[TAB 2]

Complaint 26-09-CD, *Constant v. Wilson*

Presented By:

Kim Stone, Campaign Disclosure Coordinator

BEFORE THE ALASKA PUBLIC OFFICES COMMISSION

Christopher Constant,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. **26-09-CD**
	)	
Bernadette Wilson,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

NOTICE OF HEARING AND PROCEDURAL ORDER

A hearing in this case will take place before the Alaska Public Offices Commission at approximately 9:50 a.m. on Tuesday, October 6, 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: 133 537 561#), 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 September 29, 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 receiving a contribution from a corporation, reimbursing herself and others for campaign expenditures, and by failing to sufficiently disclose expenditures to campaign consulting businesses.
3) **Procedural history.** Complainant Christopher Constant filed a complaint against Respondent Bernadette Wilson on July 27, 2026 alleging violations of campaign disclosure law. Respondent filed a Response to the Complaint on August 18, 2026. Staff's investigation report recommending the complaint be upheld was issued September 25, 2026.

[1] Meeting ID: 249 420 002 013 246, Passcode: Zc3Cb3Ju

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 October 5, 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 October 6, 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: September 25, 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:	
Zachary Wallen Chalmers, Adams, Backer & Wallen, LLC 301 South Hills Village Dr., Ste. LL200-420 Pittsburgh, PA 15241 zwallen@chalmersadams.com Robert Stone rob@stonelawalaska.com	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email ☒ Email only
Christopher Constant 133 E. Harvard Ave Anchorage, AK 99501 aktransparency@gmail.com	☒ US Mail ☒ Email

Cari Rousselle 09/25/2026

Signature Date

THE STATE of ALASKA
GOVERNOR MIKE DUNLEAVY

Department of Administration
ALASKA PUBLIC OFFICES COMMISSION
2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd., Rm. 128
Anchorage, AK 99508-4149
Main: 907.276.4176
Fax: 907.276.7018
www.doa.alaska.gov/apoc

TO: APOC Commissioners
DATE: September 25, 2026
FROM: Kim Stone, Campaign Disclosure Coordinator
SUBJECT: Staff Report *Christoper Constant v. Bernadette Wilson*, 26-09-CD

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT AND RESPONSE

Christopher Constant (Complainant) filed complaint 26-09-CD against Bernadette Wilson (Respondent) alleging she violated campaign disclosure law when she (1) did not properly identify the source of a $25,000 contribution from "IPOP, LLC", (2) attributed an excessive amount of expenditures to credit card processing fees at the business WinRed ($109,227.87), and (3) improperly reimbursed herself and others for campaign expenditures.[1] In her Answer, Respondent Wilson denies her reporting of the $25,000 contribution was incorrect but has refunded it, concedes her credit card charges to WinRed were incorrectly reported, and denies her reimbursements were improper.[2]

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Respondent's acceptance of $25,000 from IPOP, LLC, whether viewed as a contribution from an LLC or as a contribution from sole proprietorship that did not identify the owner, violated campaign disclosure law.[3] Regarding campaign vendor WinRed, Respondent incorrectly reported the purpose, and insufficiently reported the details of her

---

[1] Complaint, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27894.
[2] Answer, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=27971. Respondent argues the complaint should be dismissed because Complainant failed to provide an email read receipt. Respondent does not assert she was not served with the complaint on the date identified. Additionally, after being served with the complaint, Respondent received a Notification of Complaint letter and copy of the complaint from APOC staff and had full opportunity under 2 AAC 50.880(a)(1) to respond. APOC staff does not find merit in the argument that the complaint should be dismissed on service grounds.
[3] AS 15.13.074(f); 2 AAC 50.250(c)(1).

expenditures to the business in her year-start and 30-day primary report. Relating to reimbursements identified in the complaint, several of the payments to herself and all of the payments to individuals were improper, which additionally rendered aspects of Respondent's year-start and 30-day primary reports incomplete or erroneous. APOC staff recommends the Commission find the allegations substantiated, order Respondent reimburse the campaign, and impose mitigated civil penalties.

