbable.

- 7) Rather than commenting on the ABM return language here, refer the SB 70 changes above. In General where these bill differ, I support SB 70.
- 8) The Witness signature is current law for a reason. It increases the integrity of our election. The change is not acceptable.
- 9) Sec 30 has huge problem in original text: Counting is not what is done 7 days before Election Day. The Absentee Review Board confirm the information of the ballot jacket is proper and complete. The full or partial count is identified. Nothing is counted before the polls close.
- 10) The Absentee Ballot witness signature ensure ballot integrity. Do not eliminate the witness signatures.
- 11) Ballot cures are not useful in a world with less than a percent of defective ballots. The Covid election is a unicorn!
- 12) Drop boxes have been documented to create voter fraud. Alaska has very few mules. I oppose this change.
- 13) The section on synthetic media is interesting but without major efforts that the federal and state level this is extremely premature for Campaign Finance Law.
- 14) I oppose adding the Redistricting Board to list.

Joe Hayes

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 10:59 PM
To: Senate State Affairs
Subject: SB64 public comment

I am an Alaska resident registered to vote in Juneau, AK. I have experience working polls during elections. I am submitting comment on SB64 Elections on behalf of myself, not representing any group nor employer.

I request that my comments below be distributed to the current committee's members and the members of all future committees and bodies that will consider this bill during this session.

Though I am aware (S) STA mwt today and adopted Version H, it does not appear that version is yet available for public viewing online. As such, my comments correspond to sections, pages, and lines published as Version A and its accompanying Sectional Analysis, both dated 30 JAN 2025.

In general, I support much of the bill, but I have some concerns and suggested amendments. Election integrity begins and ends with the chain of custody of official ballots and veracity of verification processes. It is critical that we have equal opportunities to cast our ballots and a clear, defensible process with fair rules established and agreed upon in advance. Anything less undermines the validity and disenfranchises eligible voters.

Sections 2 and 5: Support, with proof of established residency as defined elsewhere in statute.

Section 3: Amend. The legal minimum voting age shall remain 18 years. Although I see no valid reason a 16yo would need to preregister to vote, I do support a 17yo preregistering if they will be 18yo on or before the polls close on election day and if they also meet all other eligibility requirements.

Add an amendment to specify that registration forms may not be premarked with any party or affiliation.

Amend items establishing residency for voter eligibility and casting ballots to require, at minimum, photo identification and manual signature or witnessed mark for all registrations, applications, requests for ballots, sealed outer envelopes containing ballots legally handled by others on behalf of an eligible voter, and forms for legally curing ballot deficiencies.

Sections 4 and 6: Oppose. All ballots shall be submitted on paper and retained in a secure facility for an established period of time after an election for the purposes of recounts and validation checks. Because they are not unique and cannot be verified, under no circumstances shall electronic signatures consisting of typed text (including signature-like typefaces) be accepted for the purposes of voting, especially without definitions, established verification processes, and verifiable witnesses.

Add an amendment to affirm elections shall occur on a single, established day on which all ballots shall be counted. Ballots collected before the polls open on election day shall not be opened nor counted except to access the sealed outer privacy envelope to verify receipt and eligibility and provide tracking. All ballots submitted early shall be made on an official ballot, placed in a sealed, marked, and traceable envelope, and remain unopened and uncounted in a secure, on-site ballot box in an official polling place or Division of Elections Office until polls open on election day. Ballots created outside polling hours on election day using an approved, secure, on-site, electronic device provided for handicap accessibility shall likewise be printed on site, sealed, marked, and stored unopened on site until polls open on election day. All ballots received on or after the date of issuance of valid, requested absentee ballots and before the polls close on election day shall be counted on election day or within a stated number of days established in statute.

Section 20: There appears to be a typographical error on page 12, line 04. The phrase "shall not" must replace "shall" as it is nonsensical and in conflict with other sections of the statutes to allow a person to vote the questioned ballot in this

circumstance if they do not surrender the absentee ballot since there would be no way to timely verify that they cannot submit multiple ballots.

Sec. 23: Support with amendment to strike "and assist" from page 13, line 24. While they may witness the count, under no circumstances shall a candidate nor campaign's representatives or watchers officially count or directly handle any ballots (except their own single ballot).

Sec. 25: Oppose removing the requirement for a witness for ballots cast outside an official polling place. Witnesses are vital to verifying the validity and custody of an official ballot.

Sec. 28: Oppose. Ballots shall be marked on and with the date received at an official polling place, post office, or Division of Elections Office. Ballots not marked and received by the date and time polls close on election day shall be marked invalidated due to tardiness and shall not be counted. Ballots lawfully deposited in an official drop box before polls open on election day shall be marked as received on the next business day.

Sec. 29: Oppose. Absentee ballots, while important for residents that are unable to vote in person for allowable reasons, are vulnerable and must be requested and validated for each election. Absentee ballots should not be the norm and official ballots should not leave the custody of election officials without specific, validated requests. Automatic mailing of ballots not specifically requested by an eligible absentee voter through the required process shall be invalidated and not counted.

Sec. 30: Oppose. Ballots may be validated in advance using the sealed outer envelope, but shall not be opened, counted, nor reported until polling places open, except that the number received to date may be publicly reported and the voter may track receipt of their own ballot at any time.

Sec. 31: Oppose. Upon receipt at a polling place or Division of Elections Office, ballots received outside polling hours on election day shall be marked received with the date and time. Ballots not received and marked as such by the closing of polls on election day shall be invalidated and shall not be counted. Ballots received during polling hours on election shall be placed in a secure ballot box on site and do not require receipt markings under this section except where required by other statutes.

Sec. 34: Amend to include that the cure for a rejected ballot shall include a valid witness with contact information and signature for verification purposes.

Sec. 35: Oppose. Balloting by mail and early voting shall not be the norm. Postal boxes shall suffice for authorized absentee ballots returned by mail. Drop boxes shall be limited to those secured inside a polling place or official Division of Elections Office during a defined period of time beginning upon issuance of the first, valid absentee ballot for that election and ending when polls close on election day. Ballots placed in such dropboxes shall be marked as required in Sec. 31 of this bill and remain sealed in a secure ballot box in the custody of an official polling place, Division of Elections office, or authorized officer thereof. Routine mail-in balloting and drop boxes are unnecessary and present vulnerabilities to the chain of custody and integrity of a ballot. In addition, ballots out of custody of election officials, such as those mailed out, lack witnesses to ensure secret ballots without fraud or duress (such as in the case of domestic violence).

Sec. 39: Amend to remove distances or viewing from any type of highway as long as the sign is located fully on private property and not within a public easement or right of way; is not displayed for compensation; and is not erected for a period exceeding 30 calendar days before through 3 calendar days after the election in which the candidate or question are deliberated. Specify limitation of not more than one sign of the stated maximum size per legally defined parcel. Allow for Department to apply fines for noncompliance.

Sec. 43: Citing the recent candidate incarcerated in another state who had never established residency in Alaska, add an amendment to require all candidates be legal residents on the date of registration for candidacy and meet all other

eligibility requirements. Require that write-in candidates be legal residents on or before the date of election. In order to appear on the ballot, all candidates shall be registered and deemed eligible for a stated minimum number of days before an election day.

Add an amendment to require the names of registered write-in candidates not be openly displayed at a polling place except in the same size, color, font, frequency, and manner of other candidates appearing on the sample or official ballot. To avoid electioneering, unregistered write-in candidates shall not be displayed at a polling place.

Thank you for your consideration.

H. O'Claray

[REDACTED]
Juneau, AK 99802
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

I strongly opposed to this bill as written.

It hogwash. Do better.

Senate Bill 64 (SB 64) introduces a range of provisions that could have potential legal and practical implications. Below are some potential violations and issues with this bill, considering various aspects of voting rights, election fairness, and legal challenges.

1. Voter Preregistration for Minors (16 years old)

- Potential Issues:

- **Constitutionality and Federal Law Compliance:** While many states allow voter preregistration at 16 or 17, there are questions about the constitutionality of allowing people who are under 18 to be officially recorded on voter rolls. The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) requires that only U.S. citizens who meet the age requirement (18 years old by Election Day) be allowed to vote. If the preregistration is not structured in compliance with federal age requirements or is seen as creating confusion in the voter roll, it could lead to legal challenges.

