

SB

351

Interim:
600 East Railroad Avenue
Wasilla, Alaska 99654
(907) 376-3370
(907) 376-3157 Fax



Session:
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
(907) 465-6600
(907) 465-3805 Fax

SENATOR LYDA GREEN
SENATE DISTRICT G

CSSB 351 (FIN) SUPPORTING MATERIAL

CSSB 351 (FIN) "An act requiring the Alaska Public Offices Commission to accept documents by nonelectronic means."

Recent changes to the Alaska Statutes have allowed the Alaska Public Offices Commission to accommodate electronic reporting and distribution of information to the public. However, an unintended consequence is that APOC has determined that it will no longer accept filing of Public Official Financial Disclosures, Campaign Disclosures, Lobbyist Reports, and Legislative Financial Disclosures in a format other than electronic. Essentially, the Legislative intent to encourage APOC to develop the ability to accept electronic filing has resulted in an unnecessary obstacle for those members of the public not accustomed to using computers.

APOC is working to provide alternative filing plans for communities that lack reliable internet service but the alternative will likely be that they can just submit their disk, not that they get to continue to use paper forms. No accommodations are being contemplated for those members of the public who wish to continue to file in paper form. Ironically, paper copies of submitted filings will still be available from the office.

CSSB 351 (FIN) addresses this problem by broadening the acceptable format for filing of APOC mandatory reports. Specifically, while electronic filing may be encouraged, APOC shall continue to accept paper filing from those who do not want to take advantage of electronic filing opportunities.

CSSB 351 (FIN) is the result of conversations with APOC in order to address their concerns with the proposed legislation while at the same time staying true to the purpose of SB 351. The CS limits proposed changes to the filing required of an elected official or a candidate in an election and no longer addresses lobbyist filings.

Interim:
600 East Railroad Avenue
Wasilla, Alaska 99654
(907) 376-3370
(907) 376-3157 Fax



Session:
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
(907) 465-6600
(907) 465-3805 Fax

SENATOR LYDA GREEN
SENATE DISTRICT G

CSSB 351 (FIN) SPONSOR STATEMENT

“An act requiring the Alaska Public Offices Commission to accept documents by nonelectronic means.”

Recent changes to the Alaska Statutes have allowed the Alaska Public Offices Commission to accommodate electronic reporting and distribution of information to the public. However, an unintended consequence is that APOC has determined that it will no longer accept filing in a format other than electronic. This effectively creates an unnecessary obstacle for those not accustomed to using computers.

CSSB 351 (FIN) broadens the acceptable format for filing of APOC mandatory reports. Specifically, while electronic filing may be encouraged, APOC shall continue to accept paper filing from those who do not want to take advantage of electronic filing opportunities.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1
 Bill Version: SB 351
 (S) Publish Date: 3/10/04

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Administration
 Title An Act requiring the Alaska Public Offices RDU Alaska Public Offices Commission
Commission to accept documents Component Alaska Public Offices Commission
 Sponsor Senate Finance
 Requester Senate State Affairs Component No. 70

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services	*	*	*	*	*	*
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies	*					
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	*	*	*	*	*	*

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	*	*	*	*	*	*
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	*	*	*	*	*	*

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: 0.0
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2005 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	*	*	*	*	*	*
Part-time	*	*	*	*	*	*
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill seeks to reverse mandatory electronic filing as requested by the administration and approved by the legislature in 2003. This bill could have a significant fiscal impact on the Commission in meeting its mission by publishing campaign disclosure information before election day.

It is not known at this time how much of an impact this bill will have. The determining factor will be how many people choose to participate electronically without a legal requirement to do so.

Prepared by: Brooke Miles, Director
 Division: Alaska Public Offices Commission
 Approved by: Mike Miller, Commissioner
 Agency: Department of Administration

Phone: 907-276-4176
 Date/Time: 3/9/04 2:56 PM
 Date: 3/9/2004



Alaska State Legislature

Senate Majority Web: <http://www.akrepublicans.org>

Sponsor: Sen. Lyda Green
Current Version: CSSB 351 (FIN)
Contact: Kim Carnot, 465-6600
Date: April 14, 2004

Fact Sheet for: Senate Bill 351

Short Title: APOC Reports by Non-electronic Means

Summary:

- Broadens the acceptable format for filing of APOC mandatory reports. Specifically, while electronic filing may be encouraged, APOC shall continue to accept paper filing from those who do not want to take advantage of electronic filing opportunities.
- Standardizes the format of APOC forms for ease of completion by the filer.

Benefits:

- Gives APOC time to develop and test its electronic filing system.
- Makes running for office as user friendly as possible by giving candidates the choice of filing electronically or in paper format.

Background:

Recent changes to Alaska Statutes have allowed the Alaska Public Offices Commission to accommodate electronic reporting and distribution of information to the public. However, an unintended consequence is that APOC has determined that it will no longer accept filing of Public Official Financial Disclosures, Campaign Disclosures, and Legislative Financial Disclosures in a format other than electronic. Essentially, the Legislative intent to encourage APOC to develop the ability to accept electronic filing has resulted in an unnecessary obstacle for those members of the public not accustomed to using computers.



Center for Governmental Studies

10951 West Pico Blvd., Suite 120
Los Angeles, CA 90064
tel: 310.470.6590 ☎ fax: 310.475.3752
e-mail: center@cgs.org ☎ website: http://www.cgs.org

ELECTRONIC FILING AND DISCLOSURE SURVEY 2002 UPDATE

64 responses

50 states

6 Canadian provinces

6 Cities

Federal Election Commission

Elections Canada

1. Has your jurisdiction developed an electronic filing system for campaign finance, lobbyist, or personal financial disclosure statements?

- (a) Yes (46) U.S. AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FE, FL, GA, HI, IL, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI
- (6) U.S. Cities Austin, Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, San Francisco (S.F.), Seattle
- (5) Canada British Columbia, Elections Canada, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec
- (b) No (4) U.S. MT, SC, TN, WY
- (2) Canada Alberta, Yukon

Internet users can access scanned data from Alabama, Alberta, Arkansas, British Columbia, Mississippi, South Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia which scan campaign finance data, and from Delaware, Kansas and North Dakota which manually enter campaign finance data and post it online.

The only responding jurisdictions surveyed that do not use computers at all for campaign statements are Alberta, Montana, South Carolina, Tennessee, Wyoming and Yukon.