ANALYSIS

When APOC receives a properly filed complaint, Commission staff must undertake an investigation and present the investigation report.[4] Staff bears the burden of proving a violation by a preponderance of the evidence.[5] The allegations as presented in the complaint, and APOC staff analysis, are as follows.

a) Respondent's $25,000 contribution from IPOP, LLC was improper, either as a prohibited contribution from an LLC or as a contribution from a sole proprietorship that failed to identify the owner

Respondent Wilson was a candidate for governor in the 2026 State Primary Election and is a current candidate in the 2026 State General Election.

On April 20, 2026, Respondent received a $25,000 contribution from "LLC, IPOP":[6]

LLC, IPOP 9811 West Charleston Boulevard Las Vegas, Nevada 89117	Occupation: Owner Employer: IPOP LLC	$25,000.00

Alaska campaign disclosure law at AS 15.13.074(f) prohibits contributions from a corporation to a candidate. Regulation allows a contribution from a sole proprietorship, but only where the candidate identifies it "as a contribution by the owner of the sole proprietorship."[7]

---

[4] 2 AAC 50.870; 2 AAC 50.891.
[5] 2 AAC 50.891(d).
[6] 30-day primary report, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=50202&ViewType=CD.
[7] 2 AAC 50.250(c)(1).

In her Answer to the Complaint, Respondent does not deny the contributor IPOP, LLC is a corporation, or that she received a $25,000 contribution from it. She argues instead that IPOP, LLC has "only a sole member" and therefore should be considered a sole proprietorship under Alaska campaign finance law, in the same way that a sole member limited liability company "is considered as a disregarded entity for federal tax purposes."[8]

APOC staff finds that a corporation – as IPOP, LLC clearly is – remains a corporation under campaign disclosure law regardless of whether the federal government disregards IPOP LLC's particular entity form for tax purposes. Nothing in the language of 2 AAC 50.250(c) indicates this intent or result; rather, the regulation simply clarifies that a contribution from a sole proprietorship does not violate 15.13.074(f).

Even assuming, for purposes of discussion, that AS 15.13.074(f) allows candidates to receive contributions from sole member LLCs as a "sole proprietorship" contribution under 2 AAC 50.250(C), it is allowed only when the candidate identifies it "as a contribution by the owner of the sole proprietorship."[9] Nowhere in Respondent's reporting did she identify the "owner" of the "sole proprietorship," and the $25,000 contribution therefore remained outside campaign disclosure law.

In her Answer to the Complaint, Respondent advised that her campaign, upon receiving the complaint and seeing advice from APOC staff, immediately refunded the contribution to "IPOP, Inc." and does not need to take further steps relating to the contribution.[10]

<u>APOC staff finds Respondent accepted $25,000 from an LLC. To the extent that an LLC can be treated as a sole proprietorship, Staff finds that Respondent accepted $25,000 from a sole proprietorship without identifying the owner. Staff recommends a finding of violation.</u>

---

[8] Answer, pp. 3-4.
[9] 2 AAC 50.250(c).
[10] 7-day primary report, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=50850&ViewType=CD, "-$25,000 to IPOP Inc. August 6, 2026."

b) Respondent in her year-start and 30-day primary reports described above market rates for credit card processing fees and provided insufficient detail of $109,227.87 in expenditures to WinRed for campaign consultation services

Alaska campaign disclosure law requires candidates to report expenditures incurred by their campaigns. For the 2026 State Primary Election, standard APOC reports relevant to this complaint and investigation included year-start and 30-day primary reports.[11]

For expenditures to vendors who provide general campaign goods and services, 2 AAC 50.321(a)(5) requires a candidate to report certain administrative details and describe "the purpose of the expenditure."[12] However, when a candidate makes expenditures to an advertising agency or to a business providing campaign consultation or management services, the candidate must provide additional details explaining the expenditure. Specifically, 2 AAC 50.321(d) requires a candidate outline "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."[13]

