

[TAB 7]

Complaint 25-20-CD
Gimarc v. Popp

Presented By:

Kim Stone, Campaign Disclosure Coordinator

BEFORE THE ALASKA PUBLIC OFFICES COMMISSION

John Gimarc,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 25-20-CD
	)	
Bill Popp,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER

A hearing in these cases will take place before the Alaska Public Offices Commission at approximately 11:15 a.m. on Wednesday, August 26, 2026.

The Commissioners will be present in person, by telephone, or via Microsoft Teams and will receive evidence regarding this matter. You may be present at the hearing either by telephone (1-907-202-7104, Access Code: 845 091 354#), in-person (2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd, Ste 128, Anchorage, Alaska), or via [Microsoft Teams Meeting](#).¹ You may be, but are not required to be, represented by an attorney or agent.

If you wish to participate by telephone and are an individual who requires special accommodation to participate, you must advise the Commission office on or before August 19, 2026, so that special accommodation can be made.

PREHEARING AND HEARING PROCEDURES

- 1) Parties.** The parties in this case are Commission Staff and Respondent.
- 2) Issues.** At the hearing, the Commission will consider whether Respondent violated campaign disclosure law by failing to disclose numerous campaign expenditures.
- 3) Procedural history.** Complainant John Gimarc filed a complaint against Respondent Bill Popp on October 1, 2025. Respondent filed a Response to the Complaint on October 14, 2025. Staff's investigation report recommending the complaint be upheld in part and dismissed in part was issued August 4, 2026.

¹ Meeting ID: 250 016 996 214 088, Passcode: ss9Fo9K9

- 4) Hearing procedures.** The hearing will be conducted as provided in AS 15.13.380, 2 AAC 50.891, and the Alaska Administrative Procedure Act, AS 44.62.330 – 44.62.630. All testimony must be presented or submitted under oath. A party may call witnesses, cross-examine witnesses, present and rebut evidence. If the respondent does not testify, the respondent may be called and examined as if under cross-examination.
- 5) Evidence and exhibits.** All relevant evidence may be admissible at the hearing. In passing upon the admissibility of evidence, the Commission may consider, but is not bound to follow, the rules of evidence governing general civil proceedings in the courts of the State of Alaska. The Commission may exclude inadmissible evidence and order repetitive evidence discontinued.
- 6) Prehearing filings.** No later than August 18, 2026, a party:
- a) may file a list of witnesses expected to testify at the hearing;
 - b) may file copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing that are marked and identified (for example, Resp.'s Ex. A);
 - c) may file a prehearing memorandum;
 - d) may file prehearing motions, including motions to dismiss, for summary judgment, or to exclude evidence, and
 - e) shall serve all parties and the Complainant with filings submitted.
- 7) Response to motions and requests for subpoenas.** No later than August 25, 2026, a party
- a) may respond to a motion; and
 - b) may request the Commission to issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses, the production of documents, or other things related to the subject of the hearing and is responsible for serving the subpoena and paying the appropriate witness fee.
- 8) Extensions of time.** Requests to extend the deadlines in this order must be in writing, filed with the Commission, served on all parties and the Complainant, and supported by good cause.
- 9) Burden of proof.** The Commission staff has the burden to prove any charges by a preponderance of the evidence.

10) Order of proceedings. Matters considered at a hearing will ordinarily be disposed of in substantially the following order:

- a) pending motions, if any;
- b) complainant may present argument under 2 AAC 50.891(d)
- c) presentation of cases as follows, unless otherwise ordered by the Commission:
 - i) The Commission Staff's direct case, including the investigative report, evidence, and testimony of witnesses;
 - ii) Respondent's direct case;
 - iii) Rebuttal by the Commission Staff; and
 - iv) Closing statements, if any, by Respondent and Commission Staff.

10) Decision and Order. The Commission will issue an order no later than 10 days after the close of the record.

