

Response to Glen Morgan 12/19 complaint 11378 (Received 12/30/2016)

Here is the response to the 12/30/2016 complaints from Glen Morgan in relation to the Sam Hunt for State Senate campaign.

1. Complaint number one alleges failure to accurately identify contributions from the Nisqually Indian Tribe.

There was a coding error by my treasurer who inadvertently listed both contributions as primary contributions. However, there was no damage as a result of this error; only \$1000 of the contribution was used in the primary. After moving funds to my surplus account, the campaign had a balance of \$8,000 with \$5,100 identified as general election contributions. Figuring in the \$1,000, would have resulted in \$6,100 in general election funds received prior to the primary. The coding error resulted in no excess expenses for the primary election.

2. Complaint number two alleges an illegal donation to the Washington State Democratic Party.

There is no validity to this allegation. The \$250 contribution was for two tickets to the State Democratic Convention dinner and for sponsorship of the 2016 state convention. That enabled the campaign to post signs at the convention, have access to display space for campaign literature, and access to convention activities. According to Washington State Democrats' staff, "Sam Hunt for State Senate" purchased a Convention "Meal Package", which covered your convention registration and associated convention meals/events. This is the basic event package that most convention attendees purchase." The campaign had in excess of \$250 in its surplus fund and would have used those funds if we thought that this was not a legitimate campaign expense. These are all legitimate campaign expenses.

Many campaigns purchase advertising and access from the state party organizations. If the PDC determines that candidates cannot purchase advertising and campaign access to state party, it should clarify this issue and apply it to future campaigns.

3. Complaint number three alleges failure to report in-kind expenditures or in-kind contribution of mailing lists used in mailings.

The campaign developed its own mailing lists. The campaign used lists made available to candidates from the Washington State Democratic Party and customized them for use by the campaign. If an in-kind receipt is required, I will ask the party to provide me with one. However, one was not sent to the campaign; I was just granted access to the data base.

4. Complaint number four alleges failure to identify party preference in written political advertising.

There is no violation here. PDC rules state, "The Commission has determined that a sponsor identification is not required on an internal political communication that also constitutes political advertising, if (1) the communication satisfies the definition of "internal political communication" and thus it is directed from the defined entity to the audience defined in statute and rule [2], and (2) it is otherwise apparent on the face of the communication as to who the true sponsor or

sponsors (original source or sources) is of the political advertising.” The Democrat is clearly identified as a party publication.

5. Complaint number five alleges incorrect filing dates for an ad in The Democrat newspaper.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Morgan was not patient enough to wait for the next report. The bill was promptly paid when an invoice was received from the Thurston County Democrats.

6. Complaint number six alleges failure to accurately file reports by deadline.

- a) The campaign filed the payment to Isaac Wagnitz after the invoice was sent to the campaign. I am sorry that Mr. Morgan was not patient enough to wait for the next report.
- b) The same goes for the mailer postage paid to Capitol City Press. It is not possible to pay a bill and file the appropriate report until after the bill is actually received. The campaign paid Capitol City Press promptly after the invoice was received.
- c) It is uncertain what Mr. Morgan is alleging here. There obviously was an additional expense of \$14.59 that was incurred and reported in the revised C-4.

7. Complaint number seven alleges that I was five days late in filing my 2016 F-1 statement.

The allegation is correct, the final filing was five days late because I was waiting for information from a couple of organizations with which I work. This was a mistake that had no real impact.