In her year-start and 30-day primary reports, Respondent identified a combined total of $109,227.87 in "credit card processing fees" paid to WinRed, an Arlington, Virginia vendor:[14]

Original year-start report:

02/01/2026	Electronic Funds Transfer	**WinRed** 4250 Fairfax Dr Ste 600 Arlington, Virginia 22203	Credit card processing fees for this reporting cycle	**$30,345.03**

Original 30-day primary report:

[11] AS 15.13.110(a). Other standard reports under AS 15.13.110 became due only after the filing of this complaint and are not addressed herein.
[12] AS 15.13.040(a)(1)(A); 2 AAC 50.321(a)(5).
[13] 2 AAC 50.321(d) (emphasis added).
[14] Year-start report, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=49216&ViewType=CD; and 30-day primary report, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Common/View.aspx?ID=50202&ViewType=CD.

07/17/2026	Electronic Funds Transfer	**WinRed** 4250 Fairfax Dr Ste 600 Arlington, Virginia 22203	Credit card processing fees for this reporting cycle	**$78,882.84**

The complaint alleged the reports' descriptions of these lump-sum payments – which failed to break down the fees – reflected charges well above WinRed's publicly advertised credit card processing rates.[15]

Respondent in her Answer admitted the WinRed expenditures were not strictly credit card processing fees and attributed the errors to a treasurer "using the WinRed platform for the first time."[16] She argued that the failure to accurately describe the $109,227.87 paid to WinRed in the year-start and 30-day report was an innocent mistake and "considers this minor reporting issue to have been resolved with these amendments":[17]

Amended Year-start report, filed September 1, 2026:

02/01/2026	Electronic Funds Transfer	**WinRed** 4250 Fairfax Dr Ste 600 Arlington, Virginia 22203	Amount collected by WinRed this reporting cycle; includes credit card processing fees and Agency Fees dispersed to Imperator ($7,014.11); and TAG ($6,771.20).	**$30,345.03**

Amended 30-day primary report, filed September 1, 2026:

07/17/2026	Electronic Funds Transfer	**WinRed** 4250 Fairfax Dr Ste 600 Arlington, Virginia 22203	Amount collected by WinRed this reporting cycle; includes credit card processing fees and Agency Fees dispersed to Better Mousetrap ($1,852.30); Imperator ($42,054.54); O2M Digital ($2,354.11); Resurgence Media ($646.29); TMA Direct ($1,529.96); Tailwinds Political ($502.86).	**$78,882.84**

In response to APOC staff's Request for Information, Respondent provided slightly more information concerning the WinRed fees, including that several of WinRed's subcontractors (Better Mousetrap, O2M Digital, Resurgence Media, and Tailwinds Political) are all digital fundraising consultants.[18]

---

[15] Complaint, pp. 2-3.
[16] Answer, p. 4.
[17] Answer, pp. 4-5.
[18] Answer to APOC Requests for Information.

To begin the analysis, APOC staff finds WinRed, by and through its subcontractors, is a business providing campaign consultation or management services, for which 2 AAC 50.321(d) required Respondent to "disclose in detail all services rendered."[19] Without question, Respondent's original reporting of $109,227.87 in WinRed's services as "credit card processing fees" did not meet this standard. APOC staff investigation, and Respondent's admissions, revealed WinRed provided campaign consultation services and subcontracted services that went well beyond credit card processing. APOC staff finds Respondent's year-start and 30-day primary reports as originally filed were incomplete, and recommends the Commission find the allegation substantiated and assess civil penalties.

Although the filing of the complaint tolls the civil penalties associated with Respondent's originally filed year-start and 7-day primary reports, Respondent's descriptions of her WinRed expenditures remain substantially incomplete and must be further amended to comply with campaign disclosure requirements. For example, Respondent's 30-day amended report, rather than disclosing in detail all services WinRed provided for the campaign, still offers *no description* of how WinRed itself spent funds remaining after paying various subcontractors. Respondent also fails to "disclose in detail all services rendered" by the numerous subcontractors who are themselves, by Respondent's own description, *campaign fundraising consultants*. Respondent's reporting of WinRed's services on her other reports – the year-start and 7-day primary reports – also remain incomplete: while listing amounts spent by WinRed's subcontractors, the reports are devoid of details of what WinRed or the subcontractors did to earn the very substantial amounts Respondent paid them for their services.

