

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

May 9, 2023

3:09 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Laddie Shaw, Chair
Representative Stanley Wright, Vice Chair
Representative Ben Carpenter
Representative Craig Johnson
Representative Jamie Allard
Representative Andi Story

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Jennie Armstrong

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 157

"An Act establishing Juneteenth Day as a legal holiday."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 4

"An Act relating to elections."

- MOVED HB 4 OUT OF COMMITTEE

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 157

SHORT TITLE: PROCLAIM JUNETEENTH DAY A HOLIDAY

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) WRIGHT

04/12/23	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
04/12/23	(H)	STA, L&C
05/09/23	(H)	STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120

BILL: HB 4

SHORT TITLE: ELECTIONS: REPEAL RANKED CHOICE VOTING

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) VANCE

01/19/23	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/23
01/19/23	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/19/23	(H)	STA, JUD

05/02/23 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
05/02/23 (H) Heard & Held
05/02/23 (H) MINUTE (STA)
05/09/23 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120

WITNESS REGISTER

FORREST WOLF, Staff
Representative Stanley Wright
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 157 on behalf of
Representative Wright, prime sponsor.

SENATOR ELVI GRAY-JACKSON
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Spoke in support of HB 157.

DELAYNA WEST, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

DAVE LEWIS, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

BRENDA EDENS, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

MARK EDENS, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

KATHLEEN YARR, representing self
Ketchikan, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

DONALD THOMPSON, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

BARBARA TYNDALL, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

GARY TYNDALL, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

CAROL CLAUSSON, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

CARL BRODERSON, representing self
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

JOHN LETTOW, representing self
Wasilla, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

APRIL WILSON, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

LOU THEISS, representing self
Girdwood, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

PAMELA BRODIE, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

MIKE JONES, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

EILEEN BECKER, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

BILL MUNROE, representing self
Wasilla, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

GAYLE A MCCANN, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

BERT HOUGHTALING, representing self
Big Lake, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

SUE BURNSTIN, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

DOUG VANPATTEN, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

JAMES NELSON, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

LUANNE NELSON, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

SYLVIA KIDD, representing self
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

TOM BOUTIN, representing self
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

SHERRY STRIZAK, representing self
Chugiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

DAVID MONSON, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

MICHAEL GARHART, representing self
Wasilla, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

DOMINIC SCALISE, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

JOEL SIGMAN, representing self
Wasilla, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

CONSTANCE FREDENBERG, representing self
Palmer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

KIMBERLY NIELSEN, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

WILLIAM SALTONSTALL, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

ELIZABETH SALTONSTALL, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

IAN LAING, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

LAURA BONNER, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

AMY MURRILS, representing self
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

STUART SCHMUTZLER, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

LINDA COURTICE, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

CLARICE JOHNSON, representing self
Sitka, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

PAMELA CONRAD, representing self
Bethel, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

JEANNETTE LEE, Alaska Research Director
Sightline Institute
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

BOB GRUNDERSON, representing self
Chugiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

PAUL RADZINSKI, representing self
Cooper Landing, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

WALTER FEATHERLY, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

MARGARET MORAN, representing self
Soldotna, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

LIN DAVIS, representing self
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

MARILYN WICK, representing self
Talkeetna, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

RAYMOND WALKER, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 4.

SANTA CLAUS, representing self
North Pole, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 4.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:09:46 PM](#)

CHAIR LADDIE SHAW called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:09 p.m. Representatives Carpenter, C. Johnson, Allard, Story, Wright, and Shaw were present at the call to order.

HB 157-PROCLAIM JUNETEENTH DAY A HOLIDAY

[3:10:36 PM](#)

CHAIR SHAW announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 157, "An Act establishing Juneteenth Day as a legal holiday."

3:11:31 PM

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT, prime sponsor, presented HB 157, which would elevate Juneteenth to the level of other legal holidays, such as July 4th and Labor Day. By doing so, he expressed the hope that history would be better understood in Alaska and America; additionally, that ideals, such as freedom and justice, could be applied equally. He emphasized that the grandparents of millions of Americans were denied the right to vote, marry across race, or attend segregated schools. He expressed the belief that [Juneteenth] would be an opportunity to move forward and reflect.