Dated: August 7, 2026



Heather Hebdon, Executive Director
Alaska Public Offices Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE: I hereby certify that on this date, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be delivered to:	
John Gimarc 11155 Bluff Creek Cir Anchorage, AK 99515 agimarc@ak.net	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email
Bill Popp 4841 Ridge Top Cir Anchorage, AK 99509 wpopp7677@gmail.com	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email

Cari Rousselle

08/07/2026

Signature

Date

Rousselle, Cari J (DOA)

From: Microsoft Outlook
To: agimarc@ak.net
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:26 PM
Subject: Relayed: NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER

Delivery to these recipients or groups is complete, but no delivery notification was sent by the destination server:

agimarc@ak.net (agimarc@ak.net)

Subject: NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER



NOTICE OF
HEARING AND ...

Rousselle, Cari J (DOA)

From: Microsoft Outlook
To: Wpopp7677@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:50 PM
Subject: Relayed: NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER

Delivery to these recipients or groups is complete, but no delivery notification was sent by the destination server:

[Wpopp7677@gmail.com \(wpopp7677@gmail.com\)](mailto:Wpopp7677@gmail.com)

Subject: NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER



NOTICE OF
HEARING AND ...

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- ☐ Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- ☐ Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- ☐ Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

John Gimac
11155 Bluff Creek Circle
Anchorage AK 99515



9590 9402 9917 5335 2977 38

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 1126 7201 14

Restricted Delivery

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

☒ Agent

John Gimac

☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

J Gimac

C. Date of Delivery

8/8/20

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Adult Signature | ☐ Priority Mail Express® |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | ☐ Registered Mail™ |
| ☐ Certified Mail® | ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation™ |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery | |



TO: APOC Commissioners
DATE: August 4, 2026
FROM: Kim Stone, Campaign Disclosure Coordinator
SUBJECT: Staff Report *John Gimarc v. Bill Popp*, 25-20-CD

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT AND RESPONSE

Complainant John Gimarc filed complaint 25-20-CD against Respondent Bill Popp alleging Popp failed to provide sufficient details of expenditures during his 2024 campaign.¹ Respondent Popp denies the allegations and asks the Commission to dismiss the complaint.²

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Respondent's descriptions of several expenditures identified in the complaint, to advertising agencies or for campaign consultation or management services, are consistent with and compliant with Alaska campaign disclosure law. Respondent's descriptions of several other expenditures, however, did not disclose in detail all services rendered as required by regulation. APOC staff recommends a finding of violation for Respondent's reports listing those services but also recommends a reduced penalty as it is Respondent's first violation and mitigating factors apply.

BACKGROUND FACTS

Respondent Popp was a mayoral candidate in the 2024 Anchorage Municipal election. During his campaign, Respondent made expenditures to campaign vendors

¹ [Complaint](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27272), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27272>.

² [Complaint Response](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27299), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27299>.

Winfluence Strategies, LLC (Winfluence Strategies) and Alpha Media Group (Alpha Media), reporting them on his standard campaign disclosure reports. Complainant alleges the 2024 reports in which these expenditures appear, including Respondent's year-start,³ 30-day,⁴ 7-day,⁵ and 105-day⁶ reports, violated Alaska campaign disclosure regulation 2 AAC 50.321(d) because Respondent provided insufficient detail of the expenditures and because Respondent did not identify individual costs with the overall expenditure.

LAW

Alaska campaign disclosure law requires candidates to disclose debts and expenditures incurred by their campaigns. For the 2024 Anchorage election, standard APOC reports included a year-start, 30-day, 7-day, and 105-day report.⁷

For expenditures to vendors who provide general campaign goods and services, 2 AAC 50.321(a)(5) requires a candidate to report:

- (A) the date of payment;
- (B) the check number or the identifying transaction number. . . ;
- (C) the name and address of the payee;
- (D) the purpose of the expenditure; and
- (E) the amount of the expenditure . . .⁸

For expenditures to advertising agencies or those who provide campaign consultation or management services, 2 AAC 50.321(d) additionally requires a candidate to report "in detail all services rendered, including the name of each business from which campaign goods or services were purchased or subcontracted or media advertising placed, and the amount of the expenditure."⁹

When APOC receives a properly filed complaint, Commission staff must undertake

³ [Year-start report](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42635&ViewType=CD), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42635&ViewType=CD>.

⁴ [30-day report](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42883&ViewType=CD), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42883&ViewType=CD>.