APOC staff find Respondent's reporting concerning WinRed expenditures remains incomplete in her year-start, 30-day primary, and 7-day primary reports and recommends the Commission order Respondent to amend her reports to comply with 2 AAC 50.321(d)

[19] 2 AAC 50.321(d).

and the guidance attached as Exhibit 1 within 5 days of the Commission's approval of this Staff Report.[20]

c) Payments to businesses Rival Strategy Group and 137 Initiative did not violate rules against reimbursements but may have failed to sufficiently disclose services of campaign consultation businesses

Complainant alleges Respondent improperly reimbursed campaign vendors 137 Initiative and Rival Strategy Group, violating AS 15.13.086, which allows reimbursements only to the candidate, a treasurer, or a deputy treasurer:

Specifically, under the heading of "Reimbursements," Complainant points to an expenditure to the business 137 Initiative, which describes $354.75 to "reimburse" the business for supplies and fuel. Complainant additionally points to expenditures to business Rival Strategy Group, which again include "reimbursements," these for airfare.

06/07/2026	Check 1141	**137 Initiative** 3420 W. Secluded Meadows Lp Wasilla, Alaska 99623	Campaign management (overseeing daily operations; coordinating campaign departments; event scheduling; assisting the candidate); reimburse button supplies ($250); reimburse personal vehicle fuel for Valdez trip ($104.75)	**$5,354.75**
07/03/2025	Check 1015	**Rival Strategy Group** P.O. Box 92918 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87199	Politicial and strategy consulting, graphic design, communications work; Airfare (American Airlines reimbursement)	**$5,893.96**
12/30/2025	Check 1069	**Rival Strategy Group** P.O. Box 92918 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87199	Politicial and strategy consulting, graphic design, communications work; airfare reimbursement	**$6,969.95**

Complainant argues the payments amount to improper reimbursements because they were not made to the candidate, treasurer, or deputy treasurer. However, use of the term "reimbursements" may be misleading in this context. The reporting appears to reflect Respondent's payments to campaign vendors for those vendors' payments to a second

[20] Exhibit 1, APOC Staff Guidance Re: Reporting Advertising/Consultation Expenditures. APOC emailed guidance to candidates, including Respondent and her campaign treasurer, in February 2026, and again in July 2026. The guidance describes specific requirements when candidates make expenditures to businesses providing consultation or management services and includes examples of how to report such expenditures.
[20] 2 AAC 50.321(d).

business, as part of the vendor's services. The payments do not implicate campaign disclosure rules that prohibit reimbursing those who are not the candidate, treasurer or deputy treasurer; instead, they appear to reflect payments by a vendor to a subcontractor, which are not prohibited.[21] APOC staff does not find by a preponderance of evidence that the identified payments violated campaign disclosure rules against reimbursements.

The expenditures do, however, raise a different issue relating to Rival Strategy Group and 137 Initiative. Respondent describes their services as "political and strategy consulting," and the businesses appear to make payments to or subcontract third parties as part of their services for the Respondent. These factors strongly suggest both Rival Strategy Group and 137 Initiative provide "campaign consultation or management services," and Respondent's expenditures to them required – like Respondent's expenditures to WinRed – detailed disclosure of all services rendered.[22] Over the course of her campaign, Respondent has made extensive expenditures to Rival Strategy Group and 137 Initiative and also to a third business, Ace Political, which also appears to provide campaign management services: approximately $79,000 to Rival Strategy Group, approximately $63,000 to 137 Initiative, and approximately $20,000 to Ace Political. Respondent reported expenditures to these businesses on her year-start, 30-day primary, and 7-day primary reports but did not provide the detailed descriptions of expenditures required by regulation.