2. If yes, is the system voluntary for filers or is it mandatory?

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------|-------------|--|
| (a) | Voluntary | (18) | U.S. | <u>AK, CO, DE, FL, IA, IN, KY, ME, MI, MN, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, OK, PA, UT</u> |
| | | (1) | U.S. Cities | <u>Madison</u> |
| | | (3) | Canada | <u>Elections Canada, Manitoba, Quebec</u> |
| (b) | Mandatory | (20) | U.S. | <u>AZ, CA, CT, FEC, GA, HI, IL, LA, MD, MA, MO, NY, NC, OH, OR, RI, TX, VA, WA, WI</u> |
| | | (5) | U.S. Cities | <u>Austin, Los Angeles, NYC, S.F., Seattle</u> |

MI Will have mandatory filing effective 2004 for those that spend/ receive \$20K+ in the previous election cycle.

NYC Proposed rules will make it mandatory and require all campaigns to use an electronic filing system. Under the proposed rules, campaigns must request a waiver from the Board in order to be excused from this requirement.

WA Since 1999, has been mandatory for gubernatorial candidates only.

WV Had difficulties with development, plan to resume this project in the future.

WI Our efforts for an electronic filing system of campaign finance reports incorporated with an integrated campaign finance and elections agency management system continue to be stalled for lack of funding. Until funding becomes available, the Elections Board passed an administrative rule requiring reports for those registrants who are required to file electronically to transfer their reports in a spreadsheet, text-delimited file, or RTF. We are posting these on our website. However, there is no searchable database. We will continue to post summary information for all filers.

3. If mandatory, please provide the thresholds for mandatory filing and the year they go (went) into effect?

All Campaigns (4 Jurisdictions)

MA Raise or spend more than 10% of expenditure limit for that office (since 2002).

NYC If candidates accept public financing.

RI For all statewide offices (Gov., Lt. Gov., SOS, Treasurer)

VA No thresholds. Mandatory for Governor, Lt. Governor and Attorney General. Voluntary for all other offices.

Candidates/ PAC's

\$500 or more (1 Jurisdiction)

AZ \$500 (since 1993).

\$1,000 or more (1 Jurisdiction)

NY = > \$1K (since 1999).

\$5,000 or more (7 Jurisdictions)

GA \$5K for PACs and political committees
HI \$5K for Governor, Lt. Governor, Mayor, Prosecuting Attorney and Council candidates (since 1997).
MD \$5K for candidates (since 1999).
MO \$5K received or spent by a candidate for statewide office for any reporting period.
NC \$5K for statewide candidates and from other candidate, political parties, or PAC's that receive or make contributions or expenditures in excess of said amount. All other candidates may file electronically voluntarily (since 1999).
S.F. \$5K in calendar year.
Seattle \$5K+ for PACs/ Independent Expenditures (since 2000).

\$10,000 or more (3 Jurisdictions)

GA \$10K for General Assembly, superior courts, district attorney and county or municipal offices (effective 1/1/03).
MO \$15K+ for any PAC making a contribution in excess of this amount in the applicable calendar year.
OH \$10K for any contribution or expenditure for statewide candidates (since 2001), PACs (since 2002) and General Assembly (eff. 2003)

\$20,000 or more (3 Jurisdictions)

GA \$20K for constitutional offices, Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Public Service Commission (since 2/1/01).
TX \$20K except those claiming an exemption: (1) filer does not use computer equipment to keep records, (2) filers (other than candidates for statewide office or related PACs) that do not accept or spend more than \$20K in a year and (3) candidates for district judge, district attorney, or judge of a multi-county statutory county court, and related PACs (since 7/1/00).
WI \$20K for candidates receiving in a campaign period and for non-candidates, same amount received in a biennium (since 7/22/02).

\$25,000 or more (5 Jurisdictions)

Austin \$30K or agree to public financing by signing a contract.
IL \$25K (since 1999), \$10K (effective 2003).
Los Angeles \$25K (since 2001).
Seattle \$25+ for candidates, ballot issues (since 1998).
WA \$25K+ for any campaign or committee who previously or expects to expend this amount (since 2002); will reduce to \$10K in 2004.

\$50,000 or more (5 Jurisdictions)

<u>CA</u>	\$50K (since 7/00).
<u>CT</u>	\$250K for statewide candidates only (since 1/1/99).
<u>FEC</u>	\$50K in receipts & disbursements (since 1/1/01).
<u>LA</u>	\$50K in receipts for statewide offices (since 1999).
<u>OR</u>	\$50K total combined activity (since 2000, with waivers granted until 2004).

For 25 total jurisdictions, the median was \$10,000.

Lobbyists (1 Jurisdiction)**\$5,000 or more**

<u>CA</u>	\$5K (since July 2000).
-----------	-------------------------

4. Please circle which persons file financial statements electronically with your agency. (Circle more than one, if appropriate.)

- (a) **Candidates (46)**
 (b) **Political Committees (39)**
 (c) **Lobbyists (9)**
 (d) **Political Consultants (0)**
 (e) **Officeholder statements of economic interest (3)**

- (a) AZ, AK, Austin, C.A, CO, CT, DE, Elections Canada, FEC, FL, GA, HI, IL, IA, IN, KY, Los Angeles, LA, Madison, ME, Manitoba, MD, MA, MI, MN, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NYC, NY, NC, RI, OH, OK, OR, PA, Quebec, S.F., Seattle, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI
- (b) AZ, AK, Austin, CA, CO, CT, DE, FEC, FL, GA, HI, IL, IA, IN, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, NE, NV, NH, NM, NY, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, Quebec, S.F., Seattle, TX, UT, VA, WI
- (c) CA, CO, DE, IA, LA, ME, NE, PA, UT
- (d) None
- (e) LA, Seattle, WA

<u>Los Angeles</u>	Currently developing online system for lobbyist registration & disclosure.
<u>MO</u>	Currently have none e-filing. In process of developing the system.
<u>PA</u>	Lobbyists who contribute to candidates.
<u>Quebec</u>	Political parties at municipal and provincial levels can file their return of election expenses electronically. But we still demand the paper copy for signature.

WA Including appointed officials.

