

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE

February 15, 2017

1:34 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator John Coghill, Chair
Senator Mia Costello
Senator Kevin Meyer
Senator Pete Kelly
Senator Bill Wielechowski

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SENATE BILL NO. 55

"An Act relating to criminal law and procedure; relating to controlled substances; relating to sentencing; relating to the period of probation; relating to revocation, termination, suspension, cancellation, or restoration of a driver's license; relating to parole; relating to the duties of the Department of Corrections and the Department of Health and Social Services; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

SENATE BILL NO. 5

"An Act prohibiting groups controlled by a legislator from soliciting and accepting contributions or from making certain contributions and expenditures during a regular or special legislative session; and prohibiting some lobbyists from making campaign contributions to certain groups."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: SB 55

SHORT TITLE: OMNIBUS CRIME/CORRECTIONS

SPONSOR(S): JUDICIARY

02/10/17 (S) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS

02/10/17 (S) JUD, FIN
02/15/17 (S) JUD AT 1:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)

BILL: SB 5

SHORT TITLE: POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS/PROHIBITION

SPONSOR(s): MEYER

01/09/17 (S) PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/17
01/18/17 (S) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/17 (S) STA, JUD
01/31/17 (S) STA AT 3:30 PM BUTROVICH 205
01/31/17 (S) Heard & Held
01/31/17 (S) MINUTE(STA)
02/09/17 (S) STA AT 3:30 PM BUTROVICH 205
02/09/17 (S) Moved CSSB 5(STA) Out of Committee
02/09/17 (S) MINUTE(STA)
02/10/17 (S) STA RPT CS 3DP 2NR SAME TITLE
02/10/17 (S) DP: EGAN, COGHILL, GIESSEL
02/10/17 (S) NR: DUNLEAVY, WILSON
02/15/17 (S) JUD AT 1:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)

WITNESS REGISTER

JORDAN SHILLING, Staff
Senate Judiciary Committee and
Senator John Coghill
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Introduced SB 55 on behalf of the sponsor.

HILARY MARTIN, Legislative Counsel
Legislative Legal Services
Legislative Affairs Agency
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions related to SB 5.

EDRA MORLEDGE, Staff
Senator Kevin Meyer
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Described the differences between the original version of SB 5 and the committee substitute.

ALPHEUS BULLARD, Legislative Counsel
Legislative Legal Services
Legislative Affairs Agency
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions related to SB 5.

HEATHER HEBDON, Executive Director
Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions related to SB 5.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:34:35 PM](#)

CHAIR JOHN COGHILL called the Senate Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Present at the call to order were Senators Meyer, Kelly, Costello, Wielechowski, and Chair Coghill.

SB 55-OMNIBUS CRIME/CORRECTIONS

[1:35:29 PM](#)

CHAIR COGHILL announced the consideration of SB 55. He explained that this bill is what he has referred to as the technical bill. It addresses non-policy items that the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission ("Commission") has proposed, primarily recommendation 2017-14. He asked Mr. Shilling to go through the sectional summary before the committee considers the committee substitute.

[1:37:48 PM](#)

JORDAN SHILLING, Staff, Senate Judiciary Committee and Senator John Coghill, Alaska State Legislature, informed the committee that SB 55 contains a number of the technical changes that the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission has been gathering since Senate Bill 91 passed in 2016. These recommendations are mostly technical; some clarify intent and some correct drafting errors. He spoke to the following sectional summary for SB 55:

Section 1

AS 11.46.280(d) - Issuing a bad check.

Removes inadvertent inflation-adjustment of \$25,000.

Section 2

AS 11.46.285(b) - Fraudulent use of an access device.

Removes inadvertent inflation-adjustment of \$25,000.

Section 3

AS 11.46.730(c) - Defrauding creditors.

Removes inadvertent inflation-adjustment of \$25,000.

MR. SHILLING explained that in 2016, the Commission recommended raising the felony theft threshold and inflation proofing that number. The recommendation did not include inflation proofing the three larger amounts addressed in Sections 1-3. It was a drafting error to include them and the bill rectifies the error.