In light of the above, APOC staff strongly recommends Respondent review her reporting in its entirety: her year-start and 30-day primary reports for which APOC staff already has recommended a finding of violation for failing to provide WinRed expenditure details, but also her 7-day primary report and any additional reporting subsequent to the issuance of this Staff Report, to ensure all expenditures "made to an advertising agency or to an individual or business that provides campaign consultation or management services . . . disclose in detail all services rendered" in compliance with campaign disclosure rules.[23]

---

[21] AS 15.13.086.
[22] 2 AAC 50.321(d).
[23] Ex. 1.

d) Respondent's reimbursements to individuals not listed as treasurer or deputy treasurers did not comport with campaign disclosure law

In her year-start and 30-day primary report, Respondent reimbursed various individuals for items including event supplies and fuel, as follows:

06/14/2025	Check 1012	**Williams, Stephanie** 4825 Potter Crest Cir Anchorage, Alaska 99516	Reimburse event supplies paid on 6/7/25	**$9.95**
07/08/2025	Check 1002	**Wilson, Samuel** 23902 Mountain Place Anchorage, Alaska 99516	Fuel reimbursement	**$246.46**
07/08/2025	Check 1003	**Zipay, Roberta** 14950 Lochoman Lane Anchorage, Alaska 99516	Reimburse for food, beverages for July 1 event	**$415.15**
02/01/2026	Check 1074	**Bretz, Lorne** 4107 Hayes Anchorage, Alaska 99503	Reimburse for food, beverages, d??cor for event	**$91.94**
07/06/2026	Check 1152	**Bretz, Rina** 4107 Hayes St Anchorage, Alaska 99503	Reimburse event food	**$48.43**

Under AS 15.13.086, only candidates, treasurers, or deputy treasurers can make expenditures on behalf of a campaign.[24] Respondent concedes that under the law, a non-treasurer or non-deputy treasurer volunteer cannot make expenditures on behalf of the campaign. She argues, however, that where a treasurer or deputy treasurer thereafter reimburses the volunteer, the statute has been followed. Respondent "urge(s) APOC to revisit the traditional interpretation" and find Respondent did not violate the law by reimbursing volunteers for campaign purchases. APOC staff disagrees with Respondent's logic and notes the plain meaning of the statute, which prohibits individuals who are not a candidate, treasurer, or deputy treasure from making expenditures for the campaign. Staff believes the underlying purpose of the statute is exactly as respondent characterizes – a

[24] AS 15.13.086. Authorized makers of expenditures. An expenditure (1) authorized by or in behalf of a candidate may be made only by (A) the candidate; or (B) the candidate's campaign treasurer or a deputy campaign treasurer.

financial control requirement, put in place to safeguard against fraud, and abuse of, strictly regulated campaign funds. As the individuals were not authorized to make the expenditures their payments made on behalf of the campaign were (non-monetary) contributions to the campaign. Respondent violated campaign disclosure law by reimbursing them. APOC staff recommends the Commission find this allegation substantiated and assess a civil penalty for the reimbursements made to individuals who were not authorized to make expenditures on behalf of the campaign.[25]

d. Respondent's personal reimbursements outside of the three-day window for candidate repayment for airfare purchases were improper

Campaign disclosure law allows candidates two options to reimburse themselves after using personal funds for campaign-related expenses. A candidate may use the loan process outlined in AS 15.13.078, which requires a candidate to first record the use of personal funds as a contribution and then, "within five days of making the loan," submit an APOC reimbursement form.[26] Respondent took neither of these steps and is not eligible to be reimbursed via this provision.

Candidates also may be repaid after using personal money for authorized campaign expenditures pursuant to 2 AAC 50.990 "if the amount is repaid no later than three days after the date of the expenditure."[27] For candidates using this option to reimburse themselves, APOC staff recommends they identify the dates of the purchases to make clear the repayment occurred within three days.

In response to APOC staff requests for information, Respondent provided additional details of the airfare reimbursements, including the dates of purchase and receipts.