- **Voter Confusion:** Allowing minors to preregister could lead to confusion, particularly around voter eligibility and the potential for an incorrect assumption that they are eligible to vote immediately upon turning 18. This could result in voter confusion or disputes at polling places, particularly if the preregistered minors are not properly notified of their voting eligibility.

2. Synthetic Media in Electioneering Communications

- Potential Issues:

- **First Amendment Concerns:** The regulation of synthetic media (e.g., deepfakes or AI-generated videos) used in electioneering communications raises concerns about free speech and the First Amendment. While addressing the spread of misinformation is a valid concern, any law that restricts the use of synthetic media could be challenged on the grounds that it unduly limits political speech or expression. The bill would need to carefully balance the need to protect voters from disinformation with the protection of political speech.

- **Enforcement Challenges:** Determining what constitutes "synthetic media" in the context of electioneering communications could be difficult to define and enforce, particularly with fast-evolving technologies. This might lead to vagueness and overreach, opening the door for lawsuits challenging the law's application.

3. Campaign Signs and Electioneering Regulations

- Potential Issues:

- **Vague Restrictions:** If SB 64 introduces vague or overly broad restrictions on campaign signs or electioneering, it could lead to challenges under the First Amendment, which protects political speech.

For example, overly strict rules about when or where signs can be placed could be seen as a restriction on political expression, leading to legal challenges from political candidates or advocacy groups.

- **State vs. Local Authority:** If the bill overrides local ordinances or existing local government authority regarding campaign signs or election-related regulations, it could lead to conflicts between state and local governments.

4. Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree

- **Potential Issues:**
 - **Overbroad Provisions:** If the bill expands or changes the definition of unlawful interference with voting in a way that is too vague or broad, it could lead to overcriminalization of actions that might not be clearly related to actual election interference. For example, any actions that are seen as remotely related to influencing or obstructing voting (such as minor infractions) could potentially lead to criminal liability under the bill's provisions.
 - **Due Process and Fairness:** If the crime of unlawful interference is not well-defined or lacks clear guidelines, there could be concerns about due process and whether individuals or organizations might be unfairly targeted under the law, especially if the statute is used in a politically charged manner.

5. Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC) and Financial Disclosures

- **Potential Issues:**
 - **Overregulation of Political Campaigns:** Changes to the Alaska Public Offices Commission regulations could lead to excessive regulation of political campaigns, potentially limiting free speech or creating barriers for political participation. If the financial disclosure requirements are overly burdensome or unclear, candidates, political committees, and organizations might face difficulties in compliance.
 - **Privacy Concerns:** Enhanced transparency for public officials and candidates could be viewed as an invasion of privacy, particularly if personal financial disclosures go beyond what is necessary for ensuring accountability and conflict of interest protections.

6. Voter Registration and Verification Processes

- **Potential Issues:**
 - **Voter Suppression Risks:** If the bill introduces new registration requirements or verification processes that are difficult for certain populations to comply with, such as rural voters, remote communities, or marginalized groups, it could lead to concerns about voter suppression. If these changes disproportionately affect certain groups (such as Alaska Native communities or lower-income voters), the bill might face challenges for violating the Voting Rights Act.
 - **Increased Complexity:** Any new rules that add layers of complexity to the registration process (e.g., requiring additional forms of ID, proof of residency, or verification steps) could unintentionally disenfranchise voters who struggle to navigate the system, especially in rural areas where access to documentation or infrastructure might be limited.

7. Potential Conflicts with Federal Law

- Potential Issues:

- Preemption by Federal Law: If any provisions of SB 64 conflict with federal voting regulations (such as those under the National Voter Registration Act, Help America Vote Act, or the Voting Rights Act), they could be preempted or struck down by federal courts. For instance, if the bill creates stricter voting procedures or barriers that violate the federally protected right to vote, it could be challenged in court on constitutional grounds.

- Interstate Voter Registration: The bill's provisions for voter registration could face challenges if they do not align with federal efforts to streamline or standardize voter registration across states. Any discrepancies with federal guidelines might result in legal challenges.

8. Lack of Safeguards for Vulnerable Groups

- Potential Issues:

- Disenfranchisement of Vulnerable Populations: If SB 64 does not adequately address the unique needs of vulnerable populations (e.g., people with disabilities, non-English speakers, or elderly voters), it could face criticism for not ensuring equal access to the electoral process. This could lead to claims that the bill violates the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or other civil rights protections.

Conclusion:

SB 64 addresses a broad range of election-related issues, and while its provisions might aim to improve the integrity and transparency of elections, they also present several potential legal challenges. These include concerns about voter suppression, First Amendment violations, potential conflicts with federal law, and the disenfranchisement of certain groups. The bill would need to be carefully structured to avoid overreach, ensure fair access to voting, and comply with federal legal standards. If not carefully implemented, it could lead to lawsuits challenging various provisions on the grounds of constitutionality or fairness.

Here are some ways it potential violates the law and constitution.

Here is a list of potential legal and constitutional violations related to the provision of Voter Preregistration for Minors (16 years old) in Senate Bill 64 (SB 64):

1. Violation of the U.S. Constitution - Age Requirement for Voting

Potential Violation: The U.S. Constitution, particularly the 19th Amendment (granting voting rights regardless of gender) and 26th Amendment (lowering the voting age to 18), establishes that only U.S. citizens who are 18 years or older are constitutionally allowed to vote in federal elections.

- Concern: Allowing preregistration at 16 years old could lead to confusion, as the federal law mandates that voters must be 18 by Election Day to cast a ballot. While preregistration itself does not immediately grant voting rights, it could conflict with the clear constitutional mandate on voting eligibility, especially if 16-year-olds are added to voter rolls prematurely.

- Possible Challenge: A legal challenge could arise arguing that preregistering voters who are not yet 18 might create confusion or contradictions with the federal age requirement for voting.

2. Violations of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA)

Potential Violation: The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) of 1993 establishes specific guidelines for voter registration and eligibility. The NVRA requires that voters must be 18 years old by the date of the general election to vote, and it applies to all federal elections.

- Concern: If a state allows individuals who are not yet 18 (such as 16-year-olds) to be preregistered, it may inadvertently violate the NVRA's requirements, particularly if those minors are included in the official voter rolls before reaching the age of eligibility to vote.
- Possible Challenge: A challenge could be made on the grounds that the state's preregistration process violates federal law by allowing underage individuals to be added to the voter rolls, even if they cannot yet vote in a general election.

3. Equal Protection Clause (14th Amendment)

Potential Violation: The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment ensures that no state shall deny any person the equal protection of the laws. By allowing 16-year-olds to preregister, there could be concerns about unequal treatment of minors who are not yet 18 compared to other groups that are not eligible to vote.

- Concern: If the state offers voter preregistration for minors while others in similar age groups (e.g., 16-year-olds in other states) are not allowed to preregister, this could raise equal protection issues. Furthermore, there may be concerns about how this impacts the broader principles of uniformity in voter eligibility across states.
- Possible Challenge: If the preregistration process treats 16-year-olds differently without a compelling governmental reason, a court could find this a violation of equal protection under the 14th Amendment.

4. Voter Confusion and Due Process (14th Amendment)

Potential Violation: Preregistration of minors could create confusion regarding their eligibility to vote, potentially violating due process rights. Preregistered minors might mistakenly believe they are eligible to vote when they are still not legally permitted to cast ballots.

- Concern: Allowing minors to be placed on the voter rolls before reaching 18 may lead to a due process violation by depriving them of the clear, understandable right to vote at the appropriate age. The risk of misinformation or misunderstanding about voter eligibility could create constitutional concerns.
- Possible Challenge: A legal challenge could argue that the process undermines clear eligibility requirements, depriving individuals of the right to understand their legal standing in the voting process.

5. State vs. Federal Jurisdiction Issues

Potential Violation: The Supremacy Clause (Article VI of the U.S. Constitution) asserts that federal law takes precedence over state law in case of conflict. If a state law conflicts with federal laws on voter registration (such as the NVRA or the Voting Rights Act), it could face challenges for violating federal authority.

