

Record

April 1999

Federal Election Commission

Volume 25, Number 4

Table of Contents

Court Cases

- 1 FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee
- 4 National Committee of the Reform Party v. FEC
- 5 FEC v. Forbes
- 5 Judd v. FEC
- 5 On Appeal?

Budget

- 1 FEC Testifies Before House Appropriations Committee

Election Administration

- 2 Update of National Voting System Standards to Proceed

Staff

- 2 New Personnel Director Appointed

Correction

- 5 Advisory Opinions

Regulations

- 7 Commission Opens Comment Period for Electronic FOIA Amendments

Reports

- 7 Louisiana Special General Election Reporting

Federal Register

Outreach

- 8 FEC 1999-2000 Conference Series Begins April 22
- 10 FEC Conducts Monthly Roundtable Sessions

Public Appearances

- 10 Index

Court Cases

FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee

On February 23, the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado granted the Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee's (the Committee's) motion for summary judgment on its counterclaim, ruling that the coordinated party expenditure limits found at 2 U.S.C. §441a(d) are unconstitutional and cannot be enforced against the Committee. The court denied the FEC's cross motion for summary judgment and dismissal of the amended counterclaim.

The Commission, on March 23, voted 6-0 to appeal this decision.

Coordinated party expenditures are provided for in the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act). Subject to limits, they are made by party committees "in cooperation, consultation, or concert" with a candidate's general election campaign. These expenditures are considered contributions under the Act, and the limits are calculated by a mathematical formula found at 2 U.S.C. §441a(d)(3)(A) and (B).

Background

The catalyst for this case was an April 1986 Committee-sponsored

(continued on page 3)

Budget

FEC Testifies Before House Appropriations Committee

FEC Vice Chairman Darryl R. Wold presented the FEC's request to members of a House appropriations subcommittee for a \$38.6 million budget for fiscal year 2000, a modest 4.5 percent increase to the FEC's current budget. The increase is needed largely to cover inflation in operations costs, but would also include salaries for nine additional compliance staff.

Mr. Wold, who appeared March 9 before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, described some of the FEC's recent successes.

- Campaign finance activity has jumped 82 percent during the last 12 years, from \$1.1 billion in the 1986 election cycle to \$2 billion in the 1998 election cycle, yet "[w]e have handled these rising workloads with increased productivity," Mr. Wold said.
- "With Congress' support, the FEC has made the greatest technical strides in our disclosure program. We rapidly and successfully inaugurated an Internet service to enable anyone with access to the World Wide Web to view digital

(continued on page 2)

Budget

(continued from page 1)

images of most campaign finance reports. We also developed software that enables committees to file electronically," Mr. Wold said. He added that the FEC is pursuing ways to encourage more people to file electronically.

- The average active case load is up to 106, an increase from the average active case load of 93 in fiscal year 1998. As of February 1, the FEC had 208 cases on its enforcement docket (dealing with 3,203 respondents), and 51 percent had been actively assigned to staff.

Mr. Wold also reported on the PricewaterhouseCoopers audit (see the [March 1999 Record](#), p. 7). He also drew attention to the Commission's annual legislative recommendations, and he repeated previous FEC warnings about the near-certain shortfall in the Presidential Public Funding Program.

Federal Election Commission 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20463

800/424-9530
202/694-1100
202/501-3413 (FEC Faxline)
202/219-3336 (TDD for the
hearing impaired)
800/877-8339 (FIRS)

Scott E. Thomas, Chairman
Darryl R. Wold, Vice Chairman
Lee Ann Elliott, Commissioner
David M. Mason, Commissioner
Danny L. McDonald,
Commissioner
Karl J. Sandstrom, Commissioner

James A. Pehrkon, Acting Staff
Director
Lawrence M. Noble, General
Counsel

Published by the Information
Division

Louise D. Wides, Director
Angela Rucker, Editor

<http://www.fec.gov>

A news release about the FEC's budget request is available at <http://www.fec.gov> (click on What's New!). ♦

Election Administration

Update of National Voting System Standards to Proceed

On February 25, the Commission approved a new project to reorganize and revise the FEC's national voting system standards.