[25] Respondent should amend her reports to include non-monetary contributions from Stephanie Williams, Samuel Wilson, Roberta Zipay, Lorne Bretz, and Rina Bretz.
[26] AS 15.13.078, Contributions and loans from the candidate; AS 15.13.116(a)(4) (a candidate who holds unused campaign assets after the election may (4) repay loans from the candidate to the candidate's own campaign under AS 15.13.078(b)).
[27] 2 AAC 50.990. Definitions. (7) "contribution" (C) does not include (x) the use of personal money or credit by a candidate for an authorized campaign expenditure, if the amount is repaid no later than three days after the date of the expenditure.

Applying Respondent's additional information within the context of the regulation's three-day limit results as follows:

1.

06/30/2025	Check 1001	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Reimburse for airfare from Ketchikan to Sitka to Juneau to Anchorage	**$789.84**

Respondent was unable to locate a copy of a receipt for the purchase and unable to attest that the June 30, 2025 reimbursement occurred within the 3-day period allowed by regulation and was therefore a contribution. Respondent has indicated she will refund **$789.84** to the campaign.

2.

08/04/2025	Check 1004	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Air fare reimbursement	**$938.10**

At the time of the final draft of this Staff Report, Respondent was unable to locate a receipt for this purchase, and APOC staff is unable to determine whether the August 4, 2025 reimbursement occurred within the 3-day period allowed by regulation. Unless by the time of hearing Respondent demonstrates she purchased the airfare within the allowed three-day window, APOC staff recommends the Commission order Respondent to reimburse the campaign for the amount she received (**$938.10**).

3.

09/24/2025	Check 1005	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Reimburse airfare to D.C., Fairbanks	**$1,536.38**

Concerning the September 24, 2005 reimbursement, Respondent conglomerated separate expenditures for self-reimbursement in a single reporting entry, for travel to Fairbanks on August 14, 2025 and Washington D.C. on August 28, 2026. Respondent reports paying $415.09 on August 11, 2025, and $1,121.29 on August 19, 2025. As both purchase dates were beyond the three-day window for reimbursement, they were

contributions. Respondent must reimburse the campaign for the amount she received in reimbursement (**$1,536.38**).[28]

4.

11/25/2025	Check 1006	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Airfare reimbursement	**$2,004.13**

Regarding the November 25, 2025 reimbursement, Respondent reports and receipts substantiate the reimbursements were for campaign-related travel to Washington, D.C. and Florida, with both purchases made on November 24, 2025, within the three days allowed by regulation. The reimbursement is consistent with campaign disclosure rules.

5.

03/26/2026	Check 1007	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Reimburse airfare	**$2,815.92**

Respondent reports that the reimbursement was for airfare purchased on March 16, 2025 for travel to Florida, Washington, D.C. and Fairbanks. The March 26, 2025 reimbursement was not permissible because it occurred more than three days after the purchase, and Respondent must reimburse the campaign. (**$2,815.92**)

6.

05/02/2026	Check 1009	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Reimburse airfare	**$1,241.30**

Respondent reports and receipts substantiate purchasing separate tickets for campaign-related travel to Texas and Florida on May 2, 2025. As the reimbursement occurred May 2, 2025 within the three days allowed by regulation, it does not violate campaign disclosure rules.

[28] Respondent indicated an intent to file an APOC Candidate Reimbursement form to address the late reimbursement, but that mechanism for reimbursement is available only for candidate loans, where the candidate has filed the form within five days of making the self-loan. The option is no longer available under these circumstances.

7.

06/19/2026	Check 1010	**Wilson, Bernadette** 12301 Johns Rd #21 Anchorage, Alaska 99515	Reimburse airfare ANC / OTZ	**$694.60**

Respondent reports and receipts substantiate purchasing the ticket for campaign-related travel to Kotzebue on June 17, 2026. As the reimbursement occurred June 19, 2026, within the three days allowed by regulation, it does not violate campaign disclosure rules.