- Concern: If SB 64 establishes voter preregistration at 16 years old that runs counter to federal voting laws or federal guidance (which typically aligns with the 18-year-old voting age), it could be seen as an overreach of state jurisdiction and a potential violation of the Supremacy Clause.

- Possible Challenge: A conflict could arise if a state law allows preregistration for 16-year-olds, but this is seen as inconsistent with the federal framework governing voter eligibility and registration.

6. Potential for Disenfranchisement of Voters

Potential Violation: If 16-year-olds are allowed to preregister and the system is not carefully managed, there may be cases where preregistered minors are incorrectly removed from voter rolls or are not properly notified of their eligibility status when they reach 18. This could disenfranchise eligible voters who were misled by the preregistration process.

- Concern: Errors in the system could lead to qualified voters being removed from the rolls or incorrectly denied access to voting at 18 due to complications with their preregistration.

- Possible Challenge: A legal challenge could arise on the grounds that the preregistration process creates a risk of voter disenfranchisement due to system errors or insufficient safeguards.

7. Potential for Political Manipulation

Potential Violation: Allowing preregistration for minors might be viewed as an attempt to politicize the electoral process by targeting younger voters who are perceived as more likely to support particular candidates or political parties.

- Concern: Preregistration of minors could be seen as an attempt to influence the political behavior of younger generations before they fully understand the complexities of voting or political ideologies. This could raise concerns about electioneering and the manipulation of the electorate.
- Possible Challenge: While this concern is not necessarily a violation of a specific law, critics may challenge it on the basis of fairness, arguing that preregistration could be used as a partisan tool.

8. Potential for Increased Administrative Burden

Potential Violation: The logistics and administrative requirements of processing preregistration for minors may place a significant burden on election authorities, especially in smaller or rural areas. This could create difficulties in ensuring accuracy and preventing voter list errors.

- Concern: If the state does not allocate sufficient resources to administer preregistration correctly, it could result in administrative inefficiencies or errors that may lead to the violation of individuals' rights to vote, either through exclusion from the rolls or errors in voter information.
- Possible Challenge: If the state fails to properly implement preregistration systems and causes errors that negatively affect voters, lawsuits could be filed for violations of individuals' voting rights under the Voting Rights Act or other federal laws.

Conclusion:

The primary potential legal issues with voter preregistration for minors (16 years old) include potential conflicts with federal voting laws, challenges under the U.S. Constitution regarding voter age requirements, and issues with due process and equal protection. These concerns could result in legal challenges arguing that allowing preregistration for minors creates confusion, misrepresentation, or

conflicts with constitutional or federal voting requirements. Additionally, there is a risk that the system could inadvertently lead to disenfranchisement or administrative issues, further complicating its implementation.

Now let's discuss some of the potential cons, pros, and the legality of Synthetic Media in Electioneering Communications:

The use of synthetic media (such as deepfakes, AI-generated videos, and other manipulated media) in electioneering communications has become a critical concern, particularly as technology advances rapidly. Here's the breakdown of the potential cons, pros, and legality of this issue, as it pertains to SB 64 (Senate Bill 64) in Alaska:

Potential Cons of Synthetic Media in Electioneering Communications

Spread of Misinformation and Disinformation

- **Concern:** Synthetic media can be used to create misleading or entirely fake content, making it harder for voters to distinguish between true and false information.
- **Example:** AI-generated videos or deepfakes could depict a political candidate making false statements or engaging in inappropriate actions, which could mislead voters and sway election outcomes unfairly.
- **Impact:** Voters could be swayed by content that is entirely fabricated or manipulated, which undermines the integrity of the election process.

Erosion of Public Trust

- **Concern:** The widespread use of synthetic media could lead to voter distrust in the information they encounter, especially if they begin to question the authenticity of all media, even legitimate content.
- **Example:** Voters might start assuming that all media is potentially altered, leading to skepticism about candidates, the media, and even electoral results.
- **Impact:** This could undermine democracy by reducing people's confidence in their ability to make informed voting decisions.

Manipulation of Voters through Deceptive Campaigning

- **Concern:** Campaigns could deliberately use synthetic media to manipulate voter emotions or deceive them into making decisions based on false or exaggerated information.
- **Example:** A deepfake video might show a political opponent making controversial statements, influencing voters based on fabricated events or images.
- **Impact:** This raises the ethical issue of using technology to manipulate emotions and beliefs for political gain, distorting the fairness of the democratic process.

Challenges in Detection and Regulation

- **Concern:** Detecting and regulating synthetic media is difficult due to the constantly evolving nature of AI technologies.
- **Example:** Tools that identify deepfakes or manipulated media might not keep up with newer techniques of media synthesis, allowing misleading content to slip through the cracks.
- **Impact:** This could complicate efforts to regulate and control the dissemination of false content, especially in the context of a fast-paced election cycle.

Legal and Ethical Concerns

- **Concern:** The use of synthetic media for political purposes could raise significant ethical and legal issues, particularly when it comes to free speech versus defamation or election interference.
- **Example:** A campaign could argue that using synthetic media is simply an extension of political expression, while opponents might argue that it's a form of election interference or libel.
- **Impact:** The balance between protecting free speech and preventing harmful electioneering could lead to complex legal battles.

Potential Pros of Synthetic Media in Electioneering Communications

Enhanced Engagement and Creativity in Campaigning

- **Benefit:** Synthetic media could allow campaigns to reach a broader audience and engage them in innovative ways that traditional media cannot.
- **Example:** Politicians could use synthetic media to produce virtual events, interactive content, or compelling advertisements that resonate with younger, tech-savvy voters.
- **Impact:** This could make campaigns more accessible and relevant, particularly in a digital age where visual content plays a significant role in influencing public opinion.

Cost-Effectiveness

- **Benefit:** Using synthetic media could be more cost-effective than traditional methods of media production (e.g., filming a live ad with actors, travel costs for events, etc.).
- **Example:** Campaigns could create high-quality videos, speeches, or virtual events using AI tools, reducing the need for expensive productions.
- **Impact:** This could allow smaller campaigns to compete on more equal footing with larger ones by reducing the financial barriers to effective advertising.

Ability to Reach a Diverse Audience

- **Benefit:** Synthetic media allows campaigns to tailor their messages more specifically to different demographics and regions.
- **Example:** Using AI-generated voices, politicians could produce ads in multiple languages or dialects, making their messages more accessible to various voter groups.

- Impact: This could help candidates connect with a wider array of voters and better address the concerns of diverse communities.

More Accurate Representation of Candidate's Policy Stance

- Benefit: Synthetic media could be used to precisely communicate a candidate's positions on various issues, avoiding the potential distortion of messages that can occur in live speeches or interviews.
- Example: AI-generated scenarios or simulations could be used to demonstrate a candidate's proposed policies in a clear and concise way.
- Impact: This could enhance voter understanding of a candidate's platform by providing clear, direct information.

Enhanced Accessibility for Voters with Disabilities

- Benefit: Synthetic media can be used to create content tailored to people with disabilities, such as audio descriptions for the visually impaired or translations for non-native speakers.
- Example: Campaigns could create videos with subtitles, sign language interpretation, or AI-generated voiceovers that make their content more accessible to everyone.
- Impact: This could improve accessibility, ensuring that all voters, regardless of disability, have equal access to political information.

Legality of Synthetic Media in Electioneering Communications

The legality of using synthetic media in electioneering communications is a highly complex issue and will vary by jurisdiction. However, some key aspects to consider include:

Federal and State Laws on Election Interference

Legal Framework: The Federal Election Commission (FEC) and state election boards regulate electioneering communications, which include any broadcast, cable, or satellite communications that expressly advocate for or against a candidate.

- Concern: Synthetic media could be used to disseminate false or misleading information about candidates, potentially violating laws that prohibit election interference, defamation, or false statements about candidates.
- Legal Challenge: There may be calls for legislation specifically targeting synthetic media to prevent it from being used to deceive voters, especially when it comes to deepfakes or media that misrepresents candidates' actions or statements.

