

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

February 3, 2009  
8:08 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Bob Lynn, Chair  
Representative Craig Johnson  
Representative Peggy Wilson  
Representative Max Gruenberg  
Representative Pete Petersen

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Paul Seaton, Vice Chair  
Representative Carl Gatto

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 42

"An Act establishing the Legislative Study Group on the Establishment of an Immediate Online Political Campaign Reporting System; and directing the study group to prepare a report on the possibility of creating an immediate, online state political campaign reporting system."

- HEARD AND HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 42

SHORT TITLE: LEG STUDY GROUP:ONLINE CAMPAIGN REPORTING

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) LYNN

01/20/09	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/09
01/20/09	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/20/09	(H)	STA, FIN
01/29/09	(H)	STA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
01/29/09	(H)	<Bill Hearing Postponed>
02/03/09	(H)	STA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106

**WITNESS REGISTER**

PATTY WARE  
Regulation of Lobbying  
Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC)

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions during the hearing on HB 42.

MICHAEL SICA, Staff  
Representative Bob Lynn  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HB 42, on behalf of Representative Lynn, prime sponsor.

CRAIG FISHER, CEO  
PangoMedia, Inc.  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HB 42.

ANDY ROGERS, President/CEO  
PangoMedia, Inc.  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HB 42.

CHRISTINA ELLINGSON, Assistant Director  
APOC

Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions during the hearing on HB 42.

HOLLY HILL, Executive Director  
APOC

Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions during the hearing on HB 42.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

[8:08:15 AM](#)

**CHAIR BOB LYNN** called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:08 a.m. Representatives Johnson, Wilson, Petersen, and Lynn were present at the call to order. Representative Gruenberg arrived as the meeting was in progress.

[8:09:12 AM](#)

HB 42-LEG STUDY GROUP:ONLINE CAMPAIGN REPORTING

CHAIR LYNN announced that the only order of business was HOUSE BILL NO. 42, "An Act establishing the Legislative Study Group on the Establishment of an Immediate Online Political Campaign Reporting System; and directing the study group to prepare a report on the possibility of creating an immediate, online state political campaign reporting system."

8:09:35 AM

CHAIR LYNN explained that there is a committee substitute in the committee packet which would make a single change to HB 42, which is to specify that the chair of the study group be a legislative member.

8:09:50 AM

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON moved to adopt the committee substitute (CS) for HB 42, Version 26-LS0226\E, Bullard, 2/2/09, as a work draft. There being no objection, Version E was before the committee.

8:10:10 AM

CHAIR LYNN introduced HB 42 as prime sponsor. He said HB 42 would establish a study group that would determine the feasibility of establishing an online campaign banking and reporting system that would instantly make campaign contributions and expenditures visible to the world. He credited the idea for the bill to the late Father Tom Moffatt, his first chief of staff. He said he has informally discussed the idea with the Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC) and others, beginning with his first involvement with the House State Affairs Standing Committee in 2003, and now, with the advances in Internet technology and banking software, he believes the gap between the vision and the reality of making instant reporting possible has narrowed significantly.

CHAIR LYNN said current reporting only presents a campaign disclosure "snapshot," which is only accurate on the date of the report, and dishonest candidates are able to hide information. He explained that contributions from "controversial people" or political action committees (PACs) can be deposited right after a report due date to delay political repercussions until the next report. Furthermore, candidates can delay large media buys until immediately after a due date, thereby keeping opponents in the dark about an "upcoming television onslaught." Another tactic is to scribble handwritten campaign reports and mail them

to the state before midnight on the due date, which makes the report on time but delays transcription of the report to the Internet. Such tactics can hinder Alaskans from getting the campaign transparency they deserve in a timely manner, Chair Lynn said, which defeats the purpose of a campaign disclosure. The advent of "early voting" amplifies the need for instant reporting, he remarked.

8:13:45 AM

CHAIR LYNN said the online reporting system that the study group would consider would be similar to the system currently in use by individuals with their own accounts, except that anyone in the world could see the information without a password. Campaign contributions would show up immediately when deposited, while campaign expenditures would be displayed on the Internet as soon as the vendor cashed the campaign expenditure check, he said. Instant, online campaign banking could be implemented through a bid process from Alaska banks to perform the service for a fee to be paid by the state, the candidate, or both. Another option, he suggested, could be for software to be made available to an Alaska bank of the candidate's choosing. Yet another choice could be for banks to develop their own software, modified from the online banking software currently in use.

