

Six Reasons Why PDC Audits Are Ineffective

Stated goal of PDC audit program:

*“The audit findings provide PDC staff with an opportunity to identify problem areas in reporting campaign or committee contribution and expenditure activities that may suggest a need to revise the PDC’s advice and guidance given to filers, to recommend or initiate changes in the law, or to adopt or revise the rules for reporting, and if necessary, enforcement. The Commission believes that the primary purposes of conducting audits are to: **1. Verify that the information disclosed on candidates and political committee campaign finance reports is timely and accurate in accordance with RCW 42.17A. 2. Determine whether candidates and political committees are in substantial compliance with the law, rules and reporting requirements. 3. Evaluate record keeping and reporting procedures used by filers and suggest corrective action to ensure future compliance with the law, or law/rule changes as necessary depending on the audit findings.**” – 2018 PDC Audit Report*

1) PDC audits are not real audits: staff do not compare bank statements with what is reported on form C3 or form C4.

One of the stated goals of the PDC audit program is to “*verify that the information disclosed on candidates and political committee campaign finance reports is timely and accurate in accordance with RCW 42.17A.*”

Instead of comparing the candidate or committee’s bank statements to the C3s and C4s that have been filed to make sure that all activity has been accounted for, PDC staff merely look at what has already been reported and ask to see documentation.

This means that if the candidate or committee didn’t report the contribution or expenditure in the first place, PDC staff aren’t able to tell. And because they aren’t able to tell, it doesn’t get noted in the final audit report.

For example, consider a candidate that fails to disclose a \$10,000 mailer expenditure on form C4. ² Unless agency staff actually look at the bank statement and compare it to what is reported on form C4, they wouldn’t be able to tell that a significant expenditure had gone unreported. Obviously, the same thing could happen for a large unreported contribution.

Instead of actually making sure that candidates and committees have accounted for all contributions received and all expenditures made, agency staff appear to spend a large amount of time fixated on quibbling, insignificant details relating to how expenditures are described. This prioritization makes no sense whatsoever.

¹ As of the time of this writing, the 2021 audit reports have not been released, so my criticisms are based off of the 2018 and 2020 audit cycles.

² Similar to what happened in PDC Case 95994.

For these reasons, the PDC audit program (in its current form) is not able to effectively meet its goal of *“verify[ing] that the information disclosed on candidates and political committee campaign finance reports is timely and accurate in accordance with RCW 42.17A.”*

2) PDC audits are not conducted until well after the election is concluded.

For both the 2018 and 2020 audits cycles, the PDC audits did not start until well after the election had been concluded.

To have audits be effective against bad or negligent actors, the PDC must understand that campaigns typically exist for a very short period of time, and to fulfill the very specific purpose of winning the office sought.

The threat of audits or penalties after the election has concluded is significantly less frightening to the campaign when compared to the threats of audits or penalties while the campaign is ongoing.³ Because the threat of being audited during the campaign is nil, it is far more unlikely to compel compliance with the law.

3) The risk of being audited by the PDC is extremely, extremely remote because so few audits are done.

During the 2020 audit cycle, the PDC audited only eight candidates. To put that in perspective, there were 1082 candidates that cycle. This translates to a .73% likelihood that an individual candidate campaign will be audited. My understanding is the PDC has never audited a committee, which obviously translates to a 0% likelihood that a committee will be audited.

Because such a small number of campaigns/committees are audited, the fear of being audited is greatly diminished, preventing audits from meaningfully compelling compliance with the law.

4) PDC audits only target well-resourced campaigns, which typically utilize professional compliance staff and are the least likely to be out of compliance.

For the 2018 and 2020 audits cycles, the PDC has chosen to target only well-resourced campaigns for audits. With one or two exceptions, these campaigns have all used professional treasurers.

Obviously, when the agency only audits the people that are most likely to be in compliance, it perceives overall compliance to be much higher than it is actually.

Similarly, if an organization set out to determine the overall quality of life in Bangladesh, but only looked at the top 100 wealthiest individuals in that country, it would come to a far rosier conclusion than was justified.

Choosing to audit only the most well-resourced campaigns means that the agency does not get a representative sample of overall compliance. Because the audit reports don't examine a representative sample of campaigns and committees, any results or recommendations will be heavily skewed.

