

Nic Van Putten  
Progressive Strategies NW  
25 N Broadway #108  
Tacoma, WA 98405

5/15/18

Public Disclosure Commissioners,

I am attaching this letter with a fuller explanation of my request for amendment of state administrative rule WAC 390-16-205 regarding the reporting of vendors in campaign expenses. This petition stems from a complaint filed against Noelle Balliett, a Peninsula School Board candidate in 2017, but many of the issues involved have broader applications.

The current requirement for campaigns to list the amount of money paid by a consultant to each vendor in the production of campaign material is impractical – and at times impossible – to follow. Furthermore, doing so distorts the fair market value of the material produces and thereby presents less accurate and less valuable information to the public. Lastly, because the PDC's enforcement is primarily complaint-driven, maintaining an administrative rule that is almost universally not followed by campaigns creates the potential for an uneven playing field that can tip the balance of fair elections.

To provide context, please consider this information in how a typical campaign consulting business operates. Almost all consultants in Washington State make profit both through a flat retainer fee and through markup on campaign material and advertisements. Consultants work with a regular slate of vendors to provide services from graphic design to printing, mailhouse, etc. Most consultants receive preferential pricing from these vendors that reflects the bulk rate and ongoing professional relationship. With some vendors, services are provided under contract and are not paid per item.

In the case of Noelle Balliett's campaign, our consulting firm has an ongoing arrangement to receive graphic design services from Susan Picatti Design. Our agreement bundles logo and typesetting on materials like yard signs, remits, letterhead, etc. into a flat \$250 "campaign setup" fee. When we charge campaigns, we bill \$200 for the logo itself and \$20 each for materials. In most campaigns, that results in \$10-\$30 profit, but in this case, we operated at a \$30 loss because not all material was ordered. We do this because we find that the "fair market value" for logo design – what most consultants and many graphic artists charge candidates – is around \$200.

Whereas our business charges a set price per piece for material, the amount we pay our vendors can be subject to negotiation, as is often the case with printers. For example, it wasn't until March of 2018 that we finalized and paid a series of invoices from our printer originating in August of 2017. The requirement to list the amount paid to sub-vendors necessitated that we estimate the allocation of expenses for mailers in the 2017 Primary, whereas the actual distribution of costs was not known until nearly a full year later. While the length of time here is unusual, it is common for vendors to not provide invoices until after reporting deadlines have passed.

Of final consideration on this issue is that the amount paid by our firm is different from the amount that a candidate would have paid directly to the printer, designer, etc. for the same material. By requiring campaigns to report the amount actually paid to sub-vendors rather than either the actual amount paid to our firm or the fair market value of the item, the public is misled about the value of the order. In explaining this rule, commission staff have said that it's intent is for the public to know the value of the service "as if the candidate had ordered it directly form the vendor," but that is not being accomplished under the current rule.

My request is that the Commission consider material produced by an agent, in which the agent tangibly contributed to the production of said material, to be a final product of the agent, rather than the work of a vendor(s). Because our role in creating a logo includes setting the parameters of the design such as colors, font types, and layout, I believe that the logo should be considered to be produced by our firm, and that campaigns should only be required to report the amount of money paid to our firm for the logo.

Therefore, by amending the rule to consider work tangibly produced by an agent as the product of that agent, the public will have a more accurate understanding of the value of campaign expenditures. It will facilitate easier and more accurate reporting by campaigns, involving less guess work and amended reports, and in doing so, will create a more level playing field where campaigns can comply with the rules and avoid enforcement actions. For passthrough activity and services in which the agent had no tangible role – such as the order of yard signs, or a commission on certain types of advertising, the agent should still be required to list the amount allocated to the vendor. This will preserve the Commission's intent to prevent "bundling" services and obscuring the actual flow of campaign money.

If the Commission declines to consider this type of material the product of the agent, then I hope you will at least consider amending the rule to require the fair market value of the service or good produced, rather than the amount actually allocated between vendors. This will not only improve the accuracy of reports, but it will significantly ease the reporting burden on campaigns and the enforcement burden on the PDC.

Lastly, in the particular case of the Noelle Balliett complaint, I request that the Commission reconsider the application of the rule to reflect the ongoing arrangement between Progressive Strategies NW and Susan Picatti Design. The value of the logo design itself should be \$200 as was initially reported, with the additional services of typesetting as extra costs that in this case were not incurred and therefore would not need to be reported.



**PETITION FOR ADOPTION, AMENDMENT, OR REPEAL  
OF A STATE ADMINISTRATIVE RULE**

Print Form

In accordance with [RCW 34.05.330](#), the Office of Financial Management (OFM) created this form for individuals or groups who wish to petition a state agency or institution of higher education to adopt, amend, or repeal an administrative rule. You may use this form to submit your request. You also may contact agencies using other formats, such as a letter or email.

The agency or institution will give full consideration to your petition and will respond to you within 60 days of receiving your petition. For more information on the rule petition process, see Chapter 82-05 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=82-05>.

**CONTACT INFORMATION** *(please type or print)*

Petitioner's Name Nic Van Putten  
 Name of Organization Progressive Strategies NW  
 Mailing Address 25 N Broadway #108  
 City Tacoma State WA Zip Code 98403  
 Telephone 253-459-4758 Email Nic@ProgressiveStrategiesNW.com

**COMPLETING AND SENDING PETITION FORM**

- Check all of the boxes that apply.
- Provide relevant examples.
- Include suggested language for a rule, if possible.
- Attach additional pages, if needed.
- Send your petition to the agency with authority to adopt or administer the rule. Here is a list of agencies and their rules coordinators: <http://www.leg.wa.gov/CodeReviser/Documents/RClist.htm>.

**INFORMATION ON RULE PETITION**

Agency responsible for adopting or administering the rule: \_\_\_\_\_

**1. NEW RULE - I am requesting the agency to adopt a new rule.**

The subject (or purpose) of this rule is: \_\_\_\_\_

The rule is needed because: \_\_\_\_\_

The new rule would affect the following people or groups: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. AMEND RULE - I am requesting the agency to change an existing rule.**

List rule number (WAC), if known: WAC 390-16-205

I am requesting the following change: that the PDC redefine an "expenditure by agent" to consider certain work the product of the agent rather than the work of sub-vendors. (Please see attached letter for full description).

This change is needed because: the current WAC a) distorts the value of the product as it is reported to the public, b) creates a reporting requirement that at times is not possible for campaigns to follow and c) creates an uneven playing field for campaigns based on enforcement.

The effect of this rule change will be: easier and more accurate reporting of the real value of expenditures, while limiting to a small degree reporting of the inner-workings of businesses operating in campaigns.

The rule is not clearly or simply stated: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. REPEAL RULE - I am requesting the agency to eliminate an existing rule.**

List rule number (WAC), if known: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Check one or more boxes)*

It does not do what it was intended to do.

It is no longer needed because: \_\_\_\_\_

It imposes unreasonable costs: \_\_\_\_\_

The agency has no authority to make this rule: \_\_\_\_\_


It is applied differently to public and private parties: \_\_\_\_\_

It conflicts with another federal, state, or local law or rule. List conflicting law or rule, if known: \_\_\_\_\_

It duplicates another federal, state or local law or rule. List duplicate law or rule, if known: \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please explain): \_\_\_\_\_

PETITION FOR ADOPTION, AMENDMENT, OR REPEAL OF A STATE ADMINISTRATIVE RULE



**PETITION FOR ADOPTION, AMENDMENT, OR REPEAL OF A STATE ADMINISTRATIVE RULE**