3:13:04 PM

FORREST WOLF, Staff, Representative Stanley Wright, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Wright, prime sponsor of HB 157, paraphrased the sponsor statement [included in the committee packet], which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

In 1865, union soldiers landed at Galveston, TX. with news that the war had ended. This news meant that enslaved people were now free. Since 1865, people across the world have joined together to celebrate an important day. Juneteenth- also known as Freedom Day or Emancipation Day- is a holiday celebrating the emancipation of previously enslaved peoples in America. Each year on June 19th, people of all races join one another in fellowship to honor those who gave so much for America and educate themselves about the struggles toward liberation for Black Americans. Juneteenth has been recognized and celebrated throughout Alaska. There have been events ranging from parades to street fairs.

House Bill 157 would make Juneteenth an observed legal state holiday alongside July 4th and Memorial Day. This bill would make Juneteenth a paid state holiday.

MR. WOLF presented the sectional analysis [included in the committee packet], which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 1. This section amends AS 44.12.010(a), the Statute regarding legal holidays. Specifically, it requires that June 19th, known as Juneteenth Day, be considered a legal holiday.

Section 2. This section amends AS 44.12.020, the statute regarding holidays that fall on a Sunday, with conforming language that reflects Section 1 of this bill.

Section 3. This section repeals AS 44.12.090.

[3:14:34 PM](#)

CHAIR SHAW inquired about the fiscal note.

MR. WOLF responded that the various fiscal notes reflect the fact that employees would be absent from work on Juneteenth.

[3:15:06 PM](#)

SENATOR ELVI GRAY-JACKSON, Alaska State Legislature, spoke in favor of HB 157 and emphasized its importance. In addition to being a federal holiday, she noted that Juneteenth is a holiday in the Municipality of Anchorage. She expressed her hope that the bill would "make it to the finish line" this legislative session.

[3:16:07 PM](#)

CHAIR SHAW opened public testimony on HB 157. After ascertaining that no one wished to testify, he closed public testimony.

[3:16:36 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY expressed her appreciation for the bill. She said there was a lack of education about the history of [Juneteenth] and shared her belief that making this day an official state holiday would be informative.

CHAIR SHAW announced that HB 157 would be held over.

HB 4-ELECTIONS: REPEAL RANKED CHOICE VOTING

[3:17:31 PM](#)

CHAIR SHAW announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 4, "An Act relating to elections."

[3:19:23 PM](#)

CHAIR SHAW re-opened public testimony on HB 4.

[3:20:36 PM](#)

DELAYNA WEST, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She referenced "uninformed consent" and reiterated her support for the bill.

[3:21:13 PM](#)

DAVE LEWIS, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He expressed support for ranked choice voting (RCV) because it gives power of choice to the people, as opposed to the [political] parties.

[3:21:49 PM](#)

BRENDA EDENS, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She urged the committee to support the bill and repeal RCV.

[3:22:19 PM](#)

MARK EDENS, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and the repeal of RCV. He expressed the belief that the result of the vote for the RCV initiative had been skewed by dark money.

[3:22:59 PM](#)

KATHLEEN YARR, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and the repeal of RCV. She expressed the opinion that many young people were confused by RCV and chose not to vote as a result.

[3:23:49 PM](#)

DONALD THOMPSON, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He expressed the opinion that RCV was sold as a "bill of goods" by dark money with the claim of excluding dark money. He expressed the belief the RCV is confusing, and it has diminished the number of voters.

[3:24:51 PM](#)

BARBARA TYNDALL, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and the repeal of RCV. She recounted her experience attending the audit of Ballot Measure 2 [Top-Four Ranked Choice Voting and Campaign Finance Laws Initiative (2020)] in Juneau, claiming that the proposition was a "sham." She urged the passage of HB 4.