The voluntary standards, first published in 1990, set performance benchmarks to assure election officials and the public that voting equipment would count votes accurately and securely. Independent test authorities use the standards to evaluate voting equipment under the direction of the National Association of State Election Directors (NASSED).

The Commission's approval was based upon a requirements analysis conducted by ManTech Advanced Systems International, Inc. (ManTech). As part of this project, ManTech representatives reviewed current standards, observed voting equipment in operation, and considered input from NASSED's Voting Systems Board, independent test authorities, voting system vendors and others.

Twenty-seven states currently require voting systems marketed in the state either to meet the national standards adopted by the state or to pass the NASSED evaluation process. Four more states are expected to require election equipment to meet the standards within the next election cycle. All told, the FEC standards impact nearly 3,200 counties, 13,000 election offices and 180,000 precincts nationwide. ♦

Staff

New Personnel Director Appointed

On March 15, William J. Fleming took over as the FEC's new Director of Personnel and Labor Management Relations. He comes to the Commission after serving as Deputy Personnel Officer in the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs. Before joining the Justice Department, Mr. Fleming worked with the Department of Agriculture as a Personnel Officer and Administrative Officer in Syracuse, NY, and as a Dispute Resolution Counselor in Atlanta, GA. Before working at Agriculture, Mr. Fleming was a Personnel Specialist in the Department of the Army.

Born in Syracuse, Mr. Fleming graduated from Ithaca College with a bachelor's degree in music education and, in 1994, received a master's degree in public administration from the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

Mr. Fleming succeeds former FEC personnel director David Orr, who became the Director for Human Resources Management at the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency. ♦

Need FEC Material in a Hurry?

Use FEC Faxline to obtain FEC material fast. It operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. More than 300 FEC documents—reporting forms, brochures, FEC regulations—can be faxed almost immediately.

Use a touch tone phone to dial **202/501-3413** and follow the instructions. To order a complete menu of Faxline documents, enter document number 411 at the prompt.

Court Cases

(continued from page 1)

radio advertisement that responded to a series of television ads sponsored by former Congressman Tim Wirth. The Committee advertisement contrasted the congressman's statements from his own advertising campaign with his congressional record, concluding with: "Tim Wirth has a right to run for the Senate, but he doesn't have a right to change the facts."

The ad ran before Colorado's primary election, when three Republicans were seeking to represent their party in the run against Mr. Wirth. The Committee disclosed the \$15,000 cost of the ad in its reports as a generic voter education expense not subject to the §441a(d) limit. The Commission disagreed. It viewed the expense as a coordinated party expenditure because the ad contained an "electioneering message," and it mentioned a clearly identified candidate. The Committee argued that the ad did not contain express advocacy and therefore was not subject to the coordinated party expenditure limit. It also argued that the limit was unconstitutional.

Originally, the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado agreed with the Committee, finding that the ad contained no express advocacy and was not subject to §441a(d) limits. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit reversed. It upheld the FEC's "electioneering message" standard as applied to the Committee's ad.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that §441a(d) could not be constitutionally applied in this case because the radio ad had not been coordinated with any candidate. The Court concluded that payment for the ad constituted an independent expenditure by the Committee. This ruling affirmed that party committees, even with their close ties to candidates, were capable of making

independent expenditures on behalf of those candidates, and that Congress could not place limits on independent expenditures.

The Court declined to address the constitutional challenge to the coordinated expenditure limits in the Committee's counterclaim. Instead, it referred this matter to the lower courts for further development of the facts and consideration of the law. See these *Record* issues: [November 1996](#), [August 1996](#), August 1995 and November 1993.

Recent Decision

In the district court's view, the FEC needed to demonstrate that:

- §441a(d) serves a compelling government interest and
- §441a(d) is narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.

The court said that the FEC had to show that coordinated party expenditure limits prevent corruption or the appearance of corruption. The FEC had to do more than show "the opportunity" for corruption.