5. **Do your filers need particular software that they must use, or can they use any software package that is compatible?**

- (a) **Must use particular software package (14)**
 (b) **May use any software package that is compatible (33)**

(a) U.S. AK, DE, IA, IN, LA, MA, MN, NJ, NM, RI, VA
 Canada Elections Canada, Manitoba, Quebec

(b) U.S. AZ, CA, CO, CT, FEC, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, MD, MO, MI, NE, NV, NH, NY, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, TX, UT, WA, WI
 U.S. Cities Austin, Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle
 Canada Elections Canada.

If a particular software package, name the package.

CA Currently supported only by private sector certified vendors but starting on Jan 1, 2003 there will be a free web-base alternative for filing.

CT Web-based system, only need Adobe Acrobat 4.0 software.

DE Developed by IBM for Delaware.

Elections Canada Candidates must use particular software, while Political Parties use text delimited files.

GA May use any software package that is compatible – software must be certified by our office prior to use or candidate may use developed program written in Access 2000 or Access 2002.

IA Board developed, so not named.

IN Was developed by our computer company that works with our agency.

LA L.E.A.D.E.R.S.. Filers can upload from other programs using a vendor package.

Manitoba Custom developed.

MD O.C.P.F. developed: Reporter 3.0, Depository Reporter or Bank Reporter – depends on the type of filer.

MI The compatible software program must meet our filing format.

MN Finance-2002

MO Web based reporting system. Only need software to access the Internet.

NV Web-based application, only need a browser.

NJ Customized software developed for NJ ELEC. R1 Electronic Filing System (REFS) used by legislative candidates and political committees and Gubernatorial Electronic Filing System (GEFS) used by gubernatorial campaign committees.

NM SOS Issues software

NYC C-SMART – Campaign Software for Managing and Reporting Transactions. Although filers may use any software that is compatible, we strongly recommend and urge candidates to use our software to avoid compliance issues that may effect public fund payments.

NY File layouts must meet our specs.

PA The Department provided on our website a list of vendors whose software is compatible.

Quebec Access 2000

RI System is Internet based so all filers must enter on-line.

VA VA Filing Software

WI The files must be RTF, in an Excel Spreadsheet, or in a text-delimited file. Until funding becomes available, starting with the 07/02 continuing report due 7/22/02 in our office, registrants will transfer their reports electronically and those reports will be posted on our website.

6. Have you developed a software package that filers may use?

Yes	(24)	U.S.	<u>AZ, DE, FEC, GA, HI, IL, IA, IN, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OK, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI</u>
	(3)	U.S. Cities	<u>Los Angeles, NYC, S.F.</u>
	(3)	Canada	<u>Elections Canada, Manitoba, Quebec</u>
No	(11)	U.S.	<u>CA, CO, CT, DE, MO, NE, NV, NH, OH, PA, RI</u>
	(3)	U.S. Cities	<u>Austin, Madison, Seattle</u>
	(2)	Canada	<u>Alberta, B.C.</u>

CA We have defined the filing format (CAL), but no software packages.

DE Dept of Elections staff receive and input the reports using an IBM developed software program for the state. Candidates do not electronically file information but blank forms can be downloaded in PDF, printed and used by political committees designated by the forms.

GA We have developed a downloadable Access Program candidates can use as long as they have Access 2000 or Access 2002.

HI Hawaii Electronic Reporting and Tracking System (HERTS) Generation 2.

IL IDIS Electronic Filing Software Vers. 1.2.

KY Developed by vendor.

MA Done in-house.

MI Yes.

MN Finance-2002

NYC C-SMART has been developed by that Campaign Finance Board (CFB).

OK Yes, in 1997; however, as of 7/1/02, it may longer be used due to changes in the rules, forms and schedules. We are currently developing new software.

OR No, but two private vendors have.

Seattle No, but our filers can use the State of Washington Software, WEDS.

TX The Ethics Commission has worked with a private vendor to develop new computer software that filers may obtain free of charge and install on their own computers for generating reports. Software purchased from third-party vendors may also be used if it generates reports in the required format.

- UT It's available as part of the on-line filing. It doesn't really "manage" their campaign account but they can use it to store information that hasn't been submitted yet.
- WI We have a simple Access database and Excel spreadsheet available off our website. The local designers created them for candidates' committees and have given these files to us. We have made them available to registrants from our website. Both print reports that comply with our campaign finance reporting requirements.

7. If so, how much does it cost the filers?

- Free DE, Elections Canada, FEC, GA (as long as have Access 2000 or 2002), HI, IL, IA, IN, KY, LA, Los Angeles, LA, Manitoba, MD, MA, MI, MN, NJ, NM, NYC, NY, NC, OK, Quebec, S.F., Seattle, TX, UT, WA, WI.
- OR One vendor charges \$1K for initial purchase and \$600 for two-year renewals, and allows additional committees to add on to purchased packages for \$300.
- VA \$35.00

8. Does the software include campaign management features beyond those necessary to comply with electronic filing requirement? What are they?

- DE Checks and balances that indicate if contribution limits have been exceeded.
Elections Canada Ability to print tax receipts for contributors to candidates.
- IL Check numbers; printing list of receipts and expenditures by range of date, check number and amount; print mailing labels; importing names and address.
- IN Allows them to store data, so they don't have to keep re-entering.
- KY Banking and Mail-merge - supported by vendor only.
- Manitoba Diagnostic checks and tips to aid in compliance.
- MD Excel based database allows for data export.
- MI Features include flagging potential errors, excess contributions, corporate contributions, missing data, etc.
- MN Yes, letter writing, import registered voters lists, label and phone # programs, entity tracking, and voter history.
- NJ Yes, both applications allow the information to be exported to either a flat file or spreadsheet. The GEFS application allows the user to scan and store the source documentation in electronic media for archival purposes as well as fulfilling the filing requirements. The REFS application aggregates contribution amounts by contributor.
- NYC C-SMART provides different types of reports that may assist in campaign management such as Contributor list, sorting functionality and features that assist in complying with the CFB such as limits. C-SMART is also able to export data that may be used for mail merge, spreadsheets, etc.
- NC Yes. Audit features, run labels, search for specific contributions or disbursements, daily statements.

- OK It will keep a record of expenditure information that is not required on the form; otherwise, it is form-based.
- OR This vendor's program generates thank-you/ acknowledgment letters, IRS reports, occupation inquiry letters.
- Seattle Accounting features, reconciliation features, exporting names and addresses.
- TX Import/export feature for names and addresses.
- WI The Access database was developed for candidates and does have some campaign management features. Very minimal. We do not support it.