Section 4

AS 11.71.050(a) - Misconduct involving controlled substances in the fourth degree

Eliminates penalty overlap for possession of less than an ounce of a VIA controlled substance.

MR. SHILLING explained that an individual under age 21 who illegally possesses less than an ounce of marijuana could simultaneously be charged with a class A misdemeanor and a class B misdemeanor. This bill leaves possession of less than an ounce of marijuana as a class B misdemeanor,

Section 5

AS 12.55.011(b) - Victim and community involvement in sentencing.

Clarifies that the court shall only provide the form to the victim if practicable.

MR. SHILLING explained that the court form gives victims information about the defendant's sentence and release date. It also allows the victim an opportunity to update their information with the Department of Correction's Automated Victim Notification System (VINE). Senate Bill 91 required courts to give this form to victims but the court does not maintain victim information and therefore is not able to supply the form when the victim, for whatever reason, does not attend the court hearing.

Section 6

AS 12.55.015(a) - Authorized sentences; forfeiture.

Provides explicit authority to the court to suspend an entry of judgement.

MR. SHILLING explained that this is the statute that authorizes the court to do such things as sentence individuals and impose

probation and impose fines. Suspended entry of judgment is a new concept that belongs in this section.

Section 7

AS 12.55.078(d) - Suspended entry of judgement.

Clarifies when the court shall discharge and dismiss proceedings in a suspended entry of judgement.

MR. SHILLING explained that this section adds the words "was imposed" to clarify the date that is being talked about.

Section 8

AS 12.55.078(f) - Suspended entry of judgement.

Clarifies that the crimes for which SEJ may not be used are the crimes currently charged, not prior convictions.

MR. SHILLING said the terminology was changed in this section for two reasons. The first is that in a SEJ an individual is not convicted so it is inappropriate in this context to be talking about conviction. But the change in paragraph (5) on page 5, line 17, is for a slightly different reason. The intent of SEJ is that an individual that is currently charged with domestic violence cannot be eligible for SEJ. Thus it's important to refer to the current charge that individual has rather than some previous conviction of domestic violence.

[1:44:55 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked for clarification that the same rationale applies to paragraphs (1)-(4) in Section 8. He read AS 12.55.078(f)(1), as proposed, and asked if the phrase "is charged with" refers to the immediate matter, not a previous charge.

MR. SHILLING said he didn't know that the first three instances of changing "convicted of" to "charged with" is the same problem that exists in paragraph (5). The reason the wording was changed in the three instances in paragraphs (1)-(4) is because the SEJ is unique in that there is no conviction. He views this as a drafting oversight.

CHAIR COGHILL said he believes Senator Wielechowski is asking if it refers to the issue that is under suspended imposition of judgement.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI said he's thinking of an event where someone is charged with a completely different crime. "I want the record to be clear that we're not saying in that case you can't have a suspended imposition of sentence."

MR. SHILLING emphasized that the intent is that this does not preclude an individual who has had a prior charge or conviction for one of these offenses from getting a suspended imposition of sentence.

Section 9

AS 12.55.090(c) - Granting of probation

Clarifies that the maximum probation term for a felony sex offense is 15 years, while all other unclassified felonies have a maximum probation term of 10 years.

MR. SHILLING explained that Senate Bill 91 created some confusion in this statute because there are unclassified felony sex offenses under Title 11. The added language, "not listed in (1) of this subsection;" clarifies that the maximum probation period for both classified and unclassified felony sex offenses is 15 years.

CHAIR COGHILL summarized that the probation for a sex offender may not exceed 15 years.

MR. SHILLING agreed.

CHAIR COGHILL commented that that was probably the intention all along.

MR. SHILLING continued the sectional review.

Section 10

AS 28.15.165(e) - Administrative revocations and disqualifications resulting from chemical sobriety tests and refusals to submit to tests.

Clarifies that the dismissal of all charges, regardless of prejudice, serves to meet the requirement of this section.

MR. SHILLING explained that the intent of this policy was to reinstate the license after acquittal or dismissal, regardless of whether the dismissal is with or without prejudice. This corrects a drafting oversight.