First Amendment (Freedom of Speech)

- Legal Framework: The First Amendment protects political speech, including the use of various forms of media, and any restrictions on synthetic media could be challenged on the grounds that they infringe on free speech rights.

- **Concern:** Campaigns may argue that the use of synthetic media falls under protected speech, even if the content is misleading or false. In contrast, critics may argue that there must be a balance between free speech and preventing voter deception.
- **Legal Challenge:** Legal battles could arise about the extent of regulation for synthetic media in the context of political speech, and how far laws can go in limiting or regulating its use.

Defamation and False Advertising Laws

- **Legal Framework:** Defamation laws prohibit false statements that harm the reputation of an individual, and false advertising laws prohibit misleading representations made for commercial gain.

- **Concern:** If synthetic media is used to create false statements about a candidate or their actions, it could lead to lawsuits for defamation or false advertising, depending on the nature of the content and its impact on public perception.
- **Legal Challenge:** A candidate or political entity could potentially file a lawsuit claiming harm caused by misleading synthetic media, demanding that the content be removed or penalties be applied.

Regulation of Political Ads and Electioneering Communications

- **Legal Framework:** Many jurisdictions, including federal law, have regulations concerning political ads, particularly regarding transparency, disclosure, and honesty in campaign communications.
- **Concern:** If synthetic media is used in campaign ads, there may be a push for specific disclosure requirements to ensure that voters know when content has been altered or is AI-generated.
- **Legal Challenge:** Laws could be passed requiring campaigns to disclose when synthetic media is used, or mandates that certain types of synthetic content be labeled as such to avoid voter deception.

International Legal Implications (If Applicable)

- **Legal Framework:** The issue of synthetic media in elections is global, and international norms and treaties could influence how such media is regulated across borders, particularly in countries that share similar democratic frameworks.
- **Concern:** Synthetic media could be used to interfere with elections in foreign countries, leading to international calls for regulation or sanctions to protect the integrity of elections worldwide.
- **Legal Challenge:** International cooperation may become necessary to create standards for regulating synthetic media and preventing election manipulation on a global scale.

Conclusion

The use of synthetic media in electioneering communications has both significant pros (such as enhancing campaign engagement and creativity) and cons (like misinformation, erosion of public trust, and ethical concerns). Its legality hinges on a combination of free speech, election interference laws, and defamation concerns, with potential for challenges based on both First Amendment protections and the desire to protect the integrity of the electoral process. Clear, balanced regulations will be needed to

ensure that the benefits of synthetic media are realized without undermining democratic processes. It seems it is mostly based on who is wielding this powerful weapon and whether they use it justly or not.

Now let's discuss the pros, cons, and legality of the signs.

The topic of campaign signs and electioneering regulations as part of SB 64 in Alaska, which addresses various aspects of elections and voter conduct, touches on several important considerations. Below is a breakdown of the pros, cons, and legality of these regulations as they relate to campaign signs and electioneering.

Pros of Campaign Signs and Electioneering Regulations

- Promotes Fairness in Election Campaigns
 - Benefit: Regulations on campaign signs can ensure that all candidates have equal access to public spaces and resources, promoting fairness in how campaigns use physical spaces for advertising.
 - Example: If there are clear rules about where signs can be placed, how large they can be, and the timing of their display, it helps ensure that no candidate has an unfair advantage.
 - Impact: This leads to a more level playing field, where all candidates, regardless of their resources, can participate in the election process without disproportionate influence from wealthy or well-established candidates.
- Protects Public Safety and Aesthetics
 - Benefit: Campaign sign regulations can help maintain the aesthetic quality of public spaces and prevent obstruction of traffic or pedestrian areas.
 - Example: Limiting the size and placement of signs, or requiring their removal after elections, can prevent visual clutter and ensure that signs do not obstruct important public infrastructure (e.g., roads, traffic signs).
 - Impact: These regulations help preserve the integrity of public spaces, ensuring that electioneering does not disrupt daily life or pose safety hazards.
- Reduces Voter Confusion
 - Benefit: Clear rules about where and how campaign signs can be placed can help voters clearly identify where they can expect to find campaign materials, reducing confusion.
 - Example: If a town has designated areas where signs can be placed, voters will know exactly where to look for campaign materials without having to wade through cluttered or confusing areas.
 - Impact: This makes it easier for voters to find and process campaign messaging in a structured way.
- Encourages Respect for Public Property
 - Benefit: Electioneering regulations can prevent the illegal or inappropriate placement of signs on private or government property without permission.

- Example: Regulations might require campaigners to get written consent to place signs on private properties or public land, helping to ensure that public spaces are not used for unauthorized or potentially disruptive campaigning.
- Impact: This promotes accountability and respect for public spaces, preventing instances of unauthorized use or potential vandalism.

Cons of Campaign Signs and Electioneering Regulations

Restrictions on Free Speech

- Concern: Too strict or restrictive campaign sign regulations may be seen as a violation of First Amendment rights by limiting how candidates can express themselves in the public sphere.
- Example: Limiting the size, placement, or number of campaign signs could infringe on a candidate's ability to freely promote their ideas to the public.
- Impact: This could limit political expression, especially for candidates who may not have access to other forms of advertising (like television or radio), making it harder for them to reach voters.

Uneven Enforcement

- Concern: If electioneering regulations are inconsistently enforced, it could lead to unfair advantages for certain candidates or parties, especially if local governments or election authorities are not diligent in upholding the rules.
- Example: A local government might fail to enforce sign placement rules in certain areas, allowing some campaigns to flood those regions with signs while others are penalized for minor infractions.
- Impact: This could create disparities in how different candidates are treated, undermining the fairness of the election.

Overly Burdensome or Complicated Rules

- Concern: Complex or overly detailed regulations around campaign signs might make it difficult for candidates, especially those with limited resources, to comply.
- Example: Requiring candidates to submit detailed paperwork for each sign placement or follow rigid timelines for when signs can be erected and removed could burden smaller campaigns.
- Impact: Smaller candidates or grassroots movements might be disproportionately affected by such regulations, potentially limiting their ability to compete effectively.

Potential for Excessive Bureaucracy

- Concern: If too many regulations are put in place, it could create unnecessary layers of bureaucracy that delay or complicate the election process.
- Example: Requiring too many permits or applications for placing signs could lead to delays in campaign advertising, especially if local governments take too long to process the required paperwork.

- Impact: This could lead to frustration for candidates who want to effectively communicate with voters in a timely manner, potentially diminishing the impact of their campaigns.

Signage as a Form of "Street-Level" Advertising

- Concern: Campaign signs, by nature, are a form of "street-level" advertising that can sometimes be seen as cluttering or disrupting communities, especially in urban areas.
- Example: Large numbers of signs, especially if not regulated for placement or timing, can make areas feel over-commercialized or heavily politicized.
- Impact: This could detract from the aesthetic value of neighborhoods or public spaces and might annoy voters who feel overwhelmed by constant political messaging which is why we have the law in the first place.

Legality of Campaign Signs and Electioneering Regulations

The legality of campaign signs and electioneering regulations generally rests on balancing First Amendment rights (freedom of speech) with the need to maintain public order, safety, and fairness in the election process. Several key points to consider are:

First Amendment Protections

- Legal Framework: The First Amendment guarantees freedom of speech, which includes the right of individuals and organizations to express political opinions. Campaign signs are a form of political expression, and any regulation must avoid infringing on this right.
- Concern: Overly restrictive regulations could be challenged as unconstitutional, especially if they unduly limit the ability of candidates to communicate their messages through signs.

- Legal Precedent: U.S. courts generally allow reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions on political speech, including campaign signs, as long as these restrictions are narrowly tailored to serve a legitimate government interest (such as safety or preventing visual clutter).

Time, Place, and Manner Restrictions

- Legal Framework: Courts have upheld the government's ability to regulate campaign signs in terms of where they can be placed, when they can be displayed, and how large they can be. These regulations are usually permitted as long as they are applied consistently and do not discriminate against particular viewpoints.
- Concern: Any regulation that discriminates against certain types of political messages or favors one candidate over another could be unconstitutional.
- Legal Precedent: For example, local zoning ordinances or state laws that limit the size of signs or regulate where they can be placed (e.g., on private property vs. public right-of-ways) are generally permissible as long as they do not unreasonably burden political speech.

