

NOTICE OF ORDER ADOPTING EMERGENCY RULE
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD
EmR _____

The definition of the term “political purpose,” GAB 1.28

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that pursuant to ss. 5.05(1)(f), 227.11(2)(a), 227.16, and 227.24(4) Stats., and interpreting generally Chapter 11, Stats., the Government Accountability Board will hold a public hearing to consider adoption of an emergency rule to amend GAB §1.28, Wis. Adm. Code, relating to the definition of the term “political purpose.”

Hearing Information

The public hearing will be held at the time and location shown below.

Date and Time
February 16, 2011
at 1:00 p.m.

Location
Government Accountability Board Office
212 E. Washington Avenue, 3rd Floor
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

This public hearing site is accessible to people with disabilities. If you have special needs or circumstances that may make communication or accessibility difficult at the hearing, please contact the person listed below.

STATEMENT OF EMERGENCY FINDING:

The Government Accountability Board amends s. GAB 1.28(3)(b), Wis. Adm. Code, relating to the definition of the term “political purpose.” Section GAB 1.28 as a whole continues to clarify the definition of “political purposes” found in s. 11.01(16)(a)1., Stats., but repeals the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) which prescribes communications presumptively susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.

This amendment to s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) is to the rule that was published on July 31, 2010 and effective on August 1, 2010, following a lengthy two year period of drafting, internal review and study, public comment, Legislative review, and consideration of U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Within the context of ch. 11, Stats, s. GAB 1.28 provides direction to persons intending to engage in activities for political purposes with respect to triggering registering and reporting obligations under campaign financing statutes and regulations. In addition, the rule provides more information for the public so that it may have a more complete understanding as to who is supporting or opposing which candidate or cause and to what extent, whether directly or indirectly.

Pursuant to §227.24, Stats., the Government Accountability Board finds an emergency exists as a result of pending litigation against the Board and two decisions by the United States Supreme Court: *Federal Election Commission (FEC) v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. (WRTL*

II), 550 U.S. 549 (2007) and *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. ___, (No. 08-205)(January 21, 2010). Following the effective date of the August 1, 2010 rule, three lawsuits were filed seeking a declaration that the rule was unconstitutional and beyond the Board's statutory authority: one in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, one in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and one in the Wisconsin Supreme Court. On August 13, 2010, the Wisconsin Supreme Court temporarily enjoined enforcement of the August 1, 2010 rule, pending further order by the Court.

In the lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the parties previously executed a joint stipulation asking the Court to permanently enjoin application and enforcement of the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b). On October 13, 2010, the Court issued an Opinion and Order denying that injunction request. In denying the injunction, the Court noted that "G.A.B. has within its own power the ability to refrain from enforcing, or removing altogether, the offending sentence from a regulation G.A.B. itself created" and emphasized that "removing the language—for example, by G.A.B. issuing an emergency rule—would be far more 'simple and expeditious' than asking a federal court to permanently enjoin enforcement of the offending regulation." *Wisconsin Club for Growth, Inc. v. Myse*, No. 10-CV-427, slip op. at 2 (W.D. Wis. Oct. 13, 2010). The Court further noted that staying the case would give the Board time to resolve some or all of the pending issues through further rulemaking. *Id.*, slip op. at 14.

In addition, the Board, through its litigation counsel, has represented to the Wisconsin Supreme Court that it does not intend to defend the validity of the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) and that it would stipulate to the entry of an order by that Court permanently enjoining the application or enforcement of that sentence.

This amendment brings s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) into conformity with the above stipulation, with the representations that have been made to the Wisconsin Supreme Court, and with the suggestions made in the October 13, 2010, Opinion and Order of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin. The Board finds that the immediate adoption of this amendment will preserve the public peace and welfare by providing a simple and expeditious clarification of the meaning of s. GAB 1.28 for litigants, for the regulated community, and for the general public and by doing so in advance of the 2011 Spring Election and any other future elections.

ANALYSIS PREPARED BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD:

1. Statute Interpreted: s.11.01(16), Stats.
2. Statutory Authority: ss. 5.05(1)(f) and 227.11(2)(a), Stats.
3. Explanation of agency authority: Under the existing statute, s. 11.01(16), Stats., an act is for "political purposes" when by its nature, intent or manner it directly or indirectly influences or tends to influence voting at an election. Such an act includes support or opposition to a person's present or future candidacy. Further, s. 11.01(16)(a)1., Stats., provides that acts which are for "political purposes"

include “but are not limited to” the making of a communication which expressly advocates the election, defeat, recall or retention of a clearly identified candidate.