[3:26:14 PM](#)

GARY TYNDALL, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and urged the committee to return Alaska's "election integrity." He suggested that the public had been sold a "bill of goods" and recounted his experience working at a polling station.

[3:27:48 PM](#)

CAROL CLAUSSE, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She argued that it would overturn the will of the people. She questioned why a person should vote in Alaska if the legislature could overturn the will of the people, which she characterized as un-American. She reported that exit polls found RCV to be easy to understand.

[3:29:01 PM](#)

CARL BRODERSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4, which he characterized as a semi-veiled attempt at voter suppression. He emphasized that RCV was still "one person one vote," adding that the winner was still the person with the most votes. He reported that Alaska's voter turnout trended close to the nation's and emphasized that a signature had always been required on mail-in ballots. Lastly, he highlighted the difference between an exhausted ballot and a rejected ballot. He urged the committee to respect the will of voters and to retain RCV and open primaries.

[3:30:11 PM](#)

JOHN LETTOW, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He recounted his experience as a poll watcher and asserted that passage of HB 4 would demonstrate that action had been taken to restore election integrity.

[3:31:14 PM](#)

APRIL WILSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. As a former professor of political science at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA), he reported that open ballot RCV reduced the problem of wedge issues, which was used by parties to distort electoral outcomes. She said RCV ameliorated the voting strength of single-issue voters by giving all voters the means of avoiding (indisc.) Lastly, she characterized the bill sponsor's assertion that most Alaskans were against RCV as facetious. She also took exception to the claim that the elderly do not understand RCV.

[3:33:06 PM](#)

LOU THEISS, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He recounted his experience as a poll worker, highlighting the disenfranchisement of non-republican voters.

[3:34:19 PM](#)

PAMELA BRODIE, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She discussed the public fear and anger fueled by highly partisan elected officials. She expressed pride that Alaska had returned towards peaceful relations between neighbors who disagree politically, and she pointed out that it has allowed friendships across party lines. She recounted her experience as a poll worker.

[3:35:50 PM](#)

MIKE JONES, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and the repeal of RCV. He recalled Ballot Measure 2, asserting that the proposition contained two separate and distinct issues. He said it was easy to see how a person could vote for the proposition out of concern for dark money without realizing the subtleties and unintended consequences of RCV. He urged the committee to eliminate RCV and restore trust in the election process.

[3:37:08 PM](#)

EILEEN BECKER, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She shared a personal anecdote, inferring that RCV was difficult to understand.

[3:38:43 PM](#)

BILL MUNROE, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4 because it would overturn the will of the people. He shared his belief that RCV is the best way to solve radical polarization in Alaska politics.

[3:39:18 PM](#)

GAYLE A MCCANN, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She expressed concern that Alaska was "getting a little bit too much of California involved" in its politics. She expressed the desire to have RCV on the ballot for a re-vote in the next election.

[3:40:16 PM](#)

BERT HOUGHTALING, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He posited that the judicial branch, through a level of corruption, prevented RCV from being a single item on the ballot, adding that the proposition was confused by dark money. He shared his belief that Ballot Measure 2 should not have passed and should be repealed.

[3:41:06 PM](#)

SUE BURNSTIN, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She stated that RCV expanded her option to vote for the most appealing candidate, regardless of party affiliation. She urged the legislature to give RCV a chance to succeed.

[3:41:53 PM](#)

DOUG VANPATTEN, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He expressed the desire to have the ability to vote for the most qualified candidate, regardless of party affiliation. He argued that RCV has improved democracy, as elections are more inclusive and competitive. He challenged the idea that RCV is too complicated, concluding that HB 4 is a waste of time and taxpayers' money.

[3:43:07 PM](#)

JAMES NELSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He posited that the "proof is in the pudding" as to the effectiveness of RCV, referencing the election of U.S. Representative Mary Peltola.

[3:44:17 PM](#)

LUANNE NELSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She emphasized that RCV was voted on and is the will of the people. She challenged the notion that it is too difficult to understand. She encouraged those who disliked the outcome [of Ballot Measure 2] to propose a referendum, rather than legislate its repeal.