CHAIR LYNN said in order to conform to current requirements, instant, online reporting would need to display names, addresses, occupations, and employers of campaign contributors, and would need to show "who receives what" in campaign expenditures.

CHAIR LYNN asked the committee not to overcomplicate the bill. He reminded committee members that there is no need to figure out how everything would work, because the study group proposed by the bill would do that. The major questions to be answered by the study group proposed by HB 42 are there, he said.

CHAIR LYNN said there are three questions to be posed by HB 42: Would instant campaign reporting be good public policy? Is instant campaign reporting technically feasible? Is instant campaign disclosure financially feasible? The task of the committee is to decide whether it is a good idea for a study group to consider those questions. Chair Lynn concluded by noting that Alaska would be the first state in the nation to adopt instant, online reporting. He encouraged the committee to "let Alaska lead the way for the rest of the country."

[8:16:58 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON stated his support of the instant reporting of income, but said there are too many ways that instant reporting of expenses could be problematic. For example, he noted that the print shop he used for his campaign did not submit its bill until the day after the election. He indicated that it is his business to strategize how he spends his campaign money, but the public has a right to know who is financing his campaign. He offered a further example.

[8:20:11 AM](#)

PATTY WARE, Regulation of Lobbying, Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC), Juneau, Alaska, in response to Chair Lynn, said under the current system, a candidate reports the name of the person or entity whom he/she paid. For example, if an expenditure is paid out to a television station or a large public media "buy," that is what would be listed on the campaign report. In response to a follow-up question from Chair Lynn, she confirmed that the reporting is not broken down further than that.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON responded, "If we have to make advertising agencies report to APOC every penny they spend on an ad, you're going to probably find an opponent to this type of legislation."

CHAIR LYNN said the bill does not entertain that requirement; it simply proposes that a study group form to decide what should and should not be included in instant reporting.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON opined that if [instant reporting] is a good policy, then the legislature should make it happen through the committee process; a study group is not necessary.

MICHAEL SICA, Staff, Representative Bob Lynn, Alaska State Legislature, testifying on behalf of Representative Lynn, prime sponsor, said he understands what Representative Johnson is saying. He said he thinks the intent of the sponsor is for the proposed study group to bring back a recommendation to the legislature, at which point, the legislature would go through its critical process of decision making.

[8:24:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON said most legislators are on the road most of the time; therefore, campaign checks mailed to the home base may not be deposited for three weeks. She said the bill would create a situation in which only those legislators who can get home each night would be reporting contributions instantly. Furthermore, she noted that in Wrangell there is no printing service, so she cannot even order signs locally.

CHAIR LYNN remarked that with or without this legislation, a campaign check has to be deposited as soon as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON reiterated her concern about the issue of fairness and how the bill may end up affecting those who cannot get home each night versus those who can.

CHAIR LYNN said, "It would still be more rapid than the way we do it today on paper."

[8:29:17 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN said he sees Representative Wilson's point. He said if the requirement is made to report campaign finance instantly and a candidate is in remote Alaska, he/she may be forced to hire a treasurer to ensure the reports are made [instantly], and that would make campaigns more expensive.

CHAIR LYNN said he thinks this legislation could "lessen the hurdle," because the candidate or his/her volunteer could just go to the bank and make a deposit and the deposit would show up on an online banking account for the public's viewing.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN asked Chair Lynn to confirm that he is proposing a program that would have access to a candidate's campaign banking account number so that as soon as a campaign deposit is made at the bank, that information would be immediately listed online.

CHAIR LYNN indicated that is his intent. He clarified that the public would not be able to make changes online because the information would be "read only."

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN said it would be tempting for some people who are computer savvy to hack into the information.

[8:33:14 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG recollected that past legislation designed to set up study groups was introduced in the form of a concurrent resolution.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON indicated that that is his understanding.

CHAIR LYNN cautioned against overcomplicating the process.

[8:35:18 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON said she does not think [full disclosure] will occur simply by instantly reporting a bank deposit, because a deposit does not specify how many checks are in it or the source of those checks. She said online banking and reporting are two different things.