⁵ [7-day report](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=43236&ViewType=CD), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=43236&ViewType=CD>.

⁶ [105-day report](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=43494&ViewType=CD), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=43494&ViewType=CD>.

⁷ AS 15.13.110(a).

⁸ AS 15.13.040(a)(1)(A); 2 AAC 50.321(a)(5).

⁹ 2 AAC 50.321(d).

an investigation and present the investigation report.¹⁰ Staff bears the burden of proving a violation by a preponderance of the evidence.¹¹

ANALYSIS

a) Winfluence Strategies and Alpha Media are in the business of advertising or campaign consulting

Winfluence Strategies is a business licensed in Alaska which describes itself as a “consulting, public relations, strategy firm.”¹² According to its website, it offers a broad range of services including “consultation” and the development of “effective marketing, branding and advertising campaigns.”¹³ Respondent described Winfluence Strategies’ services in several entries as “campaign management.”

Regarding Alpha Media, Respondent described the company’s services as “digital advertising” and “targeted digital advertising.”¹⁴ A website for AlphaMedia indicates the company since has become “Connoisseur Media,” offering website design, social media, branding, and search services among its digital services.¹⁵ An Alaska business license for Alpha Media LLC describes its “line of business” as “radio broadcasting stations” and “media streaming distribution services, social networks, and other media networks and content providers.”¹⁶

Complainant’s allegations presume both Winfluence Strategies LLC and Alpha Media are either an advertising agencies or businesses that provides campaign consultation or management services, which require a candidate to provide a greater level of detail of the services provided under 2 AAC 50.321(d).

Respondent does not contest the nature of the businesses but points out that his

¹⁰ 2 AAC 50.870; 2 AAC 50.891.

¹¹ 2 AAC 50.891(d).

¹² [Winfluence Strategies LLC #10145794](https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/cbp/main/Search/Entities), <https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/cbp/main/Search/Entities>, State of Alaska Corporations Database Search, accessed July 13, 2026.

¹³ <https://winfluencestrategies.com/services-1>, accessed July 13, 2026.

¹⁴ [Year-start report](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42635&ViewType=CD), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=42635&ViewType=CD>.

¹⁵ [Connrex Digital | Connoisseur Media](#), last accessed July 1, 2026.

¹⁶ [Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing](#), last accessed July 1, 2026.

descriptions identified all subcontractors and media placements and provided sufficient descriptions of the services rendered.

Based upon the above described facts, and given that Respondent does not contest Complainant's characterization of these businesses, APOC considers Winfluence Strategies and Alpha Media to be advertising agencies or businesses providing campaign management services, bringing them within the heightened reporting requirements of 2 AAC 50.321(d).

b) Respondent's expenditures through Winfluence Strategies that identified specific media outlets provided sufficient detail under 2 AAC 50.321(d)

Respondent's expenditures reflect that Winfluence Strategies placed advertising for his campaign with various media outlets. An example:

03/21/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC, Media 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Radio Advertising - ALPHA MEDIA - KFQD, KWHL, KMXS, KBRJ, KEAG	\$5,420.00
------------	---------------------------	---	--	-------------------

The expenditure describes what was purchased – radio advertising – and includes “the name of each business from which . . . media advertising [was] placed.”¹⁷ The Commission has found that 2 AAC 50.321(d) “does not require the breakdown of amounts paid to an advertising agency's or consulting firm's subcontractors or ad placements.”¹⁸ Respondent's other expenditures to Winfluence Strategies that similarly describe purchases of radio or tv ads and the stations where they were placed, without identifying amounts paid, also do not violate campaign disclosure rules. APOC staff recommends dismissal of these allegations.

Respondent also described an expenditure to Winfluence Strategies on his 7-day

¹⁷ 2 AAC 50.321(d).

