

**From:** MUSSPROP@aol.com [mailto:MUSSPROP@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 06, 2012 1:20 PM  
**To:** Julie Cozzi  
**Subject:** disclosure law

Julie

It was great talking to you this morning!!

I am typically not a public type of guy. When I come to the assembly meetings I just listen. However this issue is one that I am dedicated to.

The two largest problems with HB 12-07-296, which I believe doom it to failure are:

1) Candidates deciding what revenue is relevant. If candidates always did this correctly we would not need "sunshine" laws. But they don't; sometimes because of an over site, sometimes because of out and out deception. What disclosure laws give the public is the information necessary to call a public official on misconduct. AS 39.50.030 was set up to give the public the information it needs to make informed decisions.

2) Exempting candidates from making "totals" public. With this one exemption the entire reason for having disclosure is made null and void. Having a candidate say they received over \$5,000 from a source when that candidate received \$50,000 from that source is what I call truthful deception. The public will see this as the assembly playing fast and loose with the intent of disclosure law.

The question: Is AS 39.50.030 too complicated and can we do better by making a local law, is of course YES.

First however; I think it is disingenuous of the assembly to try to exempt themselves by arguing that the school board should be exempt. The fiduciary responsibilities of the a school board member is completely different from a member of the assembly. Perhaps most people would be willing to exempt the school board. I know I would not have a problem with exempting the school board. But exempting the assembly members who are responsible for spending millions of tax dollars is completely different then a school board member who works from a budget given by the assembly.

I also would have no problem exempting local officials from the state web site. As you said the state does not have local officials on their web site now.

There are simple ways around the detail and time needed to fill out the state paperwork, while giving the public the information it should have on an assembly person or mayor. I would be more the willing to accept instead of AS 39.50.030 a complete federal tax return. This would require no additional work from the candidates and would give the public the financial information that it deserves. Of course when I say Complete tax return I include all w2, w4, 1099, 1098s and all schedules. A federal tax return would include all sources of income, gifts, revenues etc.

The assembly not choosing a simple solution to this problem calls into question who is trying to hide what from the public. When in doubt I always want more information not less.

So in closing: I think the assembly could easily pass a new law that exempted the school board from AS39.50.030. furthermore they could exempt themselves if they replaced AS 39.50.030 with a requirement for each assembly person, candidate, and mayor to make a complete federal tax return public each year they are in office or running for office.

Now my bet is that they won't except this easy solution. And the voting public should wonder why.

Thanks for listening,  
Bob Musseman