Section 11

AS 44.19.645(g) - Powers and duties of the commission

Requires the Department of Corrections to report certain data to the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission regarding earned compliance credits for parolees.

MR. SHILLING directed attention to the data collection requirements in paragraph (6) on page 7, line 21. He explained that Senate Bill 91 created a policy for an individual to receive month-for-month credit for sustained compliance with their probation or parole. The bill included the requirement to submit the data to DOC for probation but omitted the requirement to submit the data for parole. This corrects that drafting oversight and adds this reporting requirement for DOC.

Section 12

AS 47.37.040 - Duties of the department.

Authorizes the ASAP program to accept referrals from the court for minor consuming/possession.

CHAIR COGHILL noted that Tony Piper with the Alcohol Safety Action Program was available to answer questions about the ASAP program.

MR. SHILLING explained that when Senate Bill 165 passed last year, it changed provisions in Title 4 making minor consuming alcohol a violation rather than a criminal offense. It also provided that the fine for the violation could be reduced if the defendant successfully completed the ASAP program. That provision conflicted with Senate Bill 91 and SB 55 remedies that conflict by giving the ASAP program explicit authority to accept referrals coming from the Court System.

[1:51:24 PM](#)

CHAIR COGHILL added that Senate Bill 91 narrowed the scope of the Alcohol Safety Action Program which conflicted with the provision in Senate Bill 165 to allow minors to use that program. "This just aligns those two bills, basically."

SENATOR MEYER asked if this is limited to minor in possession of alcohol, not marijuana.

MR. SHILLING offered his understanding that it is just possession and consumption of alcohol.

Section 13

AS 33.16.120(h) - Rights of certain victims in connection with parole.

Resolves a drafting error that requires the Department of Corrections to provide notifications for hearings that will not occur.

MR. SHILLING explained that Section 13 contains an error and corrects an error from Senate Bill 91. This section repeals AS 33.16.120(a) and AS 33.16.120(h), but including 120(a) was a mistake. AS 33.16.120(h), however, is an unnecessary reporting requirement that should have been removed when the House excluded some types of offenders from administrative parole. This corrects that error.

CHAIR COGHILL asked if AS 33.16.120(h) will be repealed.

MR. SHILLING answered yes.

CHAIR COGHILL asked if the committee substitute (CS) addresses just this section.

MR. SHILLING replied that is correct.

CHAIR COGHILL said he would bring the CS up after the sectional review was complete.

MR. SHILLING turned to Section 14 and deferred explanation to Hilary Martin.

Section 14

Uncodified law - applicability

This section contains applicability provisions.

CHAIR COGHILL asked Ms. Martin to explain the concept and substance of Section 14, so the committee understands whether it is a technical fix as opposed to policy.

[1:56:06 PM](#)

HILARY MARTIN, Legislative Counsel, Legislative Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, said applicability sections generally look at when a change in a crime or penalty applies, which is particularly important for criminal bills. "If you're changing the crime or if you're increasing the punishment, you

need to be careful that you're not applying it to conduct that had already been committed before it becomes effective, because that can be an expose facto violation."

Applicability sections make it clear when the law applies. For example, (a)(1) [page 11, line 13,] references the change in a crime to remove the adjustment for inflation so it applies on or after the effective date.

CHAIR COGHILL offered his understanding that some of the probation and parole requirements had to apply on or after the effective date and by changing the reporting requirements the application must correspond with the time in history that passed.

MS. MARTIN replied it depends on what is happening with the probation. Application could be when probation is ordered, or it could be for offenses committed on or after.

CHAIR COGHILL asked her to discuss the applicability in (a)(1)-(4) on page 11, lines 13-16.

[1:58:52 PM](#)

MS. MARTIN explained that they are all changes to crimes; (a)(1)-(3) remove the adjusted for inflation language and (a)(4) adds the reference to AS 11.71.060(a)(2). An element of the crime is being changed and they apply to offenses committed on or after the effective date of that section.

CHAIR COGHILL asked what the charge under AS 12.55.078(d) [page 11, lines 17-20] refers to.