¹⁸ See, e.g., [Final Order Alexander v. Hughes 25-19-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27394>, at pp. 1-2; see also [Alexander v. Bjorkman 25-12-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27395>; [Alexander v. Costello 25-14-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27391>; [Gilliland v. Merrick, Order Approving Consent Agreement 25-10-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27387>.

report that described “advertising” with Coast Television¹⁹:

03/18/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC , Media 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Coast Television - Advertising	\$800.00
------------	---------------------------	--	--------------------------------	----------

From this description, a member of the public reviewing the expenditure would understand Winfluence Strategies placed television advertising with Coast Television. A basic internet search indicates “Coastal TV” owns and operates two television broadcasting stations in Anchorage, KYUR and KYUR-DT.2.²⁰ In his response, Respondent explains that “Coastal Media” offered a “Mayoral Candidate spotlight” package for a single price but ultimately aired the program on both of the stations.²¹ Ideally, Respondent could have listed those two stations rather than identifying only the stations’ parent company. However, under the circumstances as described above, APOC staff does not find that the lack of additional detail of the expenditures renders Respondent’s reporting incomplete under campaign disclosure law.

c) Respondent properly reported expenditures covering in-house services to Winfluence Strategies

For several other expenditures to Winfluence Strategies, Complainant argues the descriptions were insufficient, asking “Were any contractors or subcontractors engaged in these activities?” and then concluding – without answering the question or presenting evidence of subcontractor involvement – that “14 violations” occurred.

Respondent replies that his contract with Winfluence Strategies included in-house services and that he reported all outsourced services separately. 2 AAC 50.321(d) does not require expenditure descriptions to affirmatively deny subcontractor use, and Complainant presented no evidence supporting wrongdoing on this basis.

APOC staff recommends dismissal of these allegations as they provide no supporting evidence that subcontractors were used but not properly reported.

¹⁹ Coast Television is also referred to as “Coastal TV” and “Coastal Media.”

²⁰ [Who We Are – Coastal TV Group](#), last accessed July 1, 2026.

²¹ Complaint Response, p.3.

Complainant also alleges Respondent violated campaign disclosure law because he did not report the individual costs of each task provided by Winfluence Strategies and Alpha Media. But as noted above, the Commission has found in several recent complaints presenting this identical issue that 2 AAC 50.321 “does not require the breakdown of amounts paid to an advertising agency’s or consulting firm’s subcontractors or ad placements.”²²

- d) Several expenditures to Winfluence Strategies and Alpha Media did not “disclose in detail all services rendered” as required by regulation

Complainant argues several additional expenditures to Winfluence Strategies reported on Respondent’s year-start, 30-day, and 105-day report fail to provide sufficient detail under 2 AAC 50.321(d), as follows:

Year-start report filed 2.15.24

10/04/2023	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd. #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management, Web design, Social Media Management, Mail Service - \$5000, RDC Breakfast - \$30, Graphic Design by Northern Media Group - \$315, Photography by D&M Photo - \$395.	\$5,740.00
10/31/2023	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management Services, Graphic Design, Mail Service, Advertising Placement, Social Media Management and postage -\$66	\$5,066.00
11/30/2023	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management, Graphic Design, Advertising Placement, Mail Service, Social Media Management	\$5,000.00
12/29/2023	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management, Graphic Design, Mail Service, Advertising Placement,	\$5,000.00

30-day report filed 3.4.24

02/05/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management	\$1,500.00
02/28/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies 205 E Dimond Blvd Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Payable to Alpha Media for Digital Advertising - Social Media and CTV	\$7,000.00
03/01/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management per contract	\$5,000.00

From 105-day report filed 6.2.24

03/28/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	\$5k Campaign Management Per Contract, \$584.12 Google Ads, \$49.44 Lowes - Sandbags for signs, \$100.00 Facebook META charges	\$5,733.56
05/09/2024	Electronic Funds Transfer	Winfluence Strategies, LLC 205 E Dimond Blvd #334 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Campaign Management Per Contract	\$2,500.00

²² See, e.g., [Final Order Alexander v. Hughes 25-19-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27394>, at pp. 1-2; see also [Alexander v. Bjorkman 25-12-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27395>; [Alexander v. Costello 25-14-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27391>; [Gilliland v. Merrick, Order Approving Consent Agreement 25-10-CD](#), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27387>.