9. How do filers send you the information? (Circle all that is appropriate.)

(a) Mail in disks (23)

U.S. AZ, FEC, FL, HI, IL, IA, KY, LA, MD, MI, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OR, PA, TX, WI

U.S. Cities Austin, NYC, S.F.

Canada Elections Canada, Quebec

(b) File over the Internet (39)

U.S. AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FEC, GA, HI, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MO, NV, NH, NM, NY, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI

U.S. Cities Los Angeles, Madison, S.F., Seattle

Canada Quebec

(c) Provide paper copies (58)

U.S. AL, AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, ID, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY

U.S. Cities Austin, Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle

Canada Alberta, B.C., Elections Canada, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec

All of the above IA, KY, LA, MD, MI, NM, NY, NC, OR, PA, S.F., TX, Quebec, WI

Austin Filers can bring in a disk.

IL Also has modem filing.

LA Filers can provide paper copies if not filing electronically.

MA Filers can provide paper copies until 2004.

MI FTP file to our server.

NE Filers download forms to PC, fill them out in Word and submit paper copy.

NYC Additionally, filers may also have information hand delivered.

PA This fall (2002) will be able to file over Internet.

Quebec Filers submit paper copy with either disk or Internet submissions.

WV Filers can download CF forms in PDF, fill out on their computers and printout for submission.

10. Do filers have to provide street addresses when filing electronically?

- (a) Yes (43)
 (b) No, but have to provide street addresses when filing paper copies (8)
 (c) Don't provide street addresses even when filing paper copies (2)

(a) U.S. AK, CO, CT, DE, FEC, FL, GA, HI, IL, IA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MA, MI, MN, MO, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI
 U.S. Cities Austin, Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle
 Canada Elections Canada, Manitoba, Quebec

(b) U.S. AL, AR, CA, MD, MS, SD, VT
 Canada Ontario,

(c) U.S. NC
 U.S. Cities Madison

NC They must provide a mailing address, but it does not have to be a street address.

11. After a candidate or committee files a statement, is it posted online?

- (a) Yes, in its entirety by scanning (29)
 U.S. AL, AZ, AR, CT, CO, FEC, GA, ID, IL, IA, LA, MI, MS, MO, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, OH, RI, SD, VT, WA, WV, WI
 U.S. Cities Austin, Madison
 Canada B.C.
- (b) Yes, but not all information is posted (13)
 U.S. AK, CA, KS, MD, OR, PA, TX, WI
 U.S. Cities Seattle
 Canada Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec
- (c) Not at all
 U.S. MT, OK, TN, WY
- (d) It is entered into a database so that anyone can download it (31)
 U.S. AK, CA, CO, DE, FL, HI, ID, IN, KY, LA, ME, MA, MI, MN, MO, NJ, NY, NC, ND, PA, RI, SD, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI
 U.S. Cities Los Angeles, NYC, S.F.
 Canada Elections Canada

12. Does your agency compile any data from these state elections and post them online before the election? (Circle all that is appropriate.)

No (11) AL, AR, Austin, Elections Canada, IA, LA, Manitoba, MO, NH, ND, OK, VT, WY

If so, what kind of information or describe the information:

- (a) **The big picture, totaling how much was raised and spent (20)**
 U.S.: AK, AZ, DE, FEC, FL, ID, IN, MI, NJ, NY, OR, RI, SD, TX, UT, WA
 U.S. Cities: Los Angeles, NYC, Seattle
 Canada: Quebec
- (b) **Data is searchable by contributor (34)**
 U.S.: AK, AZ, CO, CT, DE, FEC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, NE, NV, NJ, NY, NC, OH, RI, TX, UT, WA
 U.S. Cities: Los Angeles, NYC, S.F., Seattle
 Canada: Quebec
- (c) **Data is searchable by candidate or committee (44)**
 U.S.: AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FEC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OH, OR, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV
 U.S. Cities: Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle
 Canada: Ontario, Quebec
- (d) **Data is downloadable (35)**
 U.S.: CA, CO, FEC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IN, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, MS, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OH, PA, RI, SD, VA, WA, WV, WI
 U.S. Cities: Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle
 Canada: Ontario, Quebec

All of the above: (13) FEC, FL, ID, IN, Los Angeles, MI, NJ, NYC, NY, Quebec, RI, Seattle, WA

CA Displays filed data by filer and separate late contribution pages.

LA Planning to do "big picture" for next statewide election in 2003.

13. Do you compile information after the election and post this on the website? (Circle all that is appropriate.)

No (17) U.S. AR, AL, IL, IA, LA, MI, MS, MO, NH, OK, OR, TX, VA, WV, WI, WY
 U.S. Cities Austin

If so, what kind of information or describe the information:

- (a) **The big picture, totaling how much was raised and spent (25)**

- U.S. AK, AZ, DE, FEC, FL, HI, ID, IN, KS, MA, NV, NJ, NY, NC, ND, RI, SD, UT, WA
- U.S. Cities Los Angeles, NYC, Seattle
- Canada Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec
- (b) **Data is searchable by contributor (31)**
- U.S. AK, AZ, CT, CO, DE, FEC, FL, HI, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MN, NE, NJ, NY, NC, OH, RI, UT, VT, WA
- U.S. Cities Los Angeles, NYC, S.F., Seattle
- Canada Elections Canada,
- (c) **Data is searchable by candidate or committee (37)**
- U.S. AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FEC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MN, NE, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OH, PA, RI, SD, UT, VT, WA
- U.S. Cities Los Angeles, NYC, S.F., Seattle
- Canada Elections Canada, Manitoba, Ontario
- (d) **Data is downloadable (32)**
- U.S. CA, CO, FEC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IN, KY, ME, MD, MA, NE, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, PA, RI, SD, VT, WA
- U.S. Cities Los Angeles, Madison, NYC, S.F., Seattle
- Canada Elections Canada, Manitoba, Ontario
- All of the above FEC, FL, HI, ID, IN, Los Angeles, NJ, NYC, NY, NC, RI, Seattle, WA

14. **Do you require separate reports for independent expenditures or late expenditures?**

- (a) **Yes (36)** U.S. AK, CA, CO, CT, FEC, FL, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, ME, MA, MI, MS, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NY, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, TX, WA, WV, WI
- U.S. Cities Los Angeles, Madison, S.F., Seattle
- Canada B.C., Elections Canada,
- (b) **No (23)** U.S. AL, AZ, AR, DE, GA, HI, IL, IA, MD, MN, MO, NM, ND, SD, UT, VT, VA, WY
- U.S. Cities Austin, NYC
- Canada Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec

If yes, describe:

AK One page report that discloses date, amount and check number for expenditures made in support of or opposition to a candidate or ballot question, includes name and address of person making expenditure.

