

Senate State Affairs Committee
Monday, March 11, 2024 - 8:00 A.M.
TESTIMONY ON: All Subjects

Written Testimony

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Vickie Fadness	H 664	W	self	Lewiston	For	N	7

Please support HB664

I appreciate the work you have done to bring attention to the manipulation of truth through A1 and digital technology, but it does not go far enough. Please include all forms of A1 cloning. During May 23 to December 23 Newsguard (tracks misinformation) saw an increase from 49 to 600 A1 sites publishing false articles. That’s an increase of 1000%! A1 also clones voices and images which are impossible for a lay person to discriminate between real or fake.

It is not only American entities with diabolical, anti-American Democracy goals – but an assortment of known and unknown countries, organizations, businesses, and people who work to destroy our country.

We are at the precipice of misinformation and in dire need of legislation to stop all A1 and all other Deep State images, articles and voice cloning misinformation about our politicians and citizens.

Please support HB664

Thank you,
 Vickie Fadness
 District 7

Diane. Baumgart	H 664	W	Self	Moscow	For	N	6
-----------------	-------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

I am pleased to support this bill.

Our very democracy depends on accurately informed voters.

With the increasing use of digital technology in various media, this bill is crucial in order for voters to be able to distinguish between truth and manipulated information about

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Diane. Baumgart	cont.						6
-----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

candidates.

This bill is critical to maintaining truth in advertising about candidates who will represent us in our government.

Gretchen Wissner	H 664	W	self	Moscow	For	N	6
------------------	-------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

H 664 is a bill I wholeheartedly support.

This FAIR elections bill is such an important piece of legislation for this time in our nation's history. It's one thing for people to have honest disagreements based on different values and experiences, but it is something completely different when the disagreements are based on inaccurate or intentionally misleading information. H 426 addresses a particularly convincing form of deception.

Kathy Dawes	H 664	W	Myself and my husband, Dana	Moscow	For	N	6
-------------	-------	---	--------------------------------	--------	-----	---	---

We support bill H 664 because it is critical for voters to be able to distinguish between truth and manipulated information about candidates and issues. Truth in advertising is incredibly important, especially now when public trust in elected officials is questioned more than ever before. Accurately informed voters make our democracy work. Please vote YES on bill H 664. Thank you.

Nancy Chaney	H 664	W	self	Moscow	For	N	6
--------------	-------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

Senate State Affairs Committee

Please vote yes on H664. Applications of digital technology in media have become realistic enough to deceive us. This bill can help alert voters to the falsehood, reveal unscrupulous motives, and discourage would-be mischief-makers from messing with the democratic process in Idaho. Please vote yes on H664.

Thank you.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Mary Jo Hamilton	H 664	W	self	Moscow	For	N	6
------------------	-------	---	------	--------	-----	---	---

This bill will be critical in maintaining truth in advertising.

Nancy Britton	H 572	W	self	Ponderay	Against	N	1
---------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

Dear Legislators,

This is not for the state to determine and/or pre-empt citizens access to Federal, State or Local funds that are offered if they qualify. Such "unearned" funds are most often provided to address unforeseen circumstances with financially damaging consequences. We've recently seen such circumstances with the pandemic. Idaho citizens benefitted from Federal funds to address their business losses and personal job losses.

This is another big Idaho government centralizing local and personal decision-making. This state bill controls Idahoans and potentially causes them harm by preventing our citizens from accessing funds that are rightly theirs and that citizens in other states are able to access.

Please vote NO on H 572!

Thank you for your time,
Nancy Britton

John Harbuck	H 572	W	self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
--------------	-------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I oppose this bill for several reasons. First, it is another attempt by the Legislature to centralize its power and strip local entities of their abilities to address local problems. While I may not be in favor of all local programs to guarantee some income to individuals without requiring work, in some cases it may be ok. In addition, would this measure also make Social Security payments illegal? I went through my working life figuring SS wouldn't be around by the time I reached retirement age. I am almost 79 years old and have been receiving the benefits I paid into for nine years and rather like that. (My wife also gets SS). Does this bill also mandate no payments to individuals who have been flooded or burned out of their homes or have been impacted by health crises such as COVID?