[3:45:16 PM](#)

SYLVIA KIDD, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4 and the repeal of RCV and open primaries. She pointed out that these measures were passed as a citizen's initiative. She said Alaska often has the courage to try new things, and she argued that there has not been enough time to tell [whether RCV was working or not]. She applauded the bipartisan majorities in both the House and the Senate and concluded that RCV would result in more representation in the government.

[3:46:35 PM](#)

TOM BOUTIN, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He contended that RCV has destroyed good faith in elections and reduced voter turnout.

[3:47:12 PM](#)

SHERRY STRIZAK, representing self, testified in support of HB 4 and the repeal of RCV. She urged a return to the traditional method of voting.

[3:48:03 PM](#)

DAVID MONSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4, as RCV and open primaries were adopted by the will of the people. He asserted that the legislature should not repeal [the people's will], and he challenged the idea that RCV is confusing.

[3:49:23 PM](#)

MICHAEL GARHART, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He shared his belief that RCV has left Alaska's elections open to fraud and manipulation.

[3:50:01 PM](#)

DOMINIC SCALISE, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4, which he characterized as an insult against the democratic will of the people. He disputed the idea that RCV is challenging to understand, adding that RCV has allowed him to vote for his preferred candidate.

[3:50:53 PM](#)

JOEL SIGMAN, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He urged a return to paper ballots to ensure fair elections. He questioned the use of electronics and expressed the belief that these could be hacked and changed.

[3:52:08 PM](#)

CONSTANCE FREDENBERG, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She challenged the idea that RCV is confusing, adding that RCV has given voters more options, while eliminating the need for runoff elections.

[3:53:11 PM](#)

KIMBERLY NIELSEN, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She stated that RCV has been easy for her to understand. She expressed the understanding that it has encouraged candidates to be more bipartisan and willing to work across the aisle. She discussed the extreme divide between republicans and democrats, naming it as the most serious problem the country faces.

[3:55:01 PM](#)

WILLIAM SALTONSTALL, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He expressed satisfaction with the results of RCV, which has allowed him to vote for the candidate of his choice from either party.

[3:56:05 PM](#)

ELIZABETH SALTONSTALL, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She said that she has found the educational component for RCV to be complete and understandable, adding that the system has given her the option to vote for the best candidate.

[3:56:52 PM](#)

IAN LAING, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He posited that RCV has been the most positive and substantive piece of election reform policy enacted in the last 10 years. He expressed the opinion that systematic issues, such as political polarization, has torn Alaska and the country apart from the inside. He urged the legislature to give RCV time. He expressed the opinion that it will create a better, more functional democracy.

[3:58:10 PM](#)

LAURA BONNER, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She voiced that she had voted against Ballot Measure 2; however, she expressed appreciation that it had passed, as it has allowed her to vote for the candidate of her choice. She said she felt disenfranchised by the closed primary system and disputed the need for extensive runoff elections.

[3:59:20 PM](#)

AMY MURRILS, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She shared her belief that RCV is confusing and advised that the state return to a paper ballot system.

[4:00:11 PM](#)

STUART SCHMUTZLER, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He pointed out that RCV was passed by a majority vote, and he stated that he has found it to be unconscionable a handful of legislators would attempt to overturn this. He challenged the idea that RCV is difficult, and he reiterated opposition to legislators overturning the will of the people.

[4:01:37 PM](#)

LINDA COURTICE, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4 on behalf of herself and her family. She opined that RCV is simple to use, and it has provided a higher quality candidate list to choose from, instead of the choice being made by partisan political machines.

[4:03:15 PM](#)

CLARICE JOHNSON, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She expressed the belief that in removing RCV her voice would be taken away, along with the voice of many Alaskans. She stated that RCV has allowed her to consider all candidates

regardless of party affiliation. She discussed the Alaska Republican Party ("GOP") and the recent behavior of a "prominent Alaska Republican," which indicated to her that education is needed now more than ever. She expressed the desire to have the option to vote for more moderate republicans, adding that RCV has allowed for a wide range of views to be represented.