Respondent's year-start report lists expenditures to Winfluence Strategies that list "campaign management" but that also disclose additional services the company provided – graphic design, mail service advertising placement, social media management – all of which indicate Respondent's awareness of and effort to comply with 2 AAC 50.321(d). The descriptions are fairly cursory, however, particularly considering they cover \$20,000 worth of services over the reporting period. Whether the descriptions meet the statutory requirement of disclosing "in detail all services rendered" is questionable. At the same time, however, neither the language of the regulation nor Commission decisions in existence when the complaint was filed defined "in detail all services rendered." Since the filing of this complaint, the Commission has issued decisions responding to a series of public complaints on the issue, and in February 2026 APOC staff issued guidance providing examples of what compliant expenditure reporting might look like under the regulation.²³ But again, Respondent's filings predated this guidance.

Whether the above entries describing (for example) "campaign management, graphic design, mail service, advertising placement" meet the minimum descriptive threshold of "in detail all services rendered" ultimately need not be answered. Respondent's expenditures to Winfluence Strategies in his year-start reports violate 2 AAC 50.321(d) on other grounds, namely that several entries describe "advertising placement," but fail to identify the media outlet. Failing to identify where Winfluence placed advertisement rendered the year-start report incomplete, regardless of whether Respondent's details of their "campaign management" were sufficient. Several other expenditures to Winfluence Strategies, on the 30-day report and 105-day report, describe the services simply as "campaign management," failing to describe "in detail all services rendered" and making those reports also incomplete.

Relating to **Alpha Media**, an advertising agency, Respondent's year-start reported expenditures described as "digital advertising" and "targeted digital advertising."

²³ Exhibit 1, APOC February 2026 email guidance with examples.

11/20/2023	Debit Card	Alpha Media 301 Arctic Slope AVene Suite 200 Anchorage, Alaska 99518	Invoice #724268-1 Digital Advertising	\$850.00
01/10/2024	Debit Card	Alpha Media 301 Arctic Slope Drive #200 Anchorage, Alaska 99518	Targeted Digital Advertising	\$3,400.00

The descriptions fail to provide the heightened level of detail .321(d) requires. Respondent emphasizes that in a world of complex digital advertising, “there is no way to report every website or social media platform where the ads ‘popped up.’” But the Commission previously has rejected the premise that a reporter’s description of “digital ads,” standing alone, suffices under .321(d): “‘Digital ad’ or ‘digital ads,’ without more, provides insufficient detail on ‘all services rendered’ by an advertising agency or consulting agency.”²⁴ The Commission explained that such description “does not indicate whether [the business] created the ads, directly distributed them, arranged placement on another entity’s website or app, or provided some combination of these services”²⁵ and ordered the candidate to amend expenditure descriptions to include “at least this: ‘Direct distribution of digital ads to targeted mobile devices.’”²⁶

Under this Commission guidance, APOC staff finds Respondent’s descriptions of “digital ads” similarly insufficient and render Respondent’s year-start report incomplete.²⁷

Since the filing of the complaint, Respondent has amended another entry to describe Alpha Media’s services as “for digital advertising – social media (static) \$3,000, targeted display \$1015, and video CTV \$4000.” Additional information from Alpha Media’s invoice, or through an inquiry to the business, would likely provide further placement information and could be added to the reports. Finally, as noted above, APOC guidance issued after the filing of this complaint contains advice and examples on how to report

²⁴ [Widney v. McCabe 25-01-25 Final Order on Reconsideration](#),

<https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27247>, p. 4, fuller discussion pp. 2-6.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ Assuming the Commission accepts APOC staff’s earlier recommendation concerning Respondent’s year-start report, a finding that the Alpha Media descriptions were incomplete would not add additional penalties to the assessment.

digital advertising.²⁸

MAXIMUM POTENTIAL CIVIL PENALTIES

The maximum civil penalty for failing to timely file complete and accurate year-start, 30-day and 105-day reports is \$50 per day for each day the violation continues.²⁹ Tolling the running of the penalties as of the day the complaint was filed (October 1, 2025) results in a maximum civil penalty of \$80,600.