CHAIR LYNN related that when he gets five campaign checks, he makes five deposits.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON responded, "I would go crazy if I had to do that."

MR. SICA clarified that the idea of the sponsor is not that a check must be instantly deposited, but that once it is deposited, it would be instantly reported to the public.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON said he includes multiple checks in one deposit, and there is nowhere in a bank account where a person has copies of the checks he/she deposited.

CHAIR LYNN said he makes copies of his checks.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON said he does also, but noted that that copy would not be available to the public online. In response to Chair Lynn, he said in theory, the bank runs each check through a machine.

CHAIR LYNN said that is the type of thing a study group could figure out. He added his wish to have a representative from the banking community serve on the proposed study group.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON remarked, "I would certainly like to hear from someone from the bank, because I think we're asking them to change the way they do business." He added that he thinks that would be expensive.

MR. SICA suggested that Ms. Ware explain to the committee how checks are currently handled.

8:38:41 AM

MS. WARE revealed to the committee that APOC is already in the midst of development of an online, electronic reporting system. The online, electronic reporting for lobbyists and employers of lobbyists was deployed in February of 2008. The current contractor is also responsible for building online reporting for public official financial disclosure, as well as for campaign disclosure, she noted. The latter disclosure, she relayed, is not slated to be deployed until sometime in 2010. Regarding the detailed and complex questions the committee has regarding a deposit slip comprising multiple text, for example, she said were the bill to pass and the study group tackle some of these issues, that group may wish to consider the interface between any kind of online banking system and the existing forms that "you all" are all ready required to fill out by APOC.

MS. WARE said APOC appreciates that the proposed legislation designates that an APOC representative would be a member of the study group; however, she said APOC would want to ensure that the study group learned from the lessons APOC has learned through its experience thus far in regard to the lobbyist reporting system. She stated that APOC is committed to working with the legislature if HB 42 is passed.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON commented that she already gives APOC information on each check deposited, including the name on the check and who the person's employer is; therefore, she said she does not know if this bill is necessary.

8:42:25 AM

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN said he can see how having more and more reporting done electronically would be convenient for APOC, because reading long hand can be a nightmare. However, he said at this point he still needs some questions answered.

8:43:16 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG asked Ms. Ware, "Is this something that APOC could undertake without legislation?"

MS. WARE responded by reiterating that APOC is already in the midst of working toward online reporting. She noted that

currently, the electronic filing system for lobbyists and employers is not available to the public. She said APOC has not yet reached Chair Lynn's dream of immediate accessibility, but is working toward it.

8:45:06 AM

CRAIG FISHER, CEO, PangoMedia, Inc., told the committee that he became involved in software engineering for approximately 15 years. He addressed the three key questions outlined by Chair Lynn during his presentation of the bill. Regarding the first question, whether [instant reporting] is good for the state, he said as a citizen he supports increased transparency [in politics]. Furthermore, he said more rapid response, in terms of who is financing what, seems even more important in an age when early voting is becoming more popular.

MR. FISHER, regarding whether instant, online reporting is technically feasible, said he is fairly certain that it is. To the question of whether or not it is financially feasible, he said that is a more difficult question to answer. He said part of his work involves figuring out how much money it will take to do a project early on in that project, and he said "this doesn't seem like an incredibly complicated project." He agreed that there would be a challenge regarding security, and he said it is wise to include bank representatives in the proposed study group.

MR. FISHER, in response to a question from Representative Wilson, said it would be incredibly difficult at this point to give even a rough estimate of what the necessary software would cost the state. In response to a follow-up question from Representative Wilson, he said he does not need to know how much someone has available to spend in order to tell him/her how much something will cost. He offered an example.

8:53:07 AM

ANDY ROGERS, President/CEO, PangoMedia, Inc., read from a prepared statement as follows:

Immediate, online availability of campaign finance information will be a fantastic resource for voters. It will provide what I see as a necessary level of transparency into the electoral process that is sorely missing today. As a born and raised Alaskan father, husband, employer, and voter, I am excited that our

state's legislators would consider leading the country in this effort.