Under s. 5.05(1), Stats., the Board is expressly vested with responsibility for the administration of all Wisconsin laws relating to elections and election campaigns, specifically including chapters 5 through 12 of the Wisconsin Statutes. Pursuant to that responsibility, s. 5.05(1)(f), Stats., gives the Board express statutory authority to promulgate administrative rules “for the purpose of interpreting or implementing the laws regulating the conduct of elections or elections campaigns or ensuring their proper administration.” Similarly, s. 227.11(2)(a), Stats., grants state agencies—including the Board—the authority to “promulgate rules interpreting the provisions of any statute enforced or administered by it, if the agency considers it necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute,” as long as the rule does not “exceed[] the bounds of correct interpretation.” Sections 5.05(1)(f) and 227.11(2)(a), Stats., thus give the Board clear and express authority to promulgate rules that interpret and implement the meaning of all Wisconsin laws that regulate or govern the proper administration of election campaigns in this state, including s. 11.01(16), Stats.

Section GAB 1.28, as promulgated on August 1, 2010, made a number of changes to the Board’s interpretation and implementation of the statutory definition of an act “for political purposes” under s. 11.01(16), Stats. Those changes were fully analyzed and explained in the July 13, 2010, Order of the Government Accountability Board, CR 09-013.

The present amendment involves only the repeal of the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b). All other portions of GAB 1.28, including the first sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b), are unchanged. Moreover, all of the revisions to GAB 1.28 that were effected on August 1, 2010, remain temporarily enjoined pending further order of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The present amendment has no effect on the continued effectiveness of that injunction.

The first sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b), provides that any communication that “is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate” is a communication “for political purposes” within the meaning of s. 11.01(16), Stats., and hence is subject to all of the campaign finance regulations under ch. 11 of the Wisconsin Statutes that apply to communications for a political purpose—subject, of course, to any additional requirements or limitations contained in particular statutes.

The second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) additionally identifies communications which are susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate. That is, any communications that possess the characteristics enumerated in the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) would automatically be deemed communications for a political purpose and, as a result,

would automatically be subject to the applicable campaign finance regulations under ch. 11 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

As a result of litigation challenging the validity of the August 1, 2010, amendments to s. GAB 1.28, the Board has entered into a stipulation to refrain from enforcing the second sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b). The Board, through its litigation counsel, has also represented that it does not intend to defend the validity of that sentence and has sought judicial orders permanently enjoining its application or enforcement. This sentence is removed by this emergency rule.

This amendment does not affect the first sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b), under which individuals and organizations that raise or spend money to make communications that are susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate, are subject to campaign finance regulation under ch. 11 of the Wisconsin Statutes. As previously noted however, all of the August 1, 2010, amendments to s. GAB 1.28—including the first sentence of s. GAB 1.28(3)(b)—are currently subject to the August 13, 2010, temporary injunction by the Wisconsin Supreme Court.

4. Related statute(s) or rule(s): s. 11.01(16), Stats., and s. GAB 1.28, Wis. Adm. Code.
5. Plain language analysis: The revised rule will subject to regulation communications that are “susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.” The revised rule will subject communications meeting this criterion to the applicable campaign finance regulations and requirements of ch. 11, Stats. The scope of regulation will be subject to the United States Supreme Court Decision, *Citizens United vs. FEC* (No. 08-205), permitting the use of corporate and union general treasury funds for independent expenditures.
6. Summary of, and comparison with, existing or proposed federal regulations: The United States Supreme Court upheld regulation of political communications called “electioneering communications” in its December 10, 2003 decision: *McConnell et al. v. Federal Election Commission, et al.* (No.02-1674), its June 25, 2007 decision of: *Federal Election Commission (FEC) v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. (WRTL II)*, (No.06-969and 970), and pursuant to its January 21, 2010 decision of: *Citizens United vs. FEC* (No. 08-205).

The *McConnell* decision is a review of relatively recent federal legislation – The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA) – amending, principally, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as amended). A substantial portion of the *McConnell* Court’s decision upholds provisions of BCRA that establish a new form of regulated political communication – “electioneering communications” – and that subject that form of communication to disclosure requirements as well as to other limitations, such as the prohibition of corporate and labor contributions

for electioneering communications in BCRA ss. 201, 203. BCRA generally defines an “electioneering communication” as a broadcast, cable, or satellite advertisement that “refers” to a clearly identified federal candidate, is made within 60 days of a general election or 30 days of a primary and, if for House or Senate elections, is targeted to the relevant electorate.

In addition, the Federal Election Commission (FEC) promulgated regulations further implementing BCRA (generally 11 CFR Parts 100-114) and made revisions incorporating the *WRTL II* decision by the United States Supreme Court (generally 11 CFR Parts 104, 114.) The FEC regulates “electioneering communications.”

7. Comparison with rules in adjacent states:

Pursuant to Public Act 96-0832, Illinois revised its “electioneering communication” statute in 2009, effective July 1, 2010, to include the “no reasonable interpretation other than an appeal to vote for or against” test, among other revisions. Subject to some delineated exemptions found in 10 ILCS 5/9-1.14, the statute now defines an “electioneering communication” as any broadcast, cable or satellite communication, including radio, television, or internet communication, that:

- 1) refers to a clearly identified candidate or candidates who will appear on the ballot, a clearly identified political party, or a clearly identified question of public policy that will appear on the ballot,
- 2) is made within 60 days before a general election or 30 days before a primary election,
- 3) is targeted to the relevant electorate, and
- 4) is susceptible to no reasonable interpretation other than an appeal to vote for or against a clearly identified candidate, a political party, or a question of public policy.