³ My understanding is that Seattle's PDC equivalent (SEEC) actually goes around to many of the Seattle campaigns during the book inspection period and does limited audits, comparing the filed reports to bank statements and original records.

5) PDC audits only focus on select legal requirements that are judged by staff to be important, ignoring concerns of the regulated community.

The audit process is supposed to be an important tool for the agency to understand what is and is not working for filers, and how the agency can improve training, enforcement, and applicable legal requirements.

However, the audit process currently only focuses on requirements that staff believe to be important. This omits any mention of other requirements that may be painful for filers, or other ways that the agency could improve its processes.

For example, in 2020, the foreign contribution certification requirement took effect. Despite this, agency staff did not look to see whether or not campaigns were complying with this requirement. They also did not ask any questions relating to this requirement in the audit report.

6) There are no recommendations that are coming from these audits.

The audit process is supposed to be an important tool for the agency to understand what is and is not working for filers, and how the agency can improve training, enforcement, and applicable legal requirements.

Well, here we are, 21 months after the first audit reports were released. How has the agency used the results of these (extremely flawed) audits to improve training, enforcement, and applicable legal requirements?

From what I've been able to tell, there have been no recommendations or changes made as a result of these audits.

A Better Way to do Audits

- Conduct a greater number of audits that are more limited in scope (ideally covering one C4 reporting period) so that campaigns and committees recognize there is a substantial risk of being audited.
- Select the campaigns or committees that are to be audited at random, as opposed to selecting the campaigns or committees that are most likely to be in compliance.
- Conduct audits while the campaign cycle is ongoing to help ensure compliance BEFORE the election is over.
- During audits, request bank statements from campaigns and committees and verify that Line 18 of form C4 (ending balance for period) matches the actual bank account balance at the end of the relevant period.
- Request documentation of the three largest contributions and three largest expenditures during the period covered to verify accuracy of what was reported on form C3 and form C4.
- Be willing to listen to the regulatory concerns expressed by the auditees, and be willing to make recommendations based off of those concerns, or at least communicate those concerns in the audit reports to the Commissioners.

General Comments

1) Mini-Reporting: don't raise the threshold but eliminate it entirely

Someone submitted public comment asking for the mini-reporting threshold to be raised to \$7000. The Commission should reject this request, and instead work towards the elimination of the mini-reporting option.

The very name "mini-reporting" is a complete misnomer. People who select the mini-reporting option file no reports whatsoever and members of the public using the agency's website are unable to figure out who contributes to these entities or how these entities spend their money.

All campaigns and committees in Washington State should have to follow the same set of rules when it comes to filing contribution and expenditure reports so that voters can access timely, accurate campaign finance information.

Instead of increasing the mini-reporting threshold, the agency should work towards making ORCA easier to use and making campaign finance requirements easier to comply with.

Per RCW 42.17A.110 (8), the Commission is not required to create rules allowing mini-reporting and should end this option entirely before the June 30 deadline via rulemaking.

2) Legislative Proposal: Remove Proposal to Create New C4 Reporting Period

Please remove the proposal to create a new C4 reporting period. There is no consensus on this issue; treasurers will oppose this requirement.

While the current bill draft does a handful of positive things for treasurers, the positive things are greatly outweighed by the proposed new C4 reporting period.

Creating a new deadline without an existing system to actively and meaningfully punish those who violate existing deadlines is "putting the cart before the horse". The agency needs to enforce existing C4 deadlines before lobbying the Legislature to create new ones.

In the event that the agency decides to move forward with this proposal, I intend to file the APA Rulemaking Petition that would require the agency to actively and meaningfully engage in the enforcement of C4 reporting deadlines (as neighboring states do).

Top 6 Reasons to Oppose Increasing Number of C4 Reporting Periods
Public Written Comment by Conner Edwards
9.20.2022

1) C3s (contribution reports) are already filed on a weekly basis.

Voters have a far greater interest in contribution information (reported on form C3), as opposed to information about expenditures (reported on form C4). Increasing the number of C4s due the month before the election would dramatically increase the amount of work that treasurers must perform without much if any benefit to the public.

2) Increasing the number of C4s would distract treasurers from core responsibilities.