The FEC argued that generous contributors could demand special favors of candidates via their party committee contributions; and that party committees could withhold or grant unlimited coordinated expenditures in order to exact a quid pro quo from candidates who needed financial assistance. The court rejected the first argument, saying that the FEC had shown that large contributors to parties had obtained access to elected officials, but such access did not constitute corruption. The court rejected the analogy to unlimited soft money donations because they may not be used to make coordinated party expenditures. Moreover, because of the limits on individual contributions, the court found the contributor-to-party-to-candidate scenario "an unlikely avenue of corruption."

As to the second argument, the court stated that party committees, by their nature, exert some influence

over candidates. "[A] political party's decision to support a candidate who adheres to the parties' beliefs is not corruption. Conversely, a party's refusal to provide a candidate with electoral funds because the candidate's views are at odds with party positions is not an attempt to exert improper influence."

Furthermore, the court stated that in *Buckley v. Valeo* the Supreme Court's concern with corruption was related to large individual financial contributions—not contributions from party committees.

Finally, the court stated: "The FEC cannot rely on general public dissatisfaction with parties and politicians and the amount of money in the political process...to support its claim that the party coordinated expenditure limit serves a compelling purpose and is narrowly tailored to accomplish that purpose."

The court concluded that the FEC had failed to offer relevant, admissible evidence that suggested coordinated party expenditures had to be limited to prevent corruption or its appearance. The court also stated that coordinated party expenditures were "indistinguishable in substance" from the candidate's campaign expenditures. Since, under *Buckley*, candidate expenditures cannot be limited, coordinated party expenditures also cannot be regulated.

U.S. Supreme Court (95-489); U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit (93-1433 and 93-1434); U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado (89-1159). ♦

(Court Cases continued on page 4)

Correction

The chart appearing on page 10 of the March 1999 *Record* contained two errors regarding FEC conference dates. The year for the conferences in April and in May-June should have been 1999. A corrected chart appears on page 9 of this issue.

Court Cases

(continued from page 3)

National Committee of the Reform Party v. FEC

On February 9, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed a lower court ruling that had dismissed this case. The district court had declined to certify claims brought by the National Committee of the Reform Party to an en banc panel of the appeals court. The district court had determined that the Reform Party lacked standing in regard to some of its claims and failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted with respect to its remaining claims.

Background

In this case, the Committee, the Reform Party of California, campaign committees of former Reform Party Presidential candidate Ross Perot and an individual voter who supported Mr. Perot in the 1996 Presidential election alleged that:

- The issue ads paid for by the 1996 Democratic and Republican presidential campaigns caused the Reform Party monetary damages by reducing the number of votes its Presidential candidate received and thereby reducing the amount of federal funding the party nominee would be entitled to in the 2000 election.
- The statutory composition of the FEC at 2 U.S.C. §437c(a)(1), which states that no more than three members of the six-member Commission may be affiliated with the same political party, is unconstitutional.
- The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act (Fund Act) is unconstitutional because it denies equal protection by providing greater funding to major party candidates than it does to minor party candidates.

In addition to these claims, the Committee contended the Republican and Democratic defendants

owed it damages under California and federal laws. See the [January 1998 Record](#), p. 2, and the [April 1998 Record](#), p. 4.

Appeals Court

Issue Advertisements. The appellate court found that neither California nor federal law authorized the Committee's suit for damages related to issue advertisements produced by the Republican and Democratic committees. The FEC's power to sue alleged violators of the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) is the "exclusive civil remedy" for enforcement of the Act. 2 U.S.C. §437d(e). (Entities may, however, seek judicial review of the agency's dismissal of an administrative complaint alleging violations of the Act.) The Committee argued unsuccessfully that the FEC's "exclusive civil remedy" did not preclude the Reform Party Committee from acting as a private party and suing for damages.

Legislative history is instructive here, the court found. Before the 1976 amendments to the Act, there was confusion over just which agency should enforce the statute. In those amendments, Congress added the word "exclusive" to prohibit enforcement suits by other agencies. There is no indication that Congress was, at the same time, approving private suits. The U.S. Supreme Court has also noted that there is no authority supporting the contention that Congress intended to have anyone other than the government enforce the Act (*FEC v. National Conservative Political Action Committee*, 470 U.S. 480 (1985)).