MS. MARTIN replied that is the change to the suspended entry of judgement.

CHAIR COGHILL observed that subsection (c) [AS 12.55.090(c) on page 11, lines 21-23] refers to probation. He asked her to explain her statement that it could apply to somebody on probation, but it doesn't contemplate something that happened before the law passed.

MS. MARTIN clarified that there is a difference between an applicability section and retroactivity. AS 12.55.090(c) would apply to anyone granted probation on or after the effective date, regardless of when they committed the offense."

CHAIR COGHILL asked her to talk about subsection (d) [on page 11, lines 24-28].

MS. MARTIN said this section allows an individual to request their license revocation for driving under the influence be rescinded in the event of an acquittal or the charges are dropped. The section removes the words "without prejudice" so it applies to more people. This is a benefit that could apply before, on, or after the effective date [of Section 10].

SENATOR COGHILL offered his understanding that the timeframe falls between the signing of Senate Bill 91 and passage of SB 55.

MS. MARTIN said she believes that is correct.

[2:02:50 PM](#)

MR. SHILLING continued the sectional review.

Section 15

Uncodified law - applicability

This section contains applicability provisions clarifying that no decisions made by the Board of Parole prior to January 1, 2017 that extended the period of supervision beyond the maximum release date are to be construed as invalidated by the passage of SB 91 (2016).

There is further clarification that the earned compliance credit for parolees does not apply to time served prior to January 1, 2017.

MR. SHILLING said these clarifications address concerns that some of the applicability provisions in Senate Bill 91 are ambiguous.

Section 16

Uncodified law - effective date

This bill takes effect immediately.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if any thought was given to making the applicability dates in Section 15 the date the bill takes effect as opposed to January 1, 2017.

MR. SHILLING replied the applicability provision in Section 15 goes into effect immediately, but it ensures that credit for the earned compliance program isn't awarded prior to the date the program came into existence.

CHAIR COGHILL summarized that Senate Bill 91 contemplated that the counting for earned compliance credit would start on January 1, 2017.

[2:07:06 PM](#)

CHAIR COGHILL asked Mr. Shilling to point to the differences between the current version D and the proposed committee substitute, version J.

MR. SHILLING said the difference is in the repealer Section 13. Version D repeals AS 33.16.120(a) and AS 33.16.120(h), whereas the CS only repeals AS 33.16.120(h), which is an irrelevant notification requirement.

[2:08:54 PM](#)

CHAIR COGHILL moved to adopt the committee substitute (CS) for SB 55, labeled 30-LS0119\J, as the working document. Hearing no objection, version J, was adopted.

CHAIR COGHILL held SB 55 in committee for further consideration.

[2:10:39 PM](#)

At ease

SB 5-POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS/PROHIBITION

[2:12:05 PM](#)

CHAIR COGHILL reconvened the meeting and announced the consideration of SB 5. [CSSB 5(STA), 30-LS0112\U, was before the committee.]

[2:12:19 PM](#)

SENATOR MEYER, sponsor of SB 5, introduced the legislation paraphrasing the following sponsor statement:

In an effort to restore public trust and reduce corruption, or the appearance of corruption, in our campaign finance system, in 1996 the Alaska legislature passed sweeping campaign finance reforms. Included in legislation was a prohibition on all contributions by lobbyists to candidates outside of

their own election district. What was not anticipated or addressed by the 1996 reforms, and is an issue that arose during this last election cycle, is the ability for a lobbyist to contribute to a political action group that is controlled by a legislator or other candidate for the legislature. This loophole in the law allows a sitting legislator, or a candidate for the legislature, to solicit, raise, and disperse funds from lobbyists, on behalf of a group that they control, thus circumventing the limit on lobbyists' contributions to candidates. Further, our state statutes explicitly state that a legislator may not solicit or accept funds in order to influence a state election during a regular or special session, however, there is no clear prohibition against a political action group controlled by a legislator doing so. In addition, SB 5 includes a prohibition on dispersing funds during a legislative session.