MAXIMUM POTENTIAL CIVIL PENALTIES

The maximum civil penalty for failing to timely file complete and accurate year-start and 30-day reports is $50 per day for each day the violation continues.[29]

For receiving and failing to return a prohibited campaign contribution, the maximum civil penalty is $50 per day for each day the violation continues.[30] For purposes of calculating the penalty for failing to return the April 20, 2026 prohibited contribution, excluding the 10 days allowed to return the contribution, the penalty runs from April 30, 2026 through the date of the complaint.[31]

The maximum civil penalty for improper reimbursements is $50 per day for each day the violation continues.[32]

Tolling the running of the penalties as of the day the complaint was filed (July 27, 2026) results in a maximum civil penalty of $33,150.

Report	Dates of Violation	Penalty days	Max penalty	2 AAC 50.855 assessment
Year-start	2/17/26 – 7/27/26	160 ($50/day)	$8,000	$2,000
30-day primary	7/20/26 – 7/27/26	7 ($50/day)	$350	$175
$25,000 Prohibited contribution (IPOP LLC)	4/30/26 – 7/27/26	88 ($50/day)	$4,400	$4,400

[29] AS 15.13.390(a)(1). The Staff Report does not address any potential penalties relating to any potential violations within Respondent's 7-day primary report, as the complaint was filed prior to its filing.
[30] AS 15.13.390(a)(4).
[31] 2 AAC 50.266(a).
[32] AS 15.13.390(a)(4).

Improper reimbursements to self and others	6/14/25[33] – 7/27/26	408 ($50/day)	$20,400	$20,400
		Total	$33,150	**$26,975**

MITIGATION CRITERIA

When APOC staff assesses a penalty, the starting point for calculating the penalty is 2 AAC 50.855. Here, the regulation instructs staff to reduce the maximum statutory assessment for Respondent's incomplete year-start report to 25% of the maximum (from $8,000 to $2,000) because it was her first election cycle and first reporting error.[34] Additionally, because this was Respondent's first election cycle, staff reduces the maximum penalties for her 30-day primary reports by 50%.[35]

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.[36] The penalty may also be reduced if the penalty is significantly out of proportion to the degree of harm suffered by the public for not having the information.[37] A civil penalty is considered significantly out of proportion if it exceeds the value of the transactions insufficiently reported.[38] Finally, a penalty may be reduced where unique circumstances justify reducing the penalty.[39]

Based upon the above-described mitigators:[40]

Relating to Respondent's receipt of the $25,000 improper contribution from IPOP, LLC, APOC staff recommends a 50% reduction based upon Respondent's good filing

[33] June 14, 2025 is the date of the first improper reimbursement.
[34] 2 AAC 50.855(b)(2)(B).
[35] 2AAC 50.855(b)(2)(C).
[36] 2 AAC 50.865(a)(1)(A)-(B).
[37] 2 AAC 50.865(b)(5).
[38] *Id.*
[39] 2 AAC 50.865(b)(6).
[40] Where prudent, staff may apply mitigation on a violation-by-violation basis. Final Order 26-06-CD_26-08-CD, https://aws.state.ak.us/ApocReports/Paper/Download.aspx?ID=28151, p.30.

history and status as an inexperienced filer,[41] which brings the $4,400 assessed penalty to $2,200. APOC staff recommends a further 90% reduction, to **$220**, based upon a consideration of the unique circumstances: Respondent's demonstrated good-faith belief that the contribution was allowed and her immediate steps, in the absence of APOC action, to refund the contribution.[42]

Relating to Respondent's $20,400 assessed penalty for improper self-reimbursements, APOC staff recommends a 50% reduction based upon Respondent's good filing history and status as an inexperienced filer[43] which brings the penalty to $10,200. APOC staff recommends an additional 99% reduction, **to $102**, in consideration of the unique circumstances:[44] Nothing in APOC staff's investigation indicates the improper reimbursements were intentional or provided a personal benefit to the candidate; they were not prohibited expenditures by their nature in that they appeared to be permissible use of campaign funds.[45] Because they occurred outside the allowable timeframe, however, Respondents personal payments became contributions to her campaign. In such cases, personal reimbursement back to the campaign is the remedial action. The reimbursement amounts are significant ($6,080.24) and Respondent will bear the direct financial burden of what appear to have been unintentional errors.