Equal Treatment for All Candidates

- Legal Framework: Election laws must ensure that all candidates are treated equally when it comes to campaign signs and other forms of electioneering.
- Concern: A regulation that is applied unevenly or selectively to favor certain candidates could be legally challenged as a violation of election fairness.
- Legal Precedent: Any electioneering laws that affect campaign signs should be applied equally to all candidates to prevent an unfair advantage.

Public Property vs. Private Property

- Legal Framework: Local governments can regulate campaign signs on public property (such as sidewalks or parks) but have more limited authority over signs on private property.
- Concern: Overreach into private property rights could result in legal challenges.
- Legal Precedent: For example, if a local government imposes overly restrictive rules on where campaign signs can be placed on private land, it could be seen as a violation of property rights, especially if it hinders political expression.

Temporary vs. Permanent Signs

- Legal Framework: Campaign signs are usually considered temporary structures meant to serve a specific purpose (promoting a candidate or political issue) during an election cycle.
- Concern: Regulations should distinguish between temporary and permanent signage to avoid infringing on long-term free expression while still allowing for election-related signage to be regulated.
- Legal Precedent: Many jurisdictions have upheld rules that allow temporary campaign signs as long as they do not remain beyond the election period and do not violate health, safety, or aesthetic standards.

Conclusion

Campaign signs and electioneering regulations in SB 64 are a balancing act between promoting free expression (through the placement of campaign signs) and ensuring public safety, order, and fairness in the electoral process. While these regulations can help prevent unfair advantages and disruptions in public spaces, overly restrictive or uneven enforcement could lead to legal challenges related to First Amendment rights and equal treatment for all candidates. Careful consideration of time, place, and manner restrictions is essential to create a fair and legally sound regulatory framework. While making changes all the time is unnecessary and cumbersome to the bureaucracy of governing more regulations are not necessarily bad ideas as long as they are kept fair, just, and equal across the state.

Now let's look at the pros, cons, and yes the legality of unlawful voting in the first degree. It's your bill, so let's do procede.

The provision concerning "Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree" in SB 64 aims to define and penalize interference with the voting process, particularly serious forms of election interference. Below is a breakdown of the pros, cons, and legality of this provision.

Pros of Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree

Protects the Integrity of Elections

- **Benefit:** This provision helps safeguard the fundamental right to vote, ensuring that elections remain free, fair, and untainted by any form of coercion or fraud.
- **Example:** By criminalizing actions that prevent or interfere with a voter's ability to cast their vote (such as threatening or bribing voters), the law strengthens the integrity of the electoral process.
- **Impact:** Voters can feel secure in exercising their rights without fear of intimidation, manipulation, or outside interference.

Deterrence Against Election Fraud and Coercion

- **Benefit:** The prospect of criminal penalties for serious election interference acts as a deterrent against fraud, intimidation, or other illegal acts aimed at manipulating the vote.
- **Example:** The presence of clear penalties for unlawful interference (such as threats or fraud) may discourage individuals from attempting to influence voters improperly.
- **Impact:** This could lead to cleaner elections, where all participants have confidence in the legitimacy of the voting process.

Upholds Voter Rights and Access

- **Benefit:** It protects voter autonomy, ensuring that voters can make their decisions freely, without external pressure or illegal hindrances.
- **Example:** This could apply to situations where individuals or groups attempt to disrupt polling places, intimidate voters, or improperly influence their choices.
- **Impact:** By ensuring that voters are not subjected to unlawful influence, it reinforces the democratic principle of individuals freely choosing representatives.

Clear Legal Framework

- **Benefit:** The law provides a clear legal framework for prosecuting those who attempt to interfere with voting, establishing penalties and clear definitions of unlawful actions.
- **Example:** If someone were to engage in actions like voter intimidation or casting fraudulent votes, the law defines these acts as criminal and outlines appropriate legal consequences.
- **Impact:** This can make it easier for law enforcement and election authorities to identify and prosecute violations, improving confidence in the rule of law.

Cons of Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree

Overreach and Potential Misuse

- **Concern:** There is a risk that laws criminalizing interference with voting could be applied too broadly, potentially stifling legitimate political expression or engaging in voter suppression tactics.
- **Example:** If the law is used to target people who are peacefully protesting or voicing concerns about the electoral process, it could chill political speech.

- Impact: This could lead to unwarranted legal actions against people simply engaging in lawful political activity, such as campaigning or raising concerns about election security.

Vagueness and Ambiguity

- Concern: If the law is too vague or lacks clear definitions, it could lead to confusion about what constitutes "interference" and result in inconsistent enforcement.
- Example: If the law is not precise, actions such as advocating for a boycott of an election or engaging in spirited political debate might be misinterpreted as interference.
- Impact: This could lead to misuse of the law or unnecessary criminal prosecutions, particularly if election officials or law enforcement interpret the provision too expansively.

Disproportionate Penalties

- Concern: The penalties for unlawful interference with voting could be seen as disproportionate or excessively harsh, especially if the violation is not severe.
- Example: A person who unintentionally disrupts a polling place, perhaps through an argument or minor misunderstanding, could face severe criminal penalties, including incarceration.
- Impact: Overly harsh penalties may discourage individuals from engaging in activism or protest that is part of the broader political discourse and could be seen as disproportionate to minor offenses.

Potential for Abuse by Authorities

- Concern: The law could be misused by election officials or law enforcement to target political opponents or suppress certain groups' participation in the electoral process.
- Example: If an individual or group criticizes the electoral process, authorities might accuse them of interfering with voting in ways that are politically motivated.
- Impact: This could lead to abuses of power and create a chilling effect on legitimate political discourse, particularly during contested or polarized elections.

Legality of Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree

The legality of this provision largely depends on its compatibility with constitutional rights, especially those related to free speech, due process, and equal protection. Key considerations are:

First Amendment Considerations (Freedom of Speech)

- Legal Framework: The First Amendment guarantees the right to free speech, including political expression and protest. Laws criminalizing interference with voting must not infringe upon individuals' ability to express their political views.
- Concern: If the law is too broad or vague, it could inadvertently criminalize legitimate political speech, such as public dissent or protest against the electoral process.

- **Legal Precedent:** The law would need to ensure that it does not unlawfully suppress political speech that is protected under the Constitution. For example, peaceful protests against election procedures or candidates should not be construed as interference with voting.

Due Process and Fairness

- **Legal Framework:** Criminal laws, including those concerning election interference, must comply with due process requirements under the Fourteenth Amendment. This includes providing fair notice of what conduct is prohibited and offering a fair trial if an individual is accused.
- **Concern:** If the law is not clearly defined, it may lead to arbitrary enforcement or over-criminalization of actions that do not actually interfere with the voting process.
- **Legal Precedent:** The law must provide clear definitions of what constitutes interference with voting to avoid potential challenges based on vagueness or overbreadth.

Equal Protection

- **Legal Framework:** The law must be applied equally to all citizens and cannot unfairly target specific groups, such as racial or ethnic minorities, or individuals based on political affiliation.
- **Concern:** If the law is disproportionately enforced against certain groups (for example, minority communities or political opponents), it could violate equal protection principles under the Fourteenth Amendment.
- **Legal Precedent:** The law must avoid discriminatory application and should ensure that penalties are applied equally, regardless of political affiliation or demographics.

Penalties and Proportionality

- **Legal Framework:** Criminal laws must ensure that penalties for interference with voting are not disproportionate to the offense. This relates to the Eighth Amendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment.
- **Concern:** The law should ensure that penalties are proportional to the severity of the offense. Overly harsh penalties could be challenged if they seem excessively punitive for minor offenses.
- **Legal Precedent:** Courts have often scrutinized whether the punishment fits the crime, and overly harsh penalties could face constitutional challenges based on disproportionate punishment.