As a result of the adoption of Public Act 96-0832, Illinois is undergoing a substantial revision of its administrative code with respect to campaign finance and disclosure rules. (See proposed Illinois Administrative Code, Title 26, Chapter 1, Part 100, Campaign Financing, JCAR260100-101389r01). In the context of excluding “independent expenditures” from the term “contribution,” Section 100.10(b)(3)G., of the proposed rules include both electioneering and express advocacy communications as forms of independent expenditures.

Iowa’s Administrative Code defines “express advocacy” as including a communication that uses any word, term, phrase, or symbol that exhorts an individual to vote for or against a clearly identified candidate or the passage or defeat of a clearly identified ballot issue. (Chapter 351—4.53(1), Iowa Administrative Code.)

Michigan statutes define a “contribution” as anything of monetary value made for the purpose of influencing the nomination or election of a candidate or the qualification, passage or defeat of a ballot question. (s. 169.204(1), Mich. Stats.) “Expenditure” is defined as a payment of anything of monetary value in assistance of or opposition to the nomination or election of a candidate or the qualification, passage or defeat of a ballot question. (s. 169.206(1), Mich. Stats.) Michigan does not have any additional rules defining political purposes.

Minnesota statutes define a “campaign expenditure” or “expenditure” as the purchase or payment of money or anything of value, or an advance of credit, made or incurred for the purpose of influencing the nomination or election of a candidate or for the purpose of promoting or defeating a ballot question. (s. 10A.01, Subd. 9, Minn. Stats.) “Independent expenditure” is defined as an expenditure expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, if the expenditure is not coordinated with any candidate or any candidate’s principal campaign committee or agent. (s. 10A.01, Subd. 18, Minn. Stats.) Minnesota does not have any additional rules defining political purposes.

8. Summary of factual data and analytical methodologies: The factual data and analytical methodologies underlying the adoption of the August 1, 2010 amendments to s. GAB 1.28 have been described in the July 13, 2010, Order of the Government Accountability Board, CR 09-013. The adoption of the present amendment to s. GAB 1.28(3)(b) is predicated on the same data and methodologies and also on developments related to several court cases challenging the validity of the August 1, 2010 amendments to s. GAB 1.28. These developments were discussed by the Board in a closed session meeting with its litigation counsel on December 14, 2010. These developments are also being discussed in an open session, public meeting of the Board on December 22, 2010.
9. Analysis and supporting documentation used to determine effect on small businesses: The rule will have no effect on small business, nor any economic impact.
10. Effect on small business: The creation of this rule does not affect business.
11. Agency contact person: Shane W. Falk, Staff Counsel, Government Accountability Board, 212 E. Washington Avenue, 3rd Floor, P.O. Box 7984, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7984; Phone 266-2094; Shane.Falk@wisconsin.gov
12. Place where comments are to be submitted and deadline for submission: Government Accountability Board, Attn: Shane W. Falk, 212 E. Washington Avenue, 3rd Floor, P.O. Box 7984, Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7984, no later than January 28, 2011.

FISCAL ESTIMATE: The creation of this rule has minimal fiscal effect. There may be additional registrants filing reports with the Board and potentially additional enforcement actions that may require staff action. The extent of this potential fiscal impact is undetermined.

INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS: The creation of this rule does not affect the normal operations of business.

TEXT OF PROPOSED RULE:

Pursuant to the authority vested in the State of Wisconsin Government Accountability Board by ss. 5.05(1)(f), 227.11(2)(a) and 227.24, Stats., the Government Accountability Board hereby adopts an emergency rule amending GAB 1.28, Wis. Adm. Code, interpreting ch. 11, Stats., as follows:

SECTION 1. GAB 1.28(3)(b) is amended to read:

(b) The communication is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate. ~~A communication is susceptible of no other reasonable interpretation if it is made during the period beginning on the 60th day preceding a general, special, or spring election and ending on the date of that election or during the period beginning on the 30th day preceding a primary election and ending on the date of that election and that includes a reference to or depiction of a clearly identified candidate and:~~

- ~~1. Refers to the personal qualities, character, or fitness of that candidate;~~
- ~~2. Supports or condemns that candidate's position or stance on issues; or~~
- ~~3. Supports or condemns that candidate's public record.~~

This rule shall take effect upon its publication in the official state newspaper, the Wisconsin State Journal, pursuant to s. 227.24, Stats.

Dated this 22nd day of December, 2010.

Kevin J. Kennedy
Director and General Counsel
Government Accountability Board