[4:04:53 PM](#)

PAMELA CONRAD, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She stressed that RCV was voted in by constituents. She expressed the belief that if it needs to be repealed, it should be put back to a popular vote. She characterized the proposed legislation as a dishonest and deceitful way to overturn a popular vote. She stated that she was insulted by the assertion that RCV is too confusing. She highlighted the large pool of independent voters in Alaska, adding that RCV has given them a voice.

[4:06:29 PM](#)

JEANNETTE LEE, Alaska Research Director, Sightline Institute, testified in opposition to HB 4. She asserted that RCV has not affected the tabulation of most races, noting that every member of the House State Affairs Standing Committee won outright in the general election without triggering the ranking process. She said RCV is an option that makes runoff elections unnecessary, and this has prevented "spoilers." Returning to an open primary, she said, has given Alaska's independent voters more candidates to choose from. She expressed the understanding that the results of the RCV system does not benefit one party over another, but mirrors the majority of Alaska's voters, which are independent with a "rightwing lean."

[4:08:09 PM](#)

BOB GRUNDERSON, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He shared his belief that there has been more dark money in Alaska since RCV was passed. He added that the system has caused too much confusion, and it would split the vote if allowed to continue.

[4:09:13 PM](#)

PAUL RADZINSKI, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He characterized the attempt to overturn the will of the people as undemocratic and un-Alaskan.

[4:09:53 PM](#)

WALTER FEATHERLY, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He shared his experience running for the House as a registered nonpartisan, explaining that he was eliminated in the second round in the RCV tabulation. He indicated that the election of his opponent, a registered republican, demonstrates that RCV works at least as well for republicans as it does for all party affiliations. He opined that Ballot Measure 2 has provided Alaskans with the independence and freedom to vote for who they want, regardless of the candidate's party affiliation.

[4:11:34 PM](#)

MARGARET MORAN, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. She shared her understanding that the majority of Alaskans who are registered as nonpartisan do not want to be forced to choose a "particular ticket." She explained the ranked choice process and disputed the idea that RCV is counted by an algorithm. Instead, she shared that a computer counts the votes. She added that it would be possible to count them by hand if necessary.

[4:13:27 PM](#)

LIN DAVIS, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4, reiterating that RCV has reduced the use of extremist-wedge issues.

[4:14:22 PM](#)

MARILYN WICK, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. She described RCV as a corrupt system of voting, as it has taken away the constitutional right to cast one vote for one candidate. She encouraged a return to the original two-party primary system.

[4:15:40 PM](#)

RAYMOND WALKER, representing self, testified in support of HB 4. He expressed opposition to the Dominion Voting Systems voting machines and algorithms.

[4:16:21 PM](#)

SANTA CLAUS, representing self, testified in opposition to HB 4. He argued that prior to RCV, the republican and democratic parties monopolized the elections, controlled the primaries, and decided who could run. Additionally, he expressed his support for open primaries, which allows voters to choose the candidate that best represents their values and interests. He expressed the opinion that RCV has encouraged more candidates to run. He reiterated his support for the proposed legislation.

CHAIR SHAW, after ascertaining that there was no one else who wished to testify, closed public testimony on HB 4.

[4:18:13 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT moved to report HB 4 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY objected. She explained that laws are made by the legislature or a citizen's initiative. She expressed unease about repealing a citizen's initiative. She expressed opposition to moving HB 4 out of committee.

[4:18:59 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ALLARD shared her belief that she was deceived by Ballot Measure 2. Additionally, she cited a survey conducted by the Alaska Chamber, which suggested that many people who voted for Ballot Measure 2 also felt deceived. She opined that Ballot Measure 2 was confusing. She expressed the belief in "one person one vote."

REPRESENTATIVE STORY maintained her objection.

[4:20:32 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Carpenter, Allard, Wright, and Shaw voted in favor of moving HB 4 out of committee. Representative Story voted against it. Therefore, HB 4 was reported out of the House State Affairs Standing Committee by a vote of 4-1.

[4:21:04 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.