Senate Bill 5 will amend our state statutes to bolster our campaign finance laws by:

1. Closing the loophole that allows lobbyists to make political campaign contributions to groups headed by current lawmakers and candidates for the legislature outside of their district, and
2. Preventing groups controlled by a legislator or candidate for the legislature from soliciting, raising, or dispersing funds during a regular or special legislative session.

This measure is intended to protect against corruption- or the appearance of corruption- and restore the public's confidence in our campaign finance structure.

[2:15:26 PM](#)

EDRA MORLEDGE, Staff, Senator Kevin Meyer, said the original version of SB 5 contained a drafting error and the State Affairs CS corrected it. She suggested that the easiest way to explain the drafting error is to go through the sectional summary. She reviewed the following:

Section 1 is a new section which places restrictions on solicitation and acceptance of contributions by

groups controlled by legislators or candidates for the state legislature during a legislative session.

The original version also included in that section the restriction on expending funds during a legislative session, which we still have in the bill. It's just that those were both contained in the same section in the original bill and they needed to be broken apart because they're two different sections of this chapter.

Section 2 is rewritten to prohibit lobbyist contributions to candidates for the state legislature or to groups that are controlled by a sitting legislator or a candidate for the legislature.

Section 3 regards prohibited contributions and this is the new section. This section makes an exception for contributions by lobbyists eligible to vote only in that candidate's district, which is part of current law but for the purpose of drafting this bill, they're broken out into these new sections.

Section 4 is limitations on expenditures. This is a new section pertaining just to these groups controlled by legislators or candidates for state legislature. This basically brings these groups in line with how individual candidates operate, which is no expenditures during a legislative session.

Section 5 is the definition section. One sentence or some words that were added to the introduction of the definitions, which is on page 2, line 28 and 29, the drafter of the bill put in the words "unless the context requires otherwise" and then goes on into the definitions. That's just to remove any sort of legal ambiguity that might be construed by the definitions so they apply just to this chapter.

CHAIR COGHILL summarized that, at this point, contributions are within context of what is in current law.

MS. MORLEDGE replied that's correct.

[2:19:24 PM](#)

SENATOR COSTELLO referred to the language in the new subsection (j) on page 2, lines 9-11, and questioned whether the phrase "is

eligible to vote" is tight enough to prohibit certain lobbyist contributions. She pointed out that there is a difference between eligible to vote and able to vote.

She also asked Ms. Morledge if she had discussed with the drafter whether the word "controlled by" that appears on page 1, line 7, and page 2, line 2, is the appropriate word. "I think that the intent is that the person is a part of this political action committee, but 'controlled by' indicates they might have just control of it but they may not be listed as a participating member."

MS. MORLEDGE said the language regarding lobbyist contributions is existing law. Currently it is in subsection (g) and SB 5 places it in a new subsection (j). She added, "We didn't contemplate, perhaps, a lobbyist moving to a new district." Regarding the second question, she said she did ask for clarification and guidance from the drafter as to how the Alaska Public Offices Commission might interpret the word "controlled by."

CHAIR COGHILL noted that Mr. Bullard with Legal Services and Heather Hebdon from APOC are available to answer questions.

[2:22:52 PM](#)

SENATOR COSTELLO asked Mr. Bullard if the words "controlled by" is adequate for the intention of the bill.

ALPHEUS BULLARD, Legislative Counsel, Legislative Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, said the phrase "controlled by" is not defined for purposes of the bill so it is left to APOC to define it in regulation. "If the legislature chooses not to provide a specific definition for the purposes of the bill's provisions, I don't think it's too great a grant of legislative discretion to allow the commission to decide what 'controlled by' might mean in this instance." He added that it could also be defined on the facts of each case.

[2:24:16 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if the bill would still allow political action committees to contribute to legislators who are controlling PACS.

MS. MORLEDGE said yes.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked: 1) if contributions from out of state would still be prohibited, and 2) what the contribution limits would be.

MS. MORLEDGE deferred the question to APOC.

[2:25:05 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked how much money a PAC that is set up by a legislator can accept from out of state and if they can accept money from an out of state PAC.