B.C. Election advertising sponsors (Third Parties) must register and file disclosure reports showing how much they spent on advertising and any contributions received.

- CA Reports are filed on separate forms and displayed in an LCR/LLE section of website. If SB2095 passes, we'll have to add independent expenditure links to the candidates' pages, which we hope to do anyway.
- CO Independent expenditures are filed by separate form or website. Late expenditures are not filed separately.
- CT For independent expenditures over \$1,000.
- FEC Made during the twenty days prior to an election and over \$1,000.
- ID For entities not already filing the regular disclosure reports but not for committees filing since the independent expenditures are reported on their regular reports.
- IN Amendments
- KY Person making expenditure is required to make an independent expenditure report.
- LA Any person other than a candidate or committee accepting or spending >\$500 to influence an election must report.
- ME 21A M.R.S.A. §1019 + Commission Rules: >\$250 within 48 hrs of expenditure.
- MA If over \$100, within 7 days of making it. File on paper; electronically in 2004.
- MI They must file in any written format the name, date, amount, occupational info.
- MS See Miss. Code Ann. § 23-15-800
- NE Late independent expenditures must be reported within 2 days. A L.I.E. is an I.E. of \$1K or more made in the 14 days preceding the election.
- NV Independent expenditures report on + separately.
- NH Any expenditures of this nature must be filed within 24 hours if over \$500.
- NJ Reports are filed by those entities spending over the applicable thresholds.
- NY Any contribution or loan over \$1000 received before an election but after the cut-off date for the 11 day pre-election filing.
- NC There is a separate form to be completed for independent expenditures. This form is the "Report of Independent Expenditures and Contributions" form (CRO-2210).

- OR These are quite rare, usually apply to voters' pamphlet measure argument purchases, are not filed electronically and are not posted on our website.
- PA Independent expenditures are filed by the person making the expenditure on a separate form. Candidates report late contributions received after the pre-election report filing dates, but they are not reported on-line prior to an election. Late contributions appear on the 30 day post-election report online.
- RI Forms can be submitted on line.
- S.F. FPPC Forms 461, 465, 496.
- Seattle Same as for committees, i.e. all expenditures plus if not one person's money, then all contributors of \$25 or more.
- TX Individuals who make independent expenditures exceeding \$100 must file report. Corporations that make expenditures in connection with a measure election must file a report. These reports are not required to be filed electronically.
- WA PDC form C6 Independent Expenditures must be submitted within 24 hours of the independent expenditure.
- WV Independent expenditures must be reported.
- WI The committee making independent disbursements must complete a separate report along with their campaign finance report. In addition, during the 15-day period before an election event, committees making independent expenditures must report their activity within 24 hours when the amount exceeds \$20.

15. **If yes, do you compile information regarding independent expenditures and put it on the website? (Circle all that applies.)**

- (a) **Yes (22)**
 U.S. AK, CO, FEC, ID, IN, MA, MI, NE, NV, NJ, NY, NC, PA, RI, WA, WV, WI
 U.S. Cities Los Angeles, Madison, S.F., Seattle
 Canada B.C.
- (b) **It is on searchable database (11)**
 U.S. CA, CO, CT, ID, IN, MI, NE, NJ, NC, RI
 U.S. Cities Madison, S.F.
- (c) **We summarize it in a separate section (9)**
 U.S. CO, FEC, MI, NY, PA, WA
 U.S. Cities Los Angeles, S.F., Seattle

All of the above: CO, S.F.

No FL, KS, LA, ME, MS, NH, OH, OK, OR, TX

MA scans and posts these.

WI scans and posts these.

16. **How many filings do you receive?**

(a) **Number** _____

10 or less	<u>Austin, OK</u>
11-50	<u>Madison, OR</u>
51-100	<u>AK, CO, NC</u>
101-300	<u>GA, NM, PA, S.F., VA, WI</u>
301-500	<u>MO</u>
501-1,000	<u>LA</u>
1,001-5,000	<u>AK, CT, Elections Canada, KY, MA, NY, Ontario, RI, Seattle, TX</u>
Over 5,000	<u>CA, FEC, IL</u>

For 28 jurisdictions, the median was 450.

(b) **Percentage of eligible filings** _____

0-10%	<u>KY, NM, NC, OK</u>
11-20%	<u>LA, MN, PA</u>
21-30%	<u>Elections Canada, OR</u>
31-40%	<u>AK, Austin, FEC, FL, IL</u>
41-50%	<u>CA, CO, S.F., TX</u>
51-60%	
61-70%	<u>Manitoba</u>
71-80%	<u>NYC, UT</u>
81-90%	<u>Seattle</u>
91-100%	<u>CT, NY, Quebec</u>

For 24 jurisdictions, the median was 38%.

(c) **How many were received in your last:**

a. **election year** _____

Under 10	<u>Austin, OK</u>
11-50	<u>Madison, OR</u>
51-100	<u>AK, CO, GA, NJ</u>
101-300	<u>KY, MN, NM, S.F., VA</u>
301-500	<u>NC</u>
501-1,000	<u>Los Angeles, MI</u>
Over 1,000	<u>CA, CT, FEC, IL, LA, NYC, NY, Ontario, RI, Seattle, TX</u>

For 27 jurisdictions, the median was 388.

b. non-election year _____

Under 10	<u>Madison, OK</u>
11-50	<u>AK, NJ, NM, OR</u>
51-100	<u>CO, GA, MN, VA</u>
101-300	<u>Los Angeles., NYC, NC</u>
301-500	<u>Ontario</u>
501-1,000	<u>LA, Seattle</u>
Over 1,000	<u>CA, CT, FEC, IL, NY, RI, TX</u>

For 24 jurisdictions, the median was 165.**17. What is your annual budget for electronic filing information?**

Under \$1,000	
\$1,001-10,000	<u>MN, Seattle</u>
\$10,001-25,000	<u>IA, LA, OK, Quebec</u>
\$25,001-50,000	<u>AK, ME, MO</u>
\$50,001-75,000	<u>MA, S.F.</u>
\$75,001-100,000	<u>TX</u>
\$100,001-250,000	<u>IL, CO, NY, OH</u>
\$250,001-500,000	<u>WA</u>
Over \$500,000	<u>CA, FEC, PA</u>

For 20 jurisdictions, the median was \$87,500.