... As a software professional, I am well-qualified to speak to the probable success and the likely pitfalls associated with this initiative. I can plainly say that the technology does exist to make this a reality. We need only to align the interests of policy makers, potential candidates, banking institutions, voters, and current regulatory bodies. ... That may seem like no small task and it's probably not; however, the common threads of campaign ethics [and] contribution transparency must drive the interests of all ... stakeholders toward a simple, universal system that provides immediate and complete access to all Alaskan voters.

What then remains is to let talented professionals define the security and the technical measures necessary to protect sensitive account information, ... [and] to identify the appropriate steward of the system, be it the state, one or more of the banking institutions, or perhaps even another third-party vendor.

... It seems almost nonsensical to ask, "Should we do this?" The only real question is, "How should we do this?" ... More importantly, the potential constituencies of all candidates will have a necessary insight into detailed, complete contribution information, without an increase in load and burden on the candidates themselves, and they will have it before they enter a voting booth.

MR. ROGERS thanked Chair Lynn for championing the cause of increased transparency in government. He said as a voter he likes to see that kind of interest in his elected officials.

MR. ROGERS, in response to Representative Wilson, said one question to ask is, "Should we do this?" He said he thinks the answer is a resounding yes. Two other questions relate to how this is done and how much it will cost. Mr. Rogers said he does not think a single answer can be found without identifying the options available. He stated that banks already employ similar technology for reporting, and they do it through a narrow window - they make the information available to the account holder. The bank itself has the ability to access the account holder's

information. He said it seems conceivable that a more public view could be provided without revealing certain information. He suggested that the state would need to leverage the technology and information that banks have spent decades developing and base its budgeting from that.

MR. ROGERS suggested that another opportunity may be to access a vendor such as Quicken, or some other personal finance manager. He said, "This may be a market opportunity for them to provide a campaign disclosure sweep of software." Some of the costs could be transferred to that company, in terms of developing a new product, and the company could market the product to all states; therefore, the absolutely cost of the project may slide one way or the other, but would not be borne entirely by the state.

[8:59:49 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN asked if a university class could develop software like this as a project and then sell it to other states and make money on it, rather than the state spending money to develop the program through a private company.

MR. ROGERS responded that that is the kind of idea he would like to see considered by the proposed study group. He said his company works closely with the University of Alaska - Anchorage (UAA). He talked about the good work of interns from UAA at his company, but suggested that the level of experience necessary to do a project quickly and provide project management may not be found at the university level, but perhaps through a partnership between university students and a vendor.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN talked about the need for a copyright.

[9:03:25 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG said when he served in the legislature in the 1980s there was a special committee that considered technology. He said this proposed bill is a "foot in the door" to the state's taking advantage of and developing the latest technological concepts, and he suggested it might behoove the legislature to form a special committee on technology once more.

CHAIR LYNN said that is an excellent idea, but outside the scope of the bill.

[9:05:38 AM](#)

MS. WARE, in response to a question from Representative Wilson, said she hopes that the aforementioned work of APOC will be completed by the time the proposed study group sunsets on February 8, 2011. She spoke again about the various modules: lobbyist, public official, and campaign disclosure reporting. She said the reason the campaign module is last on the list is because it is the most complicated; there are more forms, multiple deadlines, and the campaign disclosure law covers not only state legislative campaigns, but also municipal candidates. Ms. Ware stated that there are a number of complexities involved in the process that APOC has been undertaking in the last couple of years as it has started on the road to electronic reporting.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked if the money has already been allocated.

MS. WARE responded that APOC has funding for phase two of the lobbyist module. She said APOC has some funding available for fiscal year 2010 (FY 10), but she said it is probably insufficient to complete everything on the list.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON said she cannot imagine that the banking system in its current makeup would be willing to "do something like this." She asked, "So, you're able to do this without having to go through a bank?"

MS. WARE answered that is correct. In terms of immediate accessibility to the public, the plan is to have a number of reporting capabilities so that the public can "press a button and see various pieces of information." She said that is a critical part of the system in regarding to transparency and disclosure to the public.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON related that currently she does all her [reporting] electronically. She asked if what she does now is what APOC would soon require of everyone.

MS. WARE clarified that when Representative Wilson talks about reporting "electronically" she is talking about using Excel spreadsheets. She explained that that system would no longer be used. She said the candidates would fill out forms in their accounts, which would be immediately available for their own review, and the forms would be certified and legally signed.