HEATHER HEBDON, Executive Director, Alaska Public Offices Commission (APOC), Anchorage, Alaska, confirmed that a legislator who has formed a PAC could accept money from other groups. As far as groups based outside of Alaska, there are limits that pertain to those as well. Generally, groups outside of Alaska are not permitted to contribute to a candidate, but they could form the group and register the group from out of state. However, 90 percent of their contributions must be from Alaska residents. It would not change the group's contribution limits. They would be able to accept \$500 from individuals, but 90 percent of their contributions must be from Alaska residents.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if political action committees outside of Alaska, could contribute that 10 percent of outside funds.

MS. HEBDON answered yes but they would be limited to a \$1,000 contribution limit from that outside PAC.

[2:28:02 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if a legislator could contribute money to his/her campaign or make an independent expenditure for his/her campaign, using funds from the political action committee he/she controls.

MS HEBDON answered yes. Contributions a legislator makes to his/her own campaign would be limited to \$1,000, whereas making independent expenditures on behalf of his/her own campaign would be unlimited.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI said his understanding has been that a legislator could not coordinate between independent expenditure groups and the candidate. "If a legislator controls the PAC, isn't that coordination?"

MS HEBDON replied that is part of the concern APOC has with the bill. It does not define "controlled by."

2:29:24 PM

CHAIR COGHILL said that is an excellent point and something the committee should ponder

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked the sponsor if there is a reason for not simply banning these groups from forming.

MS. MORLEDGE opined that banning these groups would infringe on an individual's First Amendment right to free speech. The sponsor researched that initially and placing sideboards seemed to be the best option. There was no contemplation of overhauling the entire campaign finance structure. The intent was to close the loophole that came to light last year.

2:30:56 PM

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI noted he saw a legal opinion that talks about legitimate government interest in restricting campaign contributions, and it seems that it would be a legitimate government interest to say candidates cannot have their own political action committees. He asked to hear from Mr. Bullard.

MR. BULLARD explained that if a legislator forms a PAC and it makes contributions or expenditures that help the legislator's own campaign, then that group will be defined as the candidate under AS 15.13.400(1)(A) or AS 15.13.400(1)(B)(v). Contributions to that group will be aggregated with contributions to the candidate for purposes of the campaign finance statutes. That group is no longer just a political action committee, it is a political action committee that is one and the same with the candidate's campaign. That situation is addressed in existing law.

CHAIR COGHILL observed that it's not a question of arm's length because once they do that combination they can't be considered an independent expenditure.

MR. BULLARD replied that is his conclusion. As to whether it would be a narrowly tailored remedy to prohibit all legislative PACs, he said the only rationale accepted by the U.S. Supreme Court for limiting campaign contributions is corruption and the threat of corruption. A PAC that can skirt existing contribution limits to legislators poses the threat of corruption. For example, if a legislator wishes to raise money towards a ballot initiative, he didn't believe a court would find that preventing

the existence of a group that relates to that ballot proposition could be construed to be narrowly tailored to prevent corruption.

[2:34:39 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if the bill could be narrowly tailored enough to prohibit collecting campaign contributions to give to other candidates.

MR. BULLARD said he hadn't looked at that question and didn't know what a court would find.

[2:35:29 PM](#)

SENATOR COSTELLO referenced page 1, line 9, and page 2, lines 4 and 26, that specifically talks about the legislature. She asked if he had contemplated using a broader term, such as a person who files for public office.

MR. BULLARD suggested he ask the sponsor.

[2:36:47 PM](#)

SENATOR MEYER said he wouldn't be opposed to changing the reference.

SENATOR COSTELLO suggested changing the wording on page 2, line 4, to reference "an individual who becomes a candidate."

CHAIR COGHILL suggested replacing the words "the state legislature" to "public office." He opined that transparency of reporting requirements are a large part of accountability.

Finding no further questions, he stated he would hold SB 5 in committee for further consideration.

[2:39:43 PM](#)

There being no further business to come before the committee, Chair Coghill adjourned the Senate Judiciary Standing Committee meeting at 2:39 p.m.