GA Not a specific line item in the budget. It is included in the Elections budget.

HI Varies

Los Angeles No specific annual budget strictly for e-filing.

NJ We do not maintain a separate budget for electronic filing.

NM Salary 1 FTE

NYC System development staff is responsible for electronic filing, therefore a separate budget is not required:

OH This number will be greatly reduced this year.

OK \$15K maintenance.

OR Not tracked separately in budget.

PA Carried over this \$5K to this fiscal year to complete the project.

Seattle Not counting salary of 1/2 FTE.

UT We don't have a specific budget for this. It comes out of our administrative budget.

WA 6 IT Staff who also do more than just e-filings = \$350K.

WI Uncertain. Cost of agency staff time and there will be a monthly cost for hosting the website based on size of files stored.

18. How much did it cost you to develop your electronic filing program?

\$25,000 or less	<u>AK, AZ, Manitoba, Quebec, WI</u>
\$25,001-50,000	
\$50,001-75,000	<u>NV</u>
\$75,001-100,000	<u>UT, VA</u>
\$100,001-250,000	<u>CO, Elections Canada, DE, HI, LA, MN, NJ, OK, OR, S.F.</u>
\$250,001-500,000	<u>IL, IA, Los Angeles, ME, NY, RI, TX, WA</u>
\$500,001-1,000,000	<u>FEC, MA</u>
Over \$1 million	<u>CA</u>

For 28 jurisdictions, the median was \$164,300.

FL In-house
GA Developed in-house by IT staff.
HI \$50K - HERTS, \$50K - HERTS 2, \$62K - HERTS2 Enhancement
IA 1st failed attempted - \$247K, 2nd failed attempt - \$82K, Internet project - cannot be computed at this time, (on-going work).
IN Still in the pilot stage - no payment has been made yet,
KY Vendor developed software on his own.
MO Entire electronic reporting systems in-house, did not request any additional funds for this process (I.S. Department has a total of 4 people: 1 Network Administrator, 1 Call Support, 1 DBA/ Programmer, 1 Programmer).
NM Salary 1 FTE
NYC Our electronic filing system has been redeveloped in house, by system development staff over the years since 1993.
NC The completed development of the new electronic filing program is not complete.
OH Designed & built in-house. No additional staff hired for project - no additional major equipment.
OK In 1997, it cost us \$70K. This year we will spend \$90K to develop new software.
Seattle \$0, our filers use state's software.
WA Paid SDR Technologies \$209K in 1998. IT Staff replaced most of SDR Solution in 2000/01: \$300K + salaries + benefits.

19. **What has been the response to your program from candidates, committees, press and the general public? Include whether you think the data is being used to the extent you hoped.**

AK Very positive from users and public. Our goal is a web-based filing system with a fully searchable/downloadable database.

CA Generally good response. Some researchers find it incomplete or insufficient for their needs. Media is generally satisfied. We have recently started offering a complete download of the database on CD-ROM for \$5 and once that becomes better known, I anticipate greater satisfaction. People seem to like the ability to see snapshots on our web pages, as well as PDF renditions of the filed forms.

CO Positive response. Data used more than expected.

CT Overall the response has been positive. Both the filers and the public are pleased with the ease of use of both systems and the accessibility of data which previously existed as hard copy in a central location.

DE Department of Elections staff receives filed reports via email and inputs it into the IBM program to create a database. Online database just became accessible January '02 and there have only been a few users. However, the Department of Elections office has a training area to show a person how to access the information wanted.

Elections Canada Positive response but printing was a problem.

FEC Generally positive. The data is easily available on the web and we have spoken with a number of researchers asking specific questions about using the electronic data. Additionally, data captured from paper reports only includes a subset of transactions, electronic filings include everything.

FL Everyone loves the program because the information is at your fingertips. I think it's great! Response would be better if electronic filing was mandatory.

GA Everyone really likes the e-filing ability. During an election year, the press uses our site to track contributions for candidates running in statewide elections. Since the e-filing is not entirely mandatory, the number of candidates submitting files electronically is about as expected.

ID Scanned reports and database have been viewed and used widely by general public, press, etc.

IL Response has been excellent. Candidates, committees, press and the general public are making use of the data. Very few criticisms. We also listen to the

feedback from people and have made some changes in how information is presented and searched on our website.

- IA We are moving from software to Internet filings. The positives have been that information can be submitted from any computer with Internet access. The negative has been that the Internet is slower and it takes longer to file. Everyone is excited about potential of viewing reports via the Internet. When system is perfected, the data will be used fully.
- IN So far our users are thrilled. We look forward to the completion of our pilot program, as it will save our agency a lot of money.
- KY The response has been great. The press is extremely pleased at this point.
- Los Angeles Positive response from all users particularly since we developed additional capabilities such as an upload feature and an expenditure query. These new features were created in response to user feedback.
- LA Although initial response was very positive, use has remained fairly static. Hoping for more electronic filers in next big election cycle-2003.
- ME Still in testing. Preliminary responses have been favorable. Many reports have been entered by Commission-employed temporary data entry persons. One major gubernatorial candidate participated.
- Manitoba Early stages, but the response is encouraging. Participants are very interested in the possibilities and have provided useful suggestions.
- MA Extremely positive from most. Some filers are nervous about actually filing electronically but we work closely with them. Data is being used right now by press and opposing campaigns. Public will catch on at some point.
- MI The response had been very favorable. It is heavily used and we think the use will continue to grow.
- MN In general, like compliance checking and campaign management features, uneasy with electronic data transfer. We hope to broaden use of the software this election cycle.
- MO Overall response by users has been very good. Would like more functionality added to current system. General public want search function added.
- NE Positive results from all sides in posting data on website.