Treasurers already have a significant number of responsibilities the month before the election, as this represents our busiest time of the year. These responsibilities include: paying invoices, making deposits, collecting foreign contribution certifications, answering questions from candidates, providing cash on hand updates, filing C3 reports, and filing LMC reports. The requirement to file an additional C4 would distract us from these core responsibilities with little if any corresponding benefit to the public.

3) Proposal to add a 27-day pre-election report wouldn't actually provide additional information to voters during 18-day voting period.

As it stands currently, ballots are mailed out 18 days before the election. **The proposed additional C4 report falls well outside the 18-day voting window and wouldn't do anything to provide additional information to people while they are voting.** We already file a C4 report at the 21-day pre-election mark, so by the time most people get their ballots, they will be able to access information that is current within 7 days.

Asking treasurers to file an additional C4 when voters don't even have their ballots in hand is like asking us to mow the lawn when the grass is not yet high enough to be cut by the blades: all burden and no benefit.

4) Other options for voters to get "up-to-date" pre-election expenditure information exist.

In the rare event a voter actually wants more information about pre-election expenditures, they can either: a) wait to vote until after campaigns file their final seven-day pre-election C4, or b) request to inspect the campaign's books. These two pre-existing options should accommodate those rare voters that are interested in expenditure information.

5) Agency doesn't actively or meaningfully enforce current C4 reporting deadlines.

In contrast to neighboring state campaign finance authorities¹, the PDC does not actively or meaningfully enforce current C4 reporting deadlines. Instead, the agency utilizes a passive "complaint-based system" that relies on members of the public to understand what filing deadlines are, find a violation, and file a complaint. These complaints are often dismissed by agency staff with no monetary penalties issued.

¹ Responses from both the PDC and neighboring state campaign finance authorities on this topic were submitted as public comment at last month's meeting and are re-attached to this document.

Top 6 Reasons to Oppose Increasing Number of C4 Reporting Periods
Public Written Comment by Conner Edwards
9.20.2022

Creating a new deadline without an existing system to actively and meaningfully punish those who violate existing deadlines is “putting the cart before the horse”. The agency needs to enforce existing C4 deadlines before lobbying the Legislature to create new ones.

6) No example provided of how this proposal would accomplish any benefit for the public.

Neither agency staff nor anyone else have provided any clear example of how this proposal, if it had been instituted for previous election cycles, would have averted any negative election-related outcomes. The purported benefit to the public of requiring an additional C4 report is too vague and abstract to justify asking the Legislature to adopt the proposal.

BUT, in the event the Commission decides to adopt the proposal anyway, please consider doing one or both of the following:

a) Putting the proposal in a standalone bill, separate from the rest of the agency request legislation.

This way, the proposal to add a C4 reporting period can live or die on its own merits and not create controversy that may impede the rest of the agency request legislation (which is great, and which will likely have broad consensus support) from passing.

b) Instead of a 26-day C4 report, making it a 34-day C4 report.

As noted in your materials, creating a 34-day C4 report instead of a 26-day C4 report would maintain the existing 2-week intervals between the 21/7 day C4 reports. As noted by another treasurer (Jason Bennett) back in June, vendor invoicing often does not occur immediately, and a two-week window would make compliance with the reporting requirements more realistic.

PDC enforcement of late C4s

Flynn, Sean (PDC) <sean.flynn@pdc.wa.gov>
To: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 1, 2022 at 11:00 AM

Hi Conner.

Thanks for your question. I'm not sure what you're getting at, but I can try to answer the questions and assumptions you propose here. I think I need to clarify our process. Yes, we "actively investigate" C-4 reporting requirements. Investigations do not "initiate enforcement," but are part of the enforcement process.

We also "actively enforce" C-4 requirements on a quite frequent basis. You can check our website to review all the cases resolving issues regarding C-4 requirements. Of course, those cases usually are not contested and often resolved by agreement or warning once the respondent has filed the appropriate report(s).

I am guessing what you may be asking about is whether the PDC initiates complaints alleging failure to timely file a C-4 report in the same way that we initiate group enforcement actions for C-1/F-1 filers. We do not have such a process for C-4 reporting requirements. The PDC always has been a complaint-driven agency. Agency resources can dictate how enforcement activity is conducted and current group enforcement takes considerable amount of time. Outside of enforcement actions and investigation, the Commission has prioritized developing an audit program to assist with promoting compliance among PACs, including timely filing reports, which they are considering for expansion.

