

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