- NV Because this is the first year this program is being utilized, comments have been limited but positive. We are going to have a survey for the participants to fill out after the reporting periods have concluded.
- NH They find it useful but hard to read because it is scanned. Filers find it extremely hard to do correctly.
- NJ The response from users has been extremely positive. The last election for which electronic filing was submitted was the 2001 general election. Both gubernatorial and legislative candidates were admitted to the electronic filing program. The gubernatorial candidates were admitted to the gubernatorial filing program. The gubernatorial candidates were able to submit their requests for public funding electronically in place of an original and three copies of paper reports and supporting documentation to the Commission. The materials for the submissions would include the submission reports and copies of contributor checks with signatures for verification. GEFS allowed the campaigns to burn every to one single CD for each submission of public matching funds as well as the required pre and post election reporting. It is now months past the election and we have not had requests for contributor lists of gubernatorial candidates, as in prior gubernatorial election years, indicating that the press and others are using the information from our website. The legislative campaigns were also very receptive to REFS as can be seen by the continued use of the program during the non-legislative election year. During the off election years, those office holders or potential candidates must file quarterly reports with the Commission.
- NM Generally good. Participation remains low.
- NYC Following the 2001 elections, the CFB surveyed candidates regarding their experience with C-SMART software. An overwhelming majority of the respondents found the software easy to navigate and understand. They also found the software helpful in complying with the New York State Board of Elections requirements as well. The response by the press has been positive. Journalists have expressed their appreciation regarding the quick access to data on our site.
- NY Response from all parties has been very favorable. The data is extensively used by the press and special interest groups.
- NC Based on preliminary results, the response has been positive from those candidates and committees utilizing the program. The press has found the electronic access most beneficial.
- OH Very well received by all. The data is being used extensively by the press & interest groups.

OK There was strong opposition to our first software. While it began as mandatory, that was repealed one year later. There has been strong support for a more user-friendly, form-based software, especially from the press.

Ontario Website info is very popular with political interest, media and general public. Visits to our public scrutiny room to view copies of filings have been greatly reduced.

OR Purchasers of the private vendor software are uniformly enthusiastic and recommend it to other committees. Many committees complain that the vendor software is too expensive and, thus, continue to request waivers. Individual treasurers who attempt to electronically file on their own find our format requirements cumbersome. The press uses the electronic files to avoid data entry workload.

Quebec Most intervenors required such programs. CD-ROMs were available for the return of election expenses and completed by approximately 90% of party candidates. A percentage above our expectations.

RI Positive response although the data could be used more.

S.F. Very favorable - However, large committees (>\$150K) may find data entry repetition.

Seattle Very positive. Everyone uses our data.

TX Mixed response from candidates. Favorable response from press.

VT Vermont candidates like the paper system.

WA Overwhelming positives from the press. Candidates & committees are typically positive, with only a few mandatory filers complaining.

20. **Do you or any groups use the data filed with you to issue reports about campaign financing in your jurisdiction? If so, please send us copies of the reports or the names of the organizations.**

AK University of Alaska, Fairbanks is conducting an on-going study.

CA I expect they will. You are beginning to, but I've not seen any comprehensive reports yet based on our data.

CO Not currently.

GA None other than press organizations.

- ID Our office compiles a summary at the end of each 2 year election cycle. There is a charge of \$10 for the summary.
- IL Biannually, we produce a book called *Money and Elections in Illinois*. We have been doing this since 1990; however, the quality of the publication has greatly increased due to easier access to information.
- IA Money and Politics Iowa
502 1/2 Brabant Laar.
Pella, Iowa 50129
mapiowa@aol.com
www.mapiowa.org
- Los Angeles We have always compiled summary information in a PDF format. We are currently in the process of implementing a system that will produce summary information automatically from the electronic filing system database.
- ME Not yet. Possibly in future.
- MA Perhaps Ma. Voters for Clean Elections. See massvoters.org.
- MI We have an excellent software and back-office system. But we would:
A) Improve reporting options for PAC's with payroll deduction
B) Enhance both importing and exporting features.
- MN Used by various researchers, (media & acadernic).
- NH Not that we know of.
- NJ Yes, the information is used by the NJ ELEC in compiling the statistical information found on its website and writing its White Paper series, which analyzes campaign financing and lobbying data.
- NM Not aware of any at this time.
- NYC Yes, the Post Election Report (PER). People buy the database on diskette but do not necessarily report back regarding the use of it. Journalists use the database on diskette to write stories requiring analysis. NYPIRG requested data from us to inform their testimony at our post-election hearings, however, they did not issue a report to our knowledge.
- NY We only compile reports for internal auditing purposes.
- OH We publish a Facts Book. Ohio Citizen Action produces a report as well.

Ontario Yes, latest is attached.

TX Several groups use the information filed with the Texas Ethics Commission to compile & issue reports including Texans for Public Justice, Common Cause, Texas Legislative Council, Texas Freedom Network, Texas Partnership PAC and Praxis List.

WA Sure, Ed Binder with statemoney.org and Gordon Nelson with ballotfunding.org.

21. Have there been any articles, such as law reviews, magazine features or newspaper stories written about you program? If so, please send them to us or provide a citation.

IL Page 5 of the June 2002 issue of the Guardian. The Illinois State Board of Elections Campaign Disclosure website was named the May 2002 "Government Site of the Month" on GovSpot.com, the award winning government information portal of the Web. Created to recognize outstanding local and state government websites, the award is presented each month to an innovative site offering a wealth of government services and information online. The website is <http://govspot.com/siteofmonth/0205ilcamfin.htm>

IA Nothing of great repute or interest - merely blurbs

KY www.courier-journal.com/localnews/2002/05/06/

Los Angeles Our system has been mentioned in various publications, but not featured.

MA Not primarily about it - it has shown up as a paragraph in passing. We will do a press release in late summer to drum up interest.

NV Yes, see attached.

NYC When the PER becomes available in September we will send it to you. There have been upward of 2000 articles and/or editorials written about the CFB in various press outlets for the "2001" election cycle.

S.F. Just radio news reports.

TX Various newspaper & magazine articles have been written about the Texas Ethics Commission. We do not maintain copies of these articles.

WA We have been nominated for a few industry awards by our imaging systems vendor, but not yet been awarded. The vendor did a White Paper article on our system: www.otg.com/stories/washingtonstatepdc.html.

22. **If you were doing your program over again, what would you do differently?**

AK Created a web-enabled database, not use Foxpro, or other software prone to eventual extinction. Explore mandatory filing legislation.

CA Design with even more end-user input. It was very hard to get the news media to give us their wish lists, but easy for them to criticize when it didn't meet all their needs.

CO Currently satisfactory.

Elections Canada The system was developed under tight constraints. We would budget more time for the project and use web based forms.