Election Fraud and Coercion Laws

- **Legal Framework:** U.S. federal and state election laws already prohibit various forms of election fraud, voter intimidation, and coercion, such as voter bribery, threats, or misleading voters.
- **Concern:** This provision would need to complement existing laws and ensure that it does not create redundancies or inconsistencies in the legal framework for protecting voting rights.
- **Legal Precedent:** As long as the law does not conflict with existing federal election laws or state election protections, and if it clearly addresses specific forms of interference, it is likely to be upheld as constitutional.

Conclusion

The provision on Unlawful Interference with Voting in the First Degree in SB 64 has the potential to strengthen the protections surrounding elections by criminalizing serious interference, such as voter intimidation or fraud. However, the law must be carefully crafted to avoid overreach, ensure fairness in enforcement, and respect First Amendment rights. If applied properly, it could deter illegal election interference and enhance voter confidence. However, the law must also be clear, proportionate, and consistent with constitutional rights to prevent misuse and avoid legal challenges.

As I continue I would like to suggest to you all you reject this bill immediately. As you can see listed clearly above why I would understand you would like this bill to go in your favor. I would also like to remind you not all of our clearly insane.

I will only discuss the cons and legality of voter's registration and the verification process. I expect you to understand the pros by now and defend them.

Cons of Voter Registration and Verification Processes:

Barriers to Voting:

- **Voter Suppression:** Overly restrictive voter registration or verification requirements, such as strict voter ID laws, can disenfranchise certain groups, such as the elderly, low-income individuals, or racial minorities, who may face challenges in obtaining the required documents.
- **Complexity or Confusion:** A complicated registration process or unclear verification methods can confuse voters, especially first-time voters, and discourage participation.

Administrative Burden and Costs:

- **Costly Implementation:** Maintaining voter rolls, verifying information, and managing registration processes can be expensive for states and local governments, especially when they need to ensure the system is updated regularly.
- **Errors and Delays:** Administrative errors in verifying or updating voter information could lead to delays or mistakes in voter registration, such as voters being wrongly removed from the rolls or not properly recorded.

Potential for Voter Disenfranchisement:

- **Voter Roll Purging:** Some states conduct purges of voter rolls to remove inactive voters, which can accidentally disenfranchise eligible individuals who might have moved, changed names, or not voted in a few cycles.
- **Strict Identification Requirements:** Requirements such as presenting specific forms of ID at registration or polling places may disproportionately affect disadvantaged groups who may not have the necessary documentation.

Privacy Concerns:

- **Data Collection:** Voter registration and verification processes often require individuals to provide sensitive personal information. This raises concerns about data security and the potential misuse of that information.
- **Potential for Discrimination:** Some critics argue that verification processes can disproportionately affect certain demographic groups, such as racial minorities, potentially leading to discriminatory practices.

Legality of Voter Registration and Verification Processes:

Constitutional Rights:

- **Voting Rights Act (1965):** The U.S. Constitution guarantees the right to vote, and certain federal laws, like the Voting Rights Act, aim to protect voters from discrimination, ensuring that voter registration and verification processes do not disenfranchise minority groups.
- **Equal Protection Clause:** The 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause requires that voting laws be applied fairly to all citizens. Laws that unduly burden certain groups (e.g., racial minorities, the elderly, or disabled individuals) could be challenged as unconstitutional.

State vs. Federal Jurisdiction:

- **State Authority:** States generally have the authority to set their own voter registration processes, but they must comply with federal laws protecting voting rights. States must balance the need for secure elections with the rights of eligible voters.
- **Challenges to State Laws:** States' voter registration and verification processes can be legally challenged in court if they are found to violate federal laws or constitutional protections. For example, overly restrictive voter ID laws or voter purging practices may face legal challenges for being discriminatory or burdensome.

Recent Legal Developments:

- **Voter ID Laws:** Many states have implemented strict voter ID laws that require voters to present photo identification at the polls. While these laws are legal in most cases, they have been challenged for disproportionately affecting certain groups, such as low-income voters or people of color.
- **Online Registration and Verification:** Some states have adopted online voter registration, which is seen as a way to make registration easier. However, the legality of online verification systems, especially regarding security, can sometimes be challenged.
- **Federal Oversight:** In some cases, especially in jurisdictions with histories of voter suppression, federal oversight may be imposed (such as through the "preclearance" provisions of the Voting Rights Act, though this was limited by the Supreme Court in 2013).

Federal and State Compliance:

- **National Voter Registration Act (1993):** This act, also known as the "Motor Voter Act," mandates that states offer voter registration opportunities when citizens apply for or renew a driver's license or state ID. It ensures easier access to registration, but states must comply with certain standards.

- Help America Vote Act (2002): This federal law set standards for election administration and voter registration, including provisions for creating a centralized voter database and improving voter identification processes.

Conclusion:

The voter registration and verification process plays a critical role in maintaining the integrity and security of elections, but it comes with both benefits and challenges. Proper verification can prevent fraud and increase voter confidence, but overly stringent requirements can disenfranchise certain groups. The legal landscape surrounding these processes is shaped by constitutional protections, federal laws, and state regulations. Efforts to balance security and accessibility continue to evolve, and legal challenges are common when registration or verification processes are seen as unfair or unconstitutional.

The last thing is probably the most important and I am most irritated about, after what you have already done to our senior population there is no forgiveness. Let's talk about lacking safeguards for vulnerable communities.

Alaska Senate Bill 64 (SB 64), which focuses on campaign finance, lobbying, and public office disclosures, has the potential to impact vulnerable groups in various ways. While SB 64 may aim to increase transparency and accountability in Alaska's political system, its lack of safeguards for vulnerable groups can raise concerns. Here are some possible areas where SB 64 may lack protections for the disabled, seniors, and anyone living in remote areas:

1. Financial Disclosure Burdens:

Vulnerable Groups: Vulnerable populations, such as low-income individuals or small grassroots organizations, might struggle with the financial disclosure requirements outlined in SB 64. If the bill imposes complex reporting or compliance requirements without providing support or exemptions for such groups, it could disproportionately affect them.

- **Lack of Safeguards:** While the bill seeks to ensure transparency, it may lack provisions that accommodate the practical challenges faced by small or under-resourced political candidates, grassroots organizations, or marginalized communities. These groups may lack the financial resources to hire experts or legal advisors to comply with the disclosure rules.

2. Potential for Discrimination or Exclusion:

Vulnerable Groups: Certain vulnerable groups, such as racial minorities, individuals with disabilities, or immigrant communities, might be disadvantaged in a complex and bureaucratic system of reporting and verification. If the rules are too complicated or difficult to navigate, these groups could be unfairly excluded from political participation.

- **Lack of Safeguards:** SB 64 might not address specific barriers that these communities face when trying to comply with the requirements, such as language barriers, lack of internet access, or limited financial resources for legal compliance. Without safeguards to ensure equitable access to the system, these groups might be disenfranchised.

3. Impact on Political Participation:

Vulnerable Groups: The bill's disclosure requirements could unintentionally discourage vulnerable groups from running for office or participating in political activities. For instance, individuals who are in precarious financial situations or have privacy concerns may be deterred from engaging with the political system due to the fear of having their personal financial information exposed or misused.

- Lack of Safeguards: If SB 64 does not include provisions to protect the privacy of personal data or provide clear guidance on how financial information is shared, certain populations may feel reluctant to participate in the political process, fearing negative repercussions or targeting.

4. Complexity and Accessibility:

Vulnerable Groups: Certain vulnerable groups, such as elderly individuals or those with disabilities, may face difficulties in navigating the system of financial disclosures or in understanding complex legal language. The bill may not provide sufficient protections or assistance to ensure these groups are not unintentionally excluded from participating due to accessibility or comprehension issues.

- Lack of Safeguards: If SB 64 does not make provisions for easy access to assistance, support, or simplified systems for those with physical, cognitive, or language barriers, it could hinder the ability of vulnerable groups to engage fully in the political process.

5. Potential for Increased Political Targeting:

Vulnerable Groups: Vulnerable groups, especially marginalized political candidates or organizations, might be more susceptible to political targeting or harassment due to the financial disclosures required by SB 64. Information about a candidate's finances could be used as a weapon to discredit or intimidate them.