[9:10:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON questioned what kind of liability the state would have if it forced banks to "take this system" and "open their doors to us" and someone [hacked] into [the system]. He expressed concern that the state may be liable for millions of dollars if that happened. Because of that concern, he said he thinks the proposed legislation should be heard by the House Judiciary Standing Committee.

CHAIR LYNN responded that there is nothing in the proposed bill that contemplates forcing a bank to do anything.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON asked if he would be forced to change banks if the bank he currently goes to does not want to accommodate a new system.

CHAIR LYNN said, "Well, I would suppose, but it's just more business for the bank. Right now we choose the bank we want to go to."

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON observed that the bill does direct the study group to consider the technology of specific banks. He said, "If we pass this law, we would be forcing the bank to do it, or forcing every candidate to go to the one bank." He said Representative Wilson, for example, may not have the required bank branch in Wrangell, Alaska.

CHAIR LYNN said that is the type of question that the study group would need to solve.

[9:15:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON directed attention to the language on page 3, lines 1-2, which proposes that [the study group prepare a report] that "reviews how the technologies employed in existing online banking systems that are used by individuals and businesses to monitor financial transactions". He said the language is very specifically instructing the study of online banking and does not explore other options. He suggested that if there is going to be a study group, it should not be limited in what it considers. He mentioned NetFile, an instant reporting company, as an example of another option that should not be excluded.

CHAIR LYNN said he would not be opposed to an amendment to include "or other entity."

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON responded that rather than adding language, he would suggest striking the aforementioned language to encourage all options.

[9:17:29 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG mentioned Title 6, regarding banking, and highly regulated federal banking laws, and he said he thinks that if some entity is "charged with doing this," it definitely needs to work with those resources. He suggested that the House State Affairs Standing Committee is equipped to deal with these issues.

[9:20:28 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN, regarding banks, surmised that if there would be any additional expense the bank incurred in order to accept campaign accounts, it would start charging larger bank fees to political candidates. He posited that that would just be another hurdle that a candidate would have to clear in order to keep his/her campaign in motion. He said he thinks some banks may be hesitant to allow candidates to open political accounts if they had to buy additional software or face additional administrative costs.

CHAIR LYNN said [costs] could be paid by the candidate, the state, the bank, or "by some combination of the three." He reiterated that it would be a business opportunity for the bank.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN responded, "Right, but it's a business opportunity that they would be charging fees for."

CHAIR LYNN commented that banks currently charge fees.

[9:22:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON reiterated that she likes the end goal of the bill, but wants to check to see if this legislation should be proposed as a resolution. Furthermore, she opined that if possible to do another way, the banks should not even be involved. She clarified that banks are not involved in current campaign disclosures other than in holding a candidate's money. Candidates report to APOC currently, which has nothing to do with the bank. Representative Wilson added, "And I think we should keep it that way." She indicated that she would like to know if what APOC has "in the works" accomplishes the goal of the bill or not. When those questions are answered, the bill

could be brought back to the committee; it is not ready now, she stated.

CHAIR LYNN reiterated that his concept is to have a study group work this out with APOC and other entities.

[9:24:39 AM](#)

MR. SICA relayed that he thinks that not limiting this to online banking technology is a good idea. He said he loves APOC's confidence regarding its related project; however, he thinks things don't work out always as planned. He suggested that the committee should not discount online banking. Mr. Sica noted that a bank executive with whom he spoke seemed excited over the idea of merging online banking technology into online reporting; Alaska could lead the way in this regard. He said banks are not just in the business of making money, but also into bringing in more customers. He concluded, "As long as we're just not totally redundant with what APOC's already doing, a study group with a fiscal note of \$4,000 is not a waste of money."

[9:26:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN said he did not realize the fiscal note is \$4,000.

MR. SICA, in response to a question from Representative Peterson, said the bill would provide two years for the study group. After one year, there would be an interim progress report. After the second year, recommendations would be made.

[9:27:37 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG noted that one way campaigns are changing is through the increasing use of credit cards for contributions. He questioned how "this concept" would be affected through the use of credit cards.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON said she uses a credit card. She offered her understanding that within 24 hours, she has to "write the check to cover that for the credit card company."