FEC I would not have included a print module that creates a paper filing in an acceptable format. This encouraged a number of filers to use the free electronic software to print and file reports which causes a drain on support resources.

FL Make electronic filing mandatory by statute.

IL We have had two versions released since the initial software was released in 1999. We have incorporated ideas from the user. We are happy with our program and the only negative might be the time required to get changes made. We have a very good relationship with our vendor, but it is obvious communication is more difficult when the developer is not in-house.

IA

1. There should have been more contractual boundaries.
2. No general use of program until exhaustively tested.
3. Program needed greater control/oversight by Board – vendors always had loose oversight.
4. Greater technical knowledge by Board staff before undertaking venture.

IN So far we are pleased with our progress. Changes are being made along the way to improve and perfect the software.

KY Always room for improvement, try to make it more idiot proof.

Los Angeles Space permitting, we would have created an upload feature that accepted CAL-ACCESS format right off the bat. Also, we would have created PDF output instead of HTML for 460's.

LA Allow transfer of existing databases into electronic filing program. Provide greater automation in the reports.

- ME Hire an information systems specialist to serve as liaison with software vendor.
- MA So far, so good. We'll see in September when the first real busy period comes. We have made some minor revisions, but that is to be expected.
- NE While the pre-election tests of the program (candidates in the 2001 Omaha and Lincoln City Elections) by the NADC staff were generally positive, there were some issues that needed to be addressed. The vendor was a one person, part time operation who was not very responsive to the need for follow-up work. The program was written in FoxPro. The state employee who had an expertise in FoxPro and who was to provide technical support left the employ of the State of Nebraska. Because of these factors, the NADC delayed the implementation of the candidate electronic filing program.
- NV Include the ability to create reports i.e. who contributed the most to whom; who spent the most, etc.
- NJ After meeting with the representatives of both gubernatorial general election campaigns after the election, we are taking the best of their suggestions as well as other areas to make enhancements and changes to the GEFS program. Enhancements and changes will be made to add a few campaign management tools as well as make the program more user friendly. They will include contributor aggregate amounts, the ability to export the contributor and expenditure tables from the database for use in the next campaign of a candidate. The addition of another table with fields that can be programmed "on the fly." Also for NJ's particular submission filing due dates, we will recommend changing the Monday submission days to later in the week. Because the 2001 election cycle was the first time using the GEFS and submission deadlines are noon on Mondays, staff made themselves available over weekends.

The REFS program is being changed to make for a more user-friendly interface, to add an additional table again with fields that can be programmed "on the fly" for campaign management and other programmatic enhancements. We are looking to make both programs purely electronic with the ability to file through the Internet. Both the REFS and GEFS programs use an encryption program for security purposes.

- NM Make mandatory.
- NYC C-SMART was first widely used by campaigns in the 1993 NYC elections. Software development is an iterative continuous process. Some of the things that we have done to improve C-SMART over the years include the following:
- Fine tuning hands-on training and encouraging more campaigns to attend earlier in the election cycle.
 - Continue to make software more user friendly.

- Adding additional features to assist in overall campaign management.
- Simplify and facilitate the amendment process.

NY Nothing given the staff and budget provided for the project.

NC We are currently revising our program. One change being implemented is direct transfer of information over the Internet. Other changes include: improved record-keeping, new forms, audit features for the filer, improved searching and printing.

OK Yes. We are doing the new software much differently. Our plans and specifications are very precise.

OR Start with an XML web based format and include end users more intensely in the development phase. Provide a bare bones electronic filing option for smaller committees that find vendor software prohibitively expensive.

Quebec Nothing identified so far.

S.F. Control.

Seattle Develop our own filing software, not rely on state's.

TX Not include Macs. Have more time for development.

WA Build more in-house. Involve end-users more in the development lifecycle.

23. Any additional comments, suggestions or questions you would like other agencies to discuss?

AR We are in the developmental stage for on-line filing for PAC and Lobbyists currently scheduled for deployment in January 2003. Information Network of Arkansas is developing this program for the Secretary of State.

B.C. Elections BC has been working on developing an electronic filing program for sometime. The software was nearly completed and ready for final testing when the government cut our operating budget. Although we had a fixed-price contract with the vendor, we lost funding for ongoing maintenance and amortization (which is required over 5 years in BC). Therefore, we cancelled the project and wrote-off the development costs. We hope to re-initiate it when and if budgets are restored.

CA It'll be an interesting year from now when we've launched CAL online!

CT The main problems were caused by the rapidly changing IT environment. By the time the system was completed, newer (and better) development tools were available.

Elections Canada Can clients enter data directly on the web site? Do other agencies accept electronic signature and if they do, how do they confirm it?

- IA
1. Why is electronic filing so important?
 2. Is it worth the cost and hassle?
 3. Does the public, not just academics and the media, really care?
 4. How do we get the public excited about it?

Los Angeles We'd be interested to know how other agencies track contributors across filings when looking for contribution violations. Since ours use free-form text, we often have to use several searches to get the information.

ME Our biggest problem has been the inefficiency of staff (qualifications and available personnel) to adequately coordinate with the software vendor during project development.

Manitoba We are doing it over again and we will be adding a record keeping system.

MA Get a good, reliable vendor who understands the subject matter.

MO We are in the process of upgrading all of our reporting systems to a new platform (.NET). With these upgrades, we plan to make dynamic reporting available to the public and add future capabilities if and when electronic filing is mandatory for all filers.

NE The NADC is now in the process of deciding how or if it wishes to approach electronic filing. An ad hoc committee has been formed to study the issue and make recommendations. Several factors have come into play. First, Microsoft acquired the rights to FoxPro, and it is expected that it will eventually cease to support it. Second, there does not seem to be much interest among candidates or other groups in electronic filing. Third, one of the main attractions of electronic filing is that the information can be easily added to a database and put on a website. This is already being done via data entry.

- NYC
1. How jurisdictions deal with late filings caused by software problems.
 2. Issuing patches: Circumstances under which they are issued? How are they distributed? Requirements for use once issued? Laws, rules, regulations governing patches?
 3. Importing contributor/ name data into the software.
 4. Campaign management features: Who has them? Have they been successful? What are they?

Ontario While it is almost inevitable that we will move to some form of electronic filing, we are currently happy to be learning from other jurisdictions.

OR Development of uniform format, nationally, for occupational/ employer information.

Seattle Do it in-house with dedicated staff. Do not contract it out!