- Lack of Safeguards: The bill may not include adequate measures to prevent the misuse of publicly available financial information to target vulnerable candidates or groups, such as safeguards against online harassment or targeted campaigns meant to discredit marginalized individuals or groups.

6. Limited Resources for Support:

Vulnerable Groups: Small or under-resourced candidates, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds, may not have access to the resources needed to ensure compliance with the bill's provisions. This could create disparities in political representation, as wealthier or well-established political candidates might have more resources to meet disclosure requirements.

- Lack of Safeguards: SB 64 may not include provisions for assistance or support for candidates from underrepresented communities, such as providing access to free legal counsel or public resources that explain the requirements in simpler terms.

Conclusion:

While SB 64 is designed to improve transparency and accountability in Alaska's political system, its lack of specific safeguards for vulnerable groups can create barriers to participation and compliance. The bill could inadvertently burden marginalized or under-resourced individuals, communities, and organizations, potentially discouraging their engagement in political activities or leaving them vulnerable to harassment. To ensure equity, future revisions of SB 64 could include provisions that specifically

address the needs of these groups, such as financial support, privacy protections, simplified processes, and protections against targeting or discrimination.

Senate Bill 64 (SB 64), which focuses on campaign finance and financial disclosures in Alaska, could have unintended negative effects on seniors, individuals with disabilities, and those living in remote locations. These groups may face unique challenges that SB 64 does not fully address, leading to potential harm. Here's how:

1. Complexity of Reporting Requirements

- **Seniors and Disabled Individuals:** The process of filing detailed financial disclosures or complying with campaign finance regulations can be complex and overwhelming for seniors or individuals with disabilities, particularly those who have limited access to technology, legal assistance, or support services.
- **Challenge:** If the reporting process is cumbersome and requires technical knowledge, seniors or disabled individuals might struggle to navigate the system. This could discourage participation in the political process or even disqualify candidates or organizations from running for office if they cannot comply.

2. Lack of Accessibility

- **Seniors and Disabled Individuals:** Many seniors and individuals with disabilities may have difficulty accessing online platforms or dealing with digital paperwork. If SB 64 relies heavily on online forms or electronic submissions without providing paper options or assistance, it could disenfranchise these groups who may not be comfortable with or have access to digital resources.
- **Challenge:** Seniors, especially older generations, and disabled individuals might not have the same level of access to technology or internet literacy. This creates a barrier to participating in or complying with the requirements of SB 64, potentially leading to unintentional violations or disenfranchisement.

3. Transportation and Remote Access Issues

- **Seniors, Disabled Individuals, and Remote Residents:** Alaska's vast size and many remote communities present unique challenges. Seniors, people with disabilities, and those living in rural or remote areas may have limited access to in-person assistance for voter registration, financial reporting, or campaign finance disclosure. Traveling to government offices to resolve issues could be difficult due to limited transportation options, especially for individuals with mobility impairments.
- **Challenge:** If SB 64 doesn't provide adequate online or mobile solutions for people in remote areas, these individuals could face barriers to submitting required documents on time. This could lead to missed deadlines, compliance issues, or the inability to participate in the political system at all.

4. Financial Burdens

- **Seniors and Disabled Individuals:** Individuals from lower-income backgrounds, including seniors on fixed incomes and disabled individuals who may be unable to work, could face significant financial burdens to comply with the financial disclosure requirements of SB 64. This might include costs associated with hiring legal or financial experts to help with the disclosure process.

- Challenge: The financial and administrative burden of ensuring compliance could be prohibitive for people who are already struggling economically, potentially preventing them from running for office, participating in campaigns, or even voting if they can't afford the necessary resources.

5. Privacy Concerns

- Seniors and Disabled Individuals: Seniors and disabled individuals may have concerns about the privacy of their financial information. Publicly disclosing sensitive financial details could raise concerns about identity theft, fraud, or potential exploitation, particularly if the individuals are more vulnerable due to their age or health conditions.
- Challenge: Without safeguards to protect the privacy of vulnerable populations, the requirement to disclose financial information could expose these individuals to risks they may not fully understand or be able to protect themselves from.

6. Digital Literacy and Language Barriers

- Seniors, Disabled Individuals, and Remote Residents: Many seniors or people with disabilities may not be as familiar with technology as younger, more able-bodied individuals. If SB 64 involves a large degree of digital paperwork, online portals, or web-based registration, those without access to the internet or the necessary digital literacy may be left out. Additionally, people in remote communities may not have reliable internet connections.
- Challenge: If the bill requires interaction with online systems and doesn't provide alternatives for those who cannot navigate the digital world, it may make it difficult or impossible for people to comply with the law.

7. Limited Support and Assistance

- Seniors, Disabled Individuals, and Remote Residents: People in remote locations or those with physical or cognitive disabilities may need additional help navigating the system, filling out paperwork, or understanding complex rules. If SB 64 does not provide resources like in-person assistance, support services, or translated materials for non-English speakers, it could prevent these groups from engaging fully in the political process.
- Challenge: The lack of support for these groups could result in increased confusion, mistakes, or missed deadlines in fulfilling reporting requirements.

8. Health-Related Issues

- Seniors and Disabled Individuals: Seniors and people with disabilities may face health-related challenges that prevent them from staying on top of complex reporting deadlines, making travel to required locations, or dealing with bureaucratic hurdles. Illnesses or physical limitations could delay compliance or make participation in elections more difficult.
- Challenge: The burden of meeting legal and reporting deadlines may add stress, which could worsen health conditions or lead to non-compliance due to lack of time or capacity.

Conclusion

SB 64, while aiming to enhance transparency and accountability, may unintentionally harm vulnerable groups such as seniors, disabled individuals, and those in remote locations by creating barriers to compliance, participation, and access to information. Without adequate safeguards—such as simplified procedures, alternative methods of reporting, targeted outreach, or additional support—these groups may be disproportionately impacted. It is essential that future revisions of SB 64 address these concerns to ensure that the political system is accessible and inclusive for all Alaskans, regardless of their circumstances.

When I look at our hosts to this great frontier I am shocked in disbelief at the dishonor you show them repeatedly. Pick up a damn book once and a while and learn a thing or two.

Senate Bill 64 (SB 64) could have particular implications for Alaska Native communities, especially considering their unique geographical, social, and cultural challenges. Alaska Natives may face various barriers in complying with the bill's requirements due to logistical, financial, and systemic issues that could disproportionately affect them. Here's how SB 64 might affect Alaska Native populations:

1. Geographic and Logistical Barriers:

- **Remote Locations:** Alaska Natives often live in remote, rural, or isolated communities, where access to essential services, including government offices, is limited. These areas may lack reliable internet or transportation options, which makes complying with requirements like financial disclosures or voter registration especially difficult.
- **Challenge:** If SB 64 relies heavily on digital platforms for registration, disclosure, or reporting, Alaska Natives in rural areas may face significant obstacles in accessing these systems. Limited access to technology or reliable internet may prevent them from participating fully in the political process or adhering to the bill's requirements.

2. Language Barriers and Cultural Considerations:

- **Language and Communication:** Many Alaska Native communities speak Indigenous languages, and some individuals may have limited proficiency in English. SB 64, if it uses complex legal or bureaucratic language, may unintentionally exclude Alaska Natives who have difficulty understanding these documents, even if translations are not provided.
- **Challenge:** If the bill's requirements are not clearly communicated in languages spoken by Alaska Native communities or if no cultural context is provided for understanding the significance of financial disclosures or other reporting requirements, it could create barriers to participation.

3. Economic and Resource Limitations:

- **Financial Resources:** Many Alaska Native communities face economic hardships or are resource-constrained. Small grassroots organizations or individual Alaska Native candidates may not have the financial means to comply with the campaign finance or disclosure regulations set forth by SB 64.
- **Challenge:** The financial burden of hiring professionals to assist with navigating complex reporting systems (e.g., lawyers or accountants) could be prohibitive for Alaska Natives, particularly in remote or lower-income areas. The lack of resources could lead to fewer Alaska Native candidates running for office, as they might struggle with compliance or affordability.