I hope that helps.

Sean Flynn

General Counsel
Public Disclosure Commission
www.pdc.wa.gov
Office (360) 664-2736
Cell (360) 789-0225

Shining light on Washington politics since 1972

From: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2022 5:50 PM
To: Bradford, Kim (PDC) <kim.bradford@pdc.wa.gov>; Young, Kurt (PDC) <kurt.young@pdc.wa.gov>; PDC <PDC@pdc.wa.gov>; Lavallee, Peter (PDC) <peter.lavallee@pdc.wa.gov>; Flynn, Sean (PDC) <sean.flynn@pdc.wa.gov>; Hodgson, Kendra (PDC) <kendra.hodgson@pdc.wa.gov>
Subject: PDC enforcement of late C4s

External Email

Hello:

I had a question that I was hoping someone at the PDC could answer.

Does the PDC actively investigate candidates and committees to determine whether or not they have timely filed the C4 reports that they are required by law to file, initiating enforcement actions when the candidates/committees have failed to do so?

I'm almost certain that the PDC doesn't actively enforce the "timely" requirement for C4s (like it does with late/missing C1s/F1s), but I just wanted to reach out to confirm this.

If at all possible, I'd appreciate it if someone could answer me by 5:00 PM on Tuesday, August 2nd, 2022.

Thank you and have a great weekend.

Best,

Conner Edwards

RE: Question on late-filed FEC reports

no-reply@fec.gov <no-reply@fec.gov>
Reply-To: "no-reply@fec.gov" <no-reply@fec.gov>
To: cg.edwards53@gmail.com

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 8:30 AM

Thank you for contacting the Federal Election Commission.

The FEC's Administrative Fine Program assesses civil money penalties for late and non-filed reports. Fines are established by a pre-existing formula.

Most reports that committees file are covered under the Administrative Fine Program. This includes semi-annual, quarterly, monthly, pre-election, 30-day post-general and special election reports, as well as 48-Hour Notices.

If the Commission finds "reason to believe" (RTB) a committee failed to file on time, the FEC will notify that committee in writing of the finding and the penalty amount. These letters are sent to the committee and its treasurer at the address listed on the committee's most recent Statement of Organization (Form 1).

Committees have 40 days to either pay the fine or submit a written challenge. The Commission will then make the appropriate final determination.

More information on the FEC's Administrative Fine Program can be found at <https://www.fec.gov/legal-resources/enforcement/administrative-fines/>

Should you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact staff in the Information Division at 202-694-1100 or 1-800-424-9530 (prompt 6).

FEC Information Division

Please note that the guidance provided by this correspondence is strictly informational and is NOT legally binding. Only the Commission, via the Advisory Opinion process, has the authority to issue a legally binding opinion. This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail.

===== ORIGINAL MESSAGE =====

From: cg.edwards53@gmail.com
Sent: 2022-08-06 07:44:38
Subject: Question on late-filed FEC reports

Hello,

I was trying to look through the FEC's website and I had this question:

If a federal candidate required to report with the FEC and appearing on the 2022 general election ballot fails to timely file a pre-general or quarterly report by the appropriate deadline, is that something that the FEC would actively notice and potentially investigate/fine the candidate for missing the deadline?

Or would it be dependent on a member of the public to notice the report had not been filed and file a complaint?

--

Best,

Conner Edwards
(425) 533-1677 cell

Ref:MSG0223356



Question on Late Reporting for Candidates

Elections <elections@sos.idaho.gov>

Wed, Aug 3, 2022 at 2:10 PM

To: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>, Elections <elections@sos.idaho.gov>

Conner,

Do you have a specific candidate in mind that you are curious about? Are they a statewide or state candidate or a county candidate?

To help you understand the process: the SOS is over statewide, state and most judicial candidates. The County Elections are over county, city, special district candidates and Magistrate Judges. There is a \$500 threshold code that applies to county, city, special district and all judicial candidates (IC 67-6608). SOS candidates all file monthly reports in the year of their election and annual reports in off election years (IC 67-6607). County and Judicial candidates that reach the \$500 threshold also file monthly in an election year once that threshold is met and yearly in non-election years if that threshold was met.