In addition, the Commission has a process in place by which entities can pursue their charges that the Act or FEC regulations have been violated.

Commission Composition. The Act states that no more than three members of the Commission may be affiliated with the same political party. 2 U.S.C. §437c(a)(1). Com-

mission seats historically have been equally divided between Democrats and Republicans only. Appellants claimed that this provision violates the Appointments Clause and their rights to free speech and equal protection. The court said that they lacked standing to raise this claim because they did not explain how the relief they requested—the invalidation of the party affiliation provision—would make minority party representation on the Commission more likely.

Fund Act. The Committee's facial challenge to the Fund Act, based on First Amendment and equal protection arguments, is foreclosed by *Buckley v. Valeo*, the court found. The Supreme Court held that the Fund Act "is a congressional effort, not to abridge, restrict, or censor speech, but rather to use public money to facilitate and enlarge public discussion and participation in the electoral process." *Buckley* went on to say that the public funding system does not discriminate against minor parties. "[T]he inability, if any, of minor-party candidates to wage effective campaigns will derive not from lack of public funding but from their inability to raise private contributions."

The Committee also argued that, as applied, the Fund Act "invidiously" discriminates against the Reform Party. The appellate court rejected this claim, concluding that the types of complaints expressed by the Reform Party were understood and taken into account by the Supreme Court when it rejected the claims of invidious discrimination in *Buckley*.

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 98-15443; U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, C97-4048. ♦

FEC v. Forbes

On February 19, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York dismissed this lawsuit after both parties asked for the action. The court order was preceded by the Commission's 4-2 vote to withdraw the lawsuit against 1996 Presidential candidate Malcolm S. "Steve" Forbes, Jr.

The FEC had asked the court in September 1998 to find that bi-weekly columns authored by the candidate in *Forbes Magazine* resulted in violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act by Mr. Forbes, the magazine, his 1996 committee and the corporation he controls. See the [November 1998 Record](#), p. 2.

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, 98 Civ. 6148. ♦

Judd v. FEC

On February 22, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit denied a motion by Keith Judd to vacate its ruling in this case. The court dismissed the case for lack of prosecution in April 1998 and later declined Mr. Judd's request for a rehearing and a rehearing en banc of the dismissal.

Mr. Judd had asked the court to find that the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account Act is unconstitutional and to award him public funding equal to that received by President Bill Clinton during his 1996 reelection effort. See articles in the following *Record* issues: [January 1999](#), [October 1998](#) and [June 1998](#).

U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 98-1078. ♦

On Appeal?

FEC v. Al Salvi for Senate Committee (98C-4933)

On February 26, the FEC appealed this case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, had dismissed this case on the grounds that it was identical to a case the Commission had previously filed in the court. That first case (98-1321) was dismissed on technical grounds. In both suits, the FEC asked the court to find that the committee misreported or failed to report more than \$1.1 million in contributions and loans during the 1996 election cycle. See the [April 1998 Record](#), p. 4, and the [October 1998 Record](#), p. 2. ♦

Advisory Opinions

AO 1999-1 Use of Campaign Funds for Candidate Salary

Mark Greene, a Texas resident planning to run for Congress in 2000, cannot use campaign funds to pay himself a salary during the campaign. Such disbursements would result in the conversion of campaign funds to personal use, which is prohibited at 2 U.S.C. §439a.

Commission regulations define personal use as any use of campaign funds to cover an expense that would exist irrespective of the candidate's campaign or duties as a federal officeholder. 11 CFR 113.1(g). The regulations go on to list specific examples of personal use such as household expenses; clothing; and mortgage, rent or utility payments for the candidate's

personal residence. 11 CFR 113.1(g)(1)(i). Expenses not covered in the regulations—such as salary payments to a candidate from his or her campaign—are examined on a case-by-case basis, based on the general definition of personal use.

Mr. Greene, an independent general contractor, stated that his \$5,000 average