4. Potential for Voter Disenfranchisement:

- **Voter Registration and Verification:** Alaska Natives may face difficulties with the voter registration process due to a variety of reasons—such as limited access to identification documents, challenges navigating digital systems, or a lack of knowledge about how to register.
- **Challenge:** If SB 64 does not offer sufficient support or alternatives for registering in person or for people without access to the necessary documentation (such as ID), Alaska Native voters could be inadvertently disenfranchised. Additionally, some Alaska Natives may live in communities that are not properly represented on voter rolls or where voter verification systems fail to accommodate their needs.

5. Privacy Concerns:

- **Privacy of Financial Information:** Alaska Natives, like others, may have concerns about the privacy of their financial information being disclosed in the public domain as part of campaign finance or public office reporting. In communities where people have close relationships and personal information is closely guarded, the disclosure of financial information could be seen as an invasion of privacy or a potential source of harm.
- **Challenge:** Without safeguards to ensure the security of personal data, Alaska Natives could be reluctant to disclose financial details, particularly if there are concerns about misuse or exploitation of sensitive information, which could discourage political participation.

6. Lack of Targeted Outreach and Support:

- **Engagement with Alaska Native Communities:** SB 64 may not include provisions for targeted outreach to Alaska Native communities, which could prevent these communities from fully understanding the bill's implications or how to comply. Alaska Native organizations may also lack the resources to provide educational campaigns that explain the new requirements in culturally relevant ways.
- **Challenge:** Without outreach efforts in Alaska Native languages, culturally competent education, or local community resources to assist with the registration and verification process, many Alaska Natives could struggle to participate or comply with the new regulations.

7. Risk of Political Exclusion:

- **Reduced Political Representation:** If the complexity of SB 64's compliance requirements creates a barrier for Alaska Native individuals or organizations, there could be a reduced representation of Alaska Natives in political offices, both at the state and local levels.
- **Challenge:** The financial and logistical challenges tied to meeting the requirements may discourage Alaska Native candidates or organizations from entering the political arena, leading to a lack of political representation and advocacy for issues that specifically affect Alaska Native communities.

8. Potential for Increased Discrimination or Targeting:

- **Political Targeting and Discrimination:** Public disclosures, such as financial reporting required by SB 64, could expose Alaska Native candidates or organizations to political targeting or harassment. These disclosures could be weaponized by political opponents or others seeking to discredit or undermine Alaska Native political participation.

- Challenge: If proper protections or safeguards aren't in place, Alaska Natives could be subjected to increased scrutiny or attacks, especially in a polarized political environment. This could discourage their engagement in public office or activism.

Conclusion:

While SB 64 aims to improve transparency and accountability in Alaska's political system, it may disproportionately impact Alaska Native communities by creating barriers to participation. These barriers include logistical challenges due to remote living conditions, potential language and cultural barriers, economic limitations, privacy concerns, and a lack of targeted outreach. To prevent these negative impacts, future revisions of SB 64 could include measures such as providing better access to resources in Indigenous languages, ensuring alternative ways to comply with the law for those in remote areas, offering financial support or exemptions for under-resourced communities, and ensuring privacy protections for sensitive information. Ensuring that Alaska Native communities have the tools, knowledge, and support to participate in the political process is essential for maintaining an inclusive and representative democracy.

I strongly oppose this bill as it is written. Do better.

Thank you

I am Randy Ruedrich from District 17 Downtown Anchorage. I represent myself

I wish to thank the Senate State Affairs Committee for this opportunity to testify on SB 64 as amended:

- 1) **Sec 1, 2, 4:** The requirement that the voter intends to return to **the same residence** is nonsensical. Voter Housing needs will change over time. No voter should expect to return to their parent's home after completing college. No military personnel return to their prior residence especially if they retired during that interim. This amendment is extremely limiting on Alaskan Voters that intend to return to Alaska. Legislation fails to provide for proper voter retention.

Suggest adopting related changes in SB 70 to clarify residency.

- 2) **Sec 25, 27 & 31: The Witness signature on the Absentee Ballots must be retained.**

Alaska State Law uses this witness signature as a second **person confirmation** that the voter who signed the ballot envelope is truly that person.

Election Day and Early Voting ballots do not require a witness signature since they are cast in the presence of DoE personnel. Absentee-In-Person (AIP) ballots are prepared in a DoE designated location with DoE staff, local government staff or tribal staff present.

The witness signature has provided assurance that the Absentee By Mail (ABM) ballot is proper for decades. An unwitnessed voter signature has lost its authentication. Our ABM Voting system has maintained Alaska Election Integrity for decades. Without this critical witness signature of the ABM Ballot, the agents of change will demand voter signature verification for a mail-in voting system. **Stop the destruction of Alaskan Election Integrity now, retain the ABM Ballot witness signatures.**

- 3) **Sec 29: Changing the Deadline for Absentee ballots to arrive to 10 days from 15 days after Election Day is in the right direction.** But the Federal Courts are working on this issue. Instead of series of state law changes to confuse voters, let's do this right in this bill: **Change to All Absentee Ballots must be returned by 8:00 pm Election Day.**
- 4) **Sec 32 33 34: Why does Alaska need a ballot cure process?**
In 2024 **82% of all ballots** were cast at the polls, at an Early Vote facility or an AIP facility. **No cure process can apply to any of these ballots.**

Only **1303 of 78,800 absentee ballots were rejected in 2024 General Election.** These 78,800 absentee ballots include 18,000 AIP ballots which include the Early Voting problems. DoE staff and their designees had the opportunity to cure approximately 70 AIP ballots when cast. Approximately **550 of these 1303** are not curable: Duplicate, not post marked, arrived late, AIP rejects, etc.

Only 105 voters did not sign their ballot and 512 ballots had witness issues.

Some voters used a national ballot form which did not request a witness signature.

No Senate District had more **than 1.6% of its Absentee ballots** rejected for no voter signature or witness issues.

HB 37 had one unsigned ballot and 6 Witness issues

HD 38 had no unsigned ballots and one Witness issue

HD 39 had no unsigned ballots and two Witness issues

HD 40 had no unsigned ballots and 13 Witness issues.

The 2020 Covid impacted Elections as well as the 2022 Special Primary Election are unique special cases.

The 2024 Elections Results show that Alaskan Voters returned quality countable absentee ballots. Less than 1.0% of all absentee ballots may be curable or 0.13% of all 2024 general election ballots may be curable.

Building an extensive cure process produces negligible benefits. Furthermore, the cure tool becomes an installed part of an all mail-in ballot process to damage Alaska Election Integrity.

5) Sec 43: Why have ballot drop boxes in Anchorage?

In 2024 as noted above, **82% of all ballots** are already received directly by other DoE processes. More than 20,000 absentee ballots **or 6% were returned** from outside of Alaska. Less than 40,000 Absentee Ballots were returned by in-state voters during October and November.

These Alaskan voters have applied for an ABM Ballot. They are not looking for a drop box.

The DoE has proposed to provide **postage paid envelopes** to make the ballot return process simpler and free.

Drop box issues can be summarized as:

Drop Boxes must be monitored and ballots collected frequently.

Drop Boxes have been vandalized, and ballots have been destroyed in lower 48

Drop Boxes have been utilized to facilitate election fraud to destroy Election Integrity.

The most severe failure in this recently amended section is:

The Municipality distributes Mail-In Ballots to most voters that can be dropped into its local white drop boxes.

The DoE does not distribute any Mail-In Ballots in Anchorage to any voters.

The DoE mails requested ABM Ballot packages to Anchorage Voters with reliable instructions to mail these ballots to the DoE.

The State election process and the Anchorage Municipality election process are significantly different.

Some voters are already confused, let's not make this much worse.

No Anchorage Muni drop boxes for Ballots that are not bulk mailed to voters.

Let's not create a new set of problems with unnecessary drop box deployments.

6) Sec 43: Synthetic Media is an interesting topic. But without major efforts at the federal and state level, **this is extremely premature for Alaska to adopt Campaign Finance Laws.**

Excessive confusing litigation may be the only outcome for this section.

- 7) **Sec 44: Do not include the quasi-judicial Redistricting Board in the Open Meeting Act universe.**

Thanks for the opportunity to provide my thoughts on these elections process changes.

Randy Ruedrich