At the SOS we send a courtesy reminder email to our candidates and political committees that they have an upcoming report due on the 10th. If applicable, we send an email on the 11th notifying them of the missed due date as prescribed by Idaho Code 67-6625A. Code allows for a 48hr grace period so we start fining \$50 a day beginning on the 13th (not counting the day they file). We then email them a fine notice when they file their past due report.

The complaints we receive are usually regarding incorrect filings or code violations as we consistently monitor our campaign finance account filings. We have on a few occasions been made aware of entities that fall within the definition of a political committees that have not created accounts and we work with them to get them into compliance. Hopefully this addresses your question. If not, what is your specific concern or complaint?

Sheryl

From: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:14 PM
To: Elections <elections@sos.idaho.gov>
Subject: [External] Question on Late Reporting for Candidates

Hello:

I live in Moscow, ID, and I had this question about how the SOS's office operates.

If a candidate is required to file a monthly campaign finance report (C-2) because they are running for election, and the SOS's office notices that the candidate has failed to do so, does the SOS's office do anything to 1) remind the candidate of their filing obligation, or 2) take steps to fine that candidate for their failure to file?

Or would the SOS's office wait for a member of the public to file a complaint before it does anything?

Best,

Conner Edwards



ALASKA RESPONSE

Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Late Reporting

Lucas, Tom R (DOA) <tom.lucas@alaska.gov>
To: "cg.edwards53@gmail.com" <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 5:45 PM

Mr. Edwards,

Staff checks to see if any reports due have not been filed. If not, we send a notice of delinquency telling the candidate to file the report because penalties are accruing. Once the report is filed late, staff assesses a penalty.

If you have any questions or desire further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thomas R. Lucas

Campaign Disclosure Coordinator

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.

From: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2022 1:44 AM
To: Public Offices Commission, Alaska (DOA sponsored) <doa.apoc@alaska.gov>
Subject: Late Reporting

You don't often get email from cg.edwards53@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the State of Alaska mail system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello:

I was looking at the Alaska Public Office Commission (APOC) website and I had this question:

If a state candidate appearing on the 2022 general election ballot fails to timely file a 30 day or 7 day Campaign Finance Report by the appropriate deadline, is that something that APOC would actively notice and potentially investigate/fine the candidate for missing the deadline?

Or would it be dependent on a member of the public to notice the report had not been filed and file a complaint?

--

Best,

Conner Edwards

(425) 533-1677 cell



HAWAII RESPONSE

Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Question on late reporting penalties

Hawaii Campaign Spending Commission <csc@hawaii.gov>
To: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 4, 2022 at 2:09 PM

Mr. Edwards,

The Commission does send a Notice of Late Report to candidates who fail to timely file their disclosure reports. These candidates can also be found on our website (<https://ags.hawaii.gov/campaign/cc/notice/>). The Commission may assess a fine in accordance to the applicable Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS").

If you have any further questions, please give our office a call at 808-586-0285.

Mahalo,

Janelle Tanna

Elections Assistant

Hawaii Campaign Spending Commission

235 S. Beretania Street, Room 300

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Phone: (808) 586-0285

Fax: (808) 586-0288

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, use, disclosure, or distribution by unintended recipients is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and delete and/or destroy all copies of the original message.

Use of Email Limited: E-mail messages to Commission staff shall not be considered or construed to be a request for an advisory opinion to the Commission under HRS §11-315, nor shall e-mail messages from Commission staff be considered or construed to be an advisory opinion rendered by the Commission.

From: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2022 10:21 AM

To: Hawaii Campaign Spending Commission <csc@hawaii.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Question on late reporting penalties

Hello:

I was looking at the Campaign Spending Commission's website, and I had this question:

If a state candidate appearing on the 2022 general election ballot fails to timely file a 1st or 2nd Preliminary General Report by the appropriate deadline, is that something that CSC would actively notice and potentially investigate/fine the candidate for missing the deadline?

Or would it be dependent on a member of the public to notice the report had not been filed and file a complaint?