Please reject this bill.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

John Harbuck	<i>cont.</i>						1
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

John Harbuck, Sandpoint
(45-year Bonner County resident)

Lindy Swartz	H 572	W	Self	Sandpoint	Against	N	1
--------------	-------	---	------	-----------	---------	---	---

I am against this bill because it is a waste of time and our taxpayer dollars to spend time on a "what if" type of bill. Work on actual problems please, quit chasing conspiracies.

Amy DUNDON	H 572	W	American Civil Liberties Union of Idaho	BOISE	Against	N	19
------------	-------	---	--	-------	---------	---	----

WRITTEN TESTIMONY AGAINST HOUSE BILL 572
SUBMITTED TO THE IDAHO
SENATE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 11, 2024
ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF IDAHO

Chairman Guthrie and Members of the Committee,

The ACLU of Idaho opposes HB 572, a bill that would prohibit guaranteed income programs. No such programs currently exist in Idaho. If passed, HB 572 would strip local governments from enacting policy to meet local needs. We also know guaranteed income programs, where they do exist, are linked to increased personal financial stability and improved local economies.

Guaranteed basic income is a direct, unconditional cash payment issued by the government. Unlike universal basic income, guaranteed basic income programs have eligibility requirements; they target economically vulnerable community members. Guaranteed basic income is a type of social welfare program. Unlike tax credits for education or childcare, however, guaranteed basic income programs are less burdensome for both the government and program participants.

Economic justice is a component of social justice. The ACLU has spent decades calling attention to the relationship between economic and racial inequality. We know the constitutional guarantee of equal protection is co-dependent on economic justice. Put another way: economic policy reform is necessary to preserve and expand the civil rights and civil liberties of every Idahoan.

In Idaho as elsewhere, decades of discriminatory housing, education, and employment policy have created deep racial disparities in

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Amy DUNDON	cont.						19
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

economic conditions and outcomes. Such policies, whether formal or tacit, continue to shape Idaho’s housing, economic, and education trends, including:

Lower home ownership rates in Latinx/Hispanic communities. Latinx Idahoans are less likely to own homes than white Idahoans

Racial wealth gaps. White families average a net worth of \$188,200 – about eight times more than the typical Black family (\$24,100), and over five times that the average Latinx family (\$36,100). Such racialized wealth discrepancies reflect the ongoing impact of racial covenants, redlining, and other racist housing policy

Income and earnings gaps. Median income for Latinx folks is \$15/hour, compared to \$20/hour for whites

Gender and racial income inequality. Latinx women take home 57% in wages compared to white men (for every \$100 paycheck issued to a white man, a Latina earns \$57)³

Unaffordable housing. On average, Idaho renters earn about \$13.30/hour - but would need to earn about \$18/hour to afford the statewide average monthly rental price⁴

Uneven economic prosperity. Despite our state’s economic growth in recent years, nearly half of Idahoans struggle to make ends meet: 12 percent of Idahoans live below the federal poverty level, and about a third are economically vulnerable⁵

We urge you to reject HB 572.

Respectfully,
Amy Dundon
ACLU of Idaho

1. Penn Social Policy and Practice (2023)³; First-of-its-kind guaranteed income program in rural area improved financial, physical, and mental well-being. <https://sp2.upenn.edu/report-first-of-its-kind-guaranteed-incomeprogram-in-rural-area-improved-financial-physical-and-mental-well-being/>

2. US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2023) Monthly Labor Review: Can stimulus checks pay for themselves? <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2023/beyond-bls/can-stimulus-checks-pay-forthemselves.htm#:~:text=The%20crux%20of%20the%20argument,>

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Amy DUNDON	cont.						19
------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

economy%20and%20spurs%20economic%20activity.

3. Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs (2020) 2012 Hispanic Profile Data Book for Idaho.

<https://icha.idaho.gov/docs/Hispanic%20Profile%20Data%20Book%202021%20%20FINAL%20V3.pdf>

4. Idaho workers would have to earn about \$17.40 to afford the statewide average cost of rent (\$903/monthly). The average wage of Idaho renters is \$13.62/hour and minimum wage in Idaho is \$7.25 an hour. Data: National Low Income Housing Coalition (2024) Out of reach: The high cost of housing. <https://nlihc.org/oor>

5. Economically vulnerable here means families classified as Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed, or ALICE. Data and findings published in United Way (2020) Research Center: Idaho. <https://www.unitedforalice.org/ida>

Vickie Fadness	H 572	W	self	Lewiston	Against	N	7
----------------	-------	---	------	----------	---------	---	---

Please do not support HB572.

Local government is pretty darn good at making decisions which have immediate and positive impact for citizens. But HB572 allows state legislators' tentacles to control local government. Stay out of local decision making.

It is NOT the state's legislature's duty to make city, county, agency, or any other political subdivision decisions regarding any program. If, for whatever reasons, local governments find "guaranteed income programs" would meet needs for their communities, they have the right to do so. State legislators DO NOT.

For example, should the impact of an unforeseen event cause major damage to a community, the local government may find a guaranteed income would help their citizens recover. Let local governments do their work and state do only their work.

Please do not support HB572

Diane Baumgart	H 572	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
----------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am pulsed to this bill. This bill represents government overreach, taking away local control by our Idaho counties, cities, and local boards.

This bill appears unduly broad, making it unclear how this could be used.

There are critical issues this legislature has not addressed. This bill is not needed and seems to target issues undefined with no rationale.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Gretchen Wissner	H 572	W	self	Moscow	Against	N	6
------------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I am writing in opposition to H 572. I believe decisions, whenever possible, should be made by those closest to the issues being addressed. Locally elected officials have a better sense of the needs of their communities than state legislators enacting one-size-fits-all policies.

Jana Argersinger	H 572	W	Self	Moscow	Against	N	6
------------------	-------	---	------	--------	---------	---	---

I emphatically oppose this bill because it is a very concerning exercise of state overreach--wresting control from local boards, cities, and counties in Idaho.

Kathy Dawes	H 572	W	Myself and my husband, Dana	Moscow	Against	N	6
-------------	-------	---	--------------------------------	--------	---------	---	---

We oppose bill H 572 because we feel it represents government overreach by prohibiting local governments from making decisions about guaranteed income programs. We do not understand the rationale for this legislation, or whether it is even necessary. Is it based on what is actually happening in Idaho? It is too general and broad and may have unintended consequences as well. Please vote NO on bill H 572. Thank you.

Karen M. Hansen	H 572	W	Self	Viola	Against	N	6
-----------------	-------	---	------	-------	---------	---	---

Vote against HB572.

HB572 is completely unnecessary state government overreach into local government. It is a preemptive power grab that violates the rights of local jurisdictions to undertake innovative problem solving strategies.

Kendal Shaber	H 572	W	self and family	Boise	Against	N	18
---------------	-------	---	-----------------	-------	---------	---	----

Please vote against 572. There is research going on internationally as well as nationally regarding various guaranteed income programs. Banning things we fear or propositions we know little about ties the hands of future policy makers and is bad governance. In this case in America it is being tried at some municipal levels outside Idaho. This bill represents the heavy hand of state government taking away local control AGAIN from the government closest to the people. The state should stay in its lane.

Please vote NO on this complete overreaction and overreach legislation. Thank you.

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Yvonne Wright	H 572	W	self	Genesee	Against	N	6

This bill takes away local control by our Idaho counties, cities, and local boards and should not move forward.