Finally, relating to Respondent's **$2,175** assessed penalty for failing to follow campaign disclosure reporting requirements for $109,227.87 in expenditures to WinRed, APOC staff finds no mitigation factors. While Respondent was an inexperienced filer, APOC issued comprehensive guidance in February 2026 and again in July 2026 on how to report these expenditures, guidance which was sent to the candidate and her campaign treasurer. APOC additionally considers that Respondent has expended an additional $162,000 with Rival Strategy Group, 137 Initiative, and Ace Political, businesses that also appear to be campaign consultation businesses that Respondent similarly reported without

[41] 2 AAC 50.865(a)(1)(A)-(B)
[42] 2 AAC 50.865(b)(6).
[43] 2 AAC 50.865(a)(1)(A)-(B)
[44] 2 AAC 50.865(b)(6).
[45] AS 15.13.112 (the underlying expenses appear to "reasonably relate to campaign activities").

required details. Finally, the assessed civil penalty of $2,175 does not exceed the value of the transactions that lacked required detail[46] and a reduction on this basis is not warranted.

Given the above considerations, staff recommends the Commission assess a total civil penalty of **$2,497.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE: I hereby certify that on this date, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be delivered to:	
Zachary Wallen Chalmers, Adams, Backer & Wallen, LLC 301 South Hills Village Dr., Ste. LL200-420 Pittsburgh, PA 15241 zwallen@chalmersadams.com Robert Stone rob@stonelawalaska.com	☒ Certified Mail ☒ Email ☒ Email only
Christopher Constant 133 E. Harvard Ave Anchorage, AK 99501 aktransparency@gmail.com	☒ US Mail ☒ Email

Cari Rousselle 09/25/2026

Signature Date

[46] 2 AAC 50.865(b)(5).

From:	Whitlock, John G (DOA)
To:	Whitlock, John G (DOA)
Cc:	Stone, Kim S (DOA); Pearson, Mackenzie R (DOA)
Subject:	A Message from APOC: Reporting expenditures to advertising agencies and for campaign consultation services / 2 AAC 50.321(d)
Date:	Sunday, July 19, 2026 1:18:45 PM
Attachments:	Examples advertising_consulting expenses.pdf

Dear Candidates, chairpersons, 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.

As you may be aware, a recurring issue (and subject of numerous public complaints) in the past year has been the **reporting of expenditures made to advertising agencies and businesses 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 an advertising agency or business providing campaign consulting or management services, you will violate campaign disclosure regulation 2 AAC 50.321(d) if your expenditure description does not explain all services that vendor is providing, in detail. You must additionally disclose any subcontractors the business engaged on behalf of your campaign and where it placed media advertising.

As our 2026 campaign cycle gets into full swing, APOC staff felt this reminder might be helpful.

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.

John Grover Whitlock

Paralegal

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] *Sourdough Public Relations* $25,000

- general account management and campaign strategy
- graphic design services for campaign logo and digital ads
- placement of digital ads on *Facebook* and *Instagram*
- printing services for campaign signs from *Fireweed Print Company*
- content creation for radio ads
- placement of radio ads on *KQRS*, *WRBC*, and *WBRX*
- creation of images and written content for text messages
- print ad content creation and placement in *The Capitol Reader*
- OTT internet-based video content and CTV ads, placed through subcontractors *YouTube*, *Netflix*, and *Amazon Prime Video*.

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] *Get The Vote Advertising LLC* $2,000

- Geotargeted voter data ad placement
- Programmatic digital advertising through pre-roll, display banner, or connected TV, placed by *StackAdapt*.

[date] *Valley Media Company* $3,000

- Digital Advertising for social media (*Facebook*, *Instagram*), video CTV, and targeted display, placed through *XYZ Digital, LLC*.
- direct distribution of digital ads to targeted mobile devices.

[date] *Anchorage Political Consulting Group* $4,500

- Digital ads including Roku OneView (programmatic CTV, online video, and display) placed through *Willow Media*.

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, *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.