--

Best,

Conner Edwards

COVID-19: Information and Latest Updates



State of Hawaii
Campaign Spending Commission

HAWAII FINE SCHEDULE

[Home](#) » [Legal Resources](#) » Schedule of Fines for Violations of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 11, Part XIII

SCHEDULE OF FINES FOR VIOLATIONS OF HAWAII REVISED STATUTES, CHAPTER 11, PART XIII

Approved June 23, 2021

SCHEDULE OF FINES¹

	HAWAII REVISED STATUTES (HRS) – Escheat to Hawaii Election Campaign Fund	HRS – Fine to General Fund	HRS – Administrative Catch-All Fine to General Fund §11-410
<u>REGISTRATION</u>			
A. Electronic Filing Form (HRS §11-321)			
1 – Not File 2 – Late File or Not Amend/Correct	N/A	N/A	1 – \$50 2 – \$25
B. Organizational Report (HRS §§11-321, 322, 323)			
1 – Not File 2 – Late File or Not Amend/Correct (within 10 days)	N/A	N/A	1 – \$100 2 – \$50
<u>REPORTING</u>			
A. Disclosure Reports (HRS §11-340)	N/A	1 – N/A	1 – 1 st time → \$500 2 nd time → \$750

<p>1 – Not File 2 – Late File</p>		<p>2 – \$50/day (first 7 days); \$200/day thereafter provided that in aggregate, the fine shall not exceed 25% of total amount of contributions/expenditures (whichever is greater) for the period covered by the report</p> <p>– Minimum fine is \$200 if more than 4 days late</p> <p>*Publish on Commission's website names of candidate committees and non-candidate committees that fail to file (HRS §11-340(f))</p>	<p>3rd time → \$1,000 2 – Fine N/A if paid fine (HRS §11-410(h)) & no criminal referral (HRS §11-412(g))</p>
<p>(Candidate & Noncandidate Committees) Reports Due 10 Days Before an Election (HRS §11-340(c))</p> <p>1 – Not File 2 – Late File</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>1 – N/A</p> <p>2 – Not to exceed \$300/day provided that in aggregate, the fine shall not exceed 25% of total amount of contributions/expenditures (whichever is greater) for the period covered by the report</p> <p>– Minimum fine is \$300</p> <p>*Publish on Commission's website (HRS §11-340(f))</p>	<p>1 – 1st time → \$500 2nd time → \$750 3rd time → \$1,000 – Fine N/A if paid fine (HRS §11-410(h)) & no criminal referral (HRS §11-412(g))</p>
<p>(Candidate & Noncandidate Committees) Late Contributions Report (HRS §§11-333(c), 335(d), 338)</p> <p>1 – Not File 2 – Late File</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>1 – \$750 2 – \$500</p>
<p>(Noncandidate Committees – Only Super PACs) Late Expenditure Report (HRS §§11-337(b), 338(c))</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>1 – \$750 2 – \$500</p>



Question on late campaign finance reports

SOS Orestar-Support * SOS <Orestar-Support.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>
To: "cg.edwards53@gmail.com" <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 4, 2022 at 10:52 AM

The schedule of filing deadlines can be found on page 20 in the manual found here: <https://sos.oregon.gov/elections/Documents/campaign-finance.pdf>

If the transaction is filed after the deadline, you will receive a late message when you file "this transaction may be considered late". Late (described on page 67) and insufficient filings are then subject to the penalty matrix (1/2% x amount x # of days late, not to exceed 10%.

If the Secretary of State determines that a committee is in violation of Oregon election law because late and/or insufficient transactions were filed and the total calculated penalty is \$50 or more, the Elections Division will create a case and issue a proposed penalty notice. If the total amount is less than \$50 we just dismiss the penalties.

Does that help clarify the question?

ORESTAR Support Team

From: Conner Edwards <cg.edwards53@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2022 2:20 AM
To: SOS Elections * SOS <Elections.SOS@sos.oregon.gov>; MORRIS Ben * SOS <Ben.MORRIS@sos.oregon.gov>
Subject: Question on late campaign finance reports

Hello:

I was just reading pg. 67-70 of the Oregon Campaign Finance Manual (<https://sos.oregon.gov/elections/Documents/campaign-finance.pdf>) and I'm not sure I fully understood something I read about the SOS's enforcement procedures, so I wanted to ask this question:

Generally speaking, if a candidate misses a filing deadline and files a late report for a transaction (let's say they filed a week later than required by law), would that be something that the agency would notice and potentially start an investigation/issue a monetary penalty for? Would it be any different if the report was filed a full month later than required?

Or would a member of the public have to notice the late reporting and file a complaint to start the enforcement/penalty process?

--

Best,

Conner Edwards