Report	Dates of Violation	Penalty days	Max penalty	2 AAC 50.855 assessment
Year-start	2/15/24 – 10/1/25	594 (x \$50)	\$29,700	\$7,450
30-day	3/4/24 – 10/1/25	576 (x \$50)	\$28,800	\$14,400
105-day	7/16/24 – 10/1/25	442 (x \$50)	\$22,100	\$11,050
		Total	\$80,600	\$32,900

MITIGATION CRITERIA

When APOC staff assesses a penalty, the starting point for calculating the penalty is 2 AAC 50.855. Here, the regulation enables staff to reduce the maximum statutory assessment for respondent’s incomplete year-start report to 25% of the maximum (from \$29,700 to \$7,450) because it was Respondent’s first election cycle and first reporting error.³⁰ Additionally, because this was Respondent’s first election cycle, staff is able to reduce the maximum penalties for his 30-day and 105-day reports by 50%.³¹

Once the statutory assessment is calculated under 2 AAC 50.855, APOC staff may consider mitigation criteria to reduce the penalty. Here, Respondent’s “good filing history” and status as an “inexperienced filer” warrant up to a 50% reduction.³²

The penalty may also be reduced by a percentage greater than 50% or waived

²⁸ Exhibit 1, APOC February 2026 email guidance with examples.

²⁹ AS 15.13.390(a)(1).

³⁰ 2 AAC 50.855(b)(2)(B).

³¹ 2AAC 50.855(b)(2)(C).

³² 2 AAC 50.865(a)(1)(A)-(B).

entirely if the penalty is significantly out of proportion to the degree of harm suffered by the public for not having the information.³³ A civil penalty is considered significantly out of proportion if it exceeds the value of the transactions insufficiently reported.³⁴ Here, while the civil penalty for Respondent's incomplete year-start report after mitigation (\$7,450) does not exceed the \$19,316 in transactions that incompletely detailed the services of Winfluence and Alpha Media,³⁵ the \$14,400 penalty for Respondent's incomplete 30-day report exceeds the \$13,500 of transactions insufficiently detailed,³⁶ and the \$11,050 penalty for Respondent's 105-day far exceeds the \$7,500 of transactions insufficiently detailed.³⁷

Given the above considerations, staff recommends a 99% reduction of the \$32,900 penalty to \$329 is appropriate and commensurate with penalties assessed in similar matters heard by the Commission.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE: I hereby certify that on this date, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be delivered to:	
Bill Popp 4841 Ridge Top Circle Anchorage, AK 99509 Wpopp7677@gmail.com	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email
John A. (Alex) Gimarc 11155 Bluff Creek Circle Anchorage, AK 99515 agimarc@ak.net	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email

Cari Rousselle

08/04/2026

Signature

Date

³³ 2 AAC 50.865(b)(5).

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ October 31, 2023; November 20, 2023; November 30, 2023; December 29, 2023, and January 10, 2024.

³⁶ February 5, 2024; February 28, 2024, and March 1, 2024.

³⁷ March 28, 2024; May 9, 2024.

From: [Stone, Kim S \(DOA\)](#)
To: [Stone, Kim S \(DOA\)](#)
Cc: [Whitlock, John G \(DOA\)](#); [Hebdon, Heather R \(DOA\)](#)
Subject: A Message from APOC: Reporting expenditures to advertising agencies and for campaign consultation services / 2 AAC 50.321(d)
Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 3:57:27 PM
Attachments: [Examples advertising consulting expenses.pdf](#)

Dear Candidates, Groups, and chairpersons or treasurers:

First, thank you all for your conscientious and continued efforts to comply with Alaska campaign disclosure requirements. Rest assured, your efforts and courtesy are appreciated by APOC staff.

A recurring issue has been how to report expenditures made to advertising agencies and those providing campaign consultation or management services under [2 AAC 50.321\(d\)](#). Unlike general expenditures under [2 AAC 50.321\(a\)\(5\)](#) which require only a description of “purpose,” expenditures under [.321\(d\)](#) require filers to:

“disclose in detail all services rendered, including the name of each business from which campaign goods or services were purchased or subcontracted or media advertising placed, and the amount of the expenditure.”

This means that if you are reporting an expenditure to a business providing campaign consulting or management services or that can be considered an advertising agency, you will violate campaign disclosure regulation [.321\(d\)](#) if your expenditure description does not explain all services it is providing, in detail. You must additionally disclose any subcontractors it engaged on behalf of your campaign and/or where it placed media advertising.