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG said Representative Wilson is talking about credit card expenditure, while he was talking about credit cards used for contribution. He asked which legislators in the room have [been given contribution via credit cards]. He noted that Representatives Johnson and Petersen raised their hands.

[9:28:58 AM](#)

MS. WARE said she cannot answer Representative Gruenberg's concern specifically, but she noted that the lobbying electronic filing system has a credit card component, in the sense that lobbyists have to pay a registration fee, and most of them want to do so electronically.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG talked about being careful with privacy issues, and he spoke of the threat from hackers. He directed attention to the language on page 3, and said he hopes the study group would be particularly sensitive to protecting the privacy not only of the candidates, but also of the contributors and the vendors to whom they pay. In response to Chair Lynn, he clarified that currently a candidate does not transmit information electronically that reveals the bank account number - just the check number. He said he does not know how this would work, but is concerned about the issue of privacy.

CHAIR LYNN said it is nobody's business what his campaign bank account number is.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG offered his understanding that if Chair Lynn were to make an electronic deposit, he would have to let the bank know the routing and checking account numbers.

CHAIR LYNN said a campaign contribution check would still be deposited as it is today; that is not done electronically.

[9:36:08 AM](#)

CHRISTINA ELLINGSON, Assistant Director, APOC, in response to Representative Wilson, said currently there is a 30-day, 7-day, and 24-hour reporting cycle designed around the election cycle, but there is nothing that would prohibit reporting in a different time period so that the information would be available instantaneously during that cycle.

[9:37:14 AM](#)

HOLLY HILL, Executive Director, APOC, in response to a question from Representative Wilson regarding APOC's financial position, said the agency currently has a request in the governor's budget for an appropriation of \$175,000 to finish its electronic filing project. Currently, she said, the project is in the lobbyist phase, and scheduled for 2010 is the remaining work on the

public official financial disclosure, the legislative financial disclosure, and the campaign disclosure. In response to a follow-up question, she offered her understanding that the request for the funds has already been made, and it will be heard by the legislative body.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked for confirmation that "it is in the governor's budget."

[MS. WARE nodded.]

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG noted that he and Representative Johnson serve on the House Finance Committee's subcommittee dealing with the Department of Administration, and he expressed his wish that APOC report to that subcommittee so that it can "follow up what's happening here."

[9:39:00 AM](#)

MS. ELLINGSON, in response to a question from Representative Petersen, said the only way the aforementioned 30-day, 7-day, and 24-hour deadlines would disappear would be if the legislature changed the law, because currently those are statutory requirements.

CHAIR LYNN confirmed that's correct. He added that that would be something for the Twenty-Seventh Alaska State Legislature to consider.

[9:40:39 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON indicated that another option that would be as unpalatable as involving a bank would be to require each contributor to file that contribution with APOC.

CHAIR LYNN asked the committee to think about questions they would like addressed before the next hearing on the bill.

[9:42:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON reiterated his desire to have the language at the top of page 3 of Version E replaced with less restrictive language.

[9:43:15 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN said he applauds the basic premise of proposed legislation.

[9:44:12 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON said she finds it difficult to support the formation of a study group, when [APOC] is already doing the work.

[9:44:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG referred back to the topic of whether or not the bill should be a resolution. He cited Uniform Rule 49, subsection (a), paragraph (3), which read as follows:

(3) A concurrent resolution is similar to the simple resolution but reflects the will, wish, view or decision of both houses speaking concurrently. It is used particularly to handle the internal business of the legislature, e.g., adjournment of the legislature, suspension and amendment of the Uniform Rules, requesting action of executive agencies and interim committees, and fixing the time and place for joint assemblies. This resolution is also used for establishing joint committees. This resolution does not require committee referral, three readings, or anything other than approval of a majority vote of the full membership of each house unless otherwise required by the rules.

CHAIR LYNN said his staff will investigate that before the next hearing on the bill.

[9:46:07 AM](#)

[HB 42 was held over.]

[9:46:23 AM](#)

[Following is a discussion regarding the upcoming calendar and the subject of addressing legislation with subcommittees.]

[9:49:52 AM](#)

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 9:49 a.m.