If your campaign or group has been leaving out [.321\(d\)](#) details, please amend your reports to bring them into compliance and make sure to include the required information in future reports.

For more in-depth information, including examples of how [.321\(d\)](#) expenditures can be reported and how to distinguish between general and [.321\(d\)](#) expenditures, please see the attached document.

Respectfully,

Kim Stone

Campaign Disclosure Coordinator

John Grover Whitlock

Paralegal III

Alaska Public Offices Commission
2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd., Rm. 128
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
Phone: (907) 276-4176
Fax: (907) 276-7018

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its content and any attachments may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

An example of expenditure reporting for campaign consultation services:

[date]	<i>Sourdough Public Relations</i>	\$25,000
	○ general account management and campaign strategy ○ graphic design services for campaign logo and digital ads ○ placement of digital ads on <i>Facebook</i> and <i>Instagram</i> ○ printing services for campaign signs from <i>Fireweed Print Company</i> ○ content creation for radio ads ○ placement of radio ads on <i>KQRS</i>, <i>WRBC</i>, and <i>WBRX</i> ○ creation of images and written content for text messages ○ print ad content creation and placement in <i>The Capitol Reader</i> ○ OTT internet-based video content and CTV ads, placed through subcontractors <i>YouTube</i>, <i>Netflix</i>, and <i>Amazon Prime Video</i>.	

Other advertising or consulting services may be less comprehensive but still involve advertising services and subcontractors under [2 AAC 50.321\(d\)](#). APOC recognizes that services such as digital voter outreach, internet-based content delivery, texting, and other digital marketing services may not fit neatly within .321(d) parameters. But describing the services simply as “advertising” or “digital ads” does not provide the heightened level of detail .321(d) requires. **If the vendor you paid in turn pays a third party to run the messaging, .321(d) requires you to name that third party** (“the name of each business from which campaign goods or services were purchased or subcontracted or media advertising placed”). Examples of expenditure reporting for various digital services might be:

[date]	<i>Get The Vote Advertising LLC</i>	\$2,000
	○ Geotargeted voter data ad placement ○ Programmatic digital advertising through pre-roll, display banner, or connected TV, placed by <i>StackAdapt</i>.	
[date]	<i>Valley Media Company</i>	\$3,000
	○ Digital Advertising for social media (<i>Facebook</i>, <i>Instagram</i>), video CTV, and targeted display, placed through <i>XYZ Digital, LLC</i>. ○ direct distribution of digital ads to targeted mobile devices.	
[date]	<i>Anchorage Political Consulting Group</i>	\$4,500
	○ Digital ads including Roku OneView (programmatic CTV, online video, and display) placed through <i>Willow Media</i>.	

If you don't have placement or subcontractor information or don't see it on your account statement or vendor's invoice, the campaign consultant or advertising agency you hired likely can provide it. Again, simply listing "advertising" or "digital ads" for .321(d) expenditures will rarely meet .321(d)'s requirements. The regulation requires a detailed description of the services performed by the subcontractor, including whether the agency or consulting firm "created the ads, directly distributed them, arranged placement on another entity's website or app, or provided some combination of these services," and the name of any business it paid to do so. [Final Order on Reconsideration](https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27247), <https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27247>, *Widney v. McCabe*, 25-01-CD (September 22, 2025), p. 4.

Please note, however, that not every expenditure for campaign messaging or communications will fall within .321(d). Where a vendor does not provide campaign consultation or management services or the services of an advertising agency, your reporting need only provide the "purpose" for these general expenditures pursuant to .321(a)(5). For example:

- A filer pays *Redoubt Design Services* to create a campaign ad. Next, the filer places the ad directly with a single media entity – whether *Facebook*, a *radio station*, a print ad in a *newspaper*, etc. Neither the design business nor the business that runs the messaging is providing .321(d) services; the filer simply reports each expenditure pursuant to [2 AAC 50.321\(a\)\(5\)](#) and states its purpose.

If your campaign or group has been leaving out .321(d) details, please amend your reports to bring them into compliance and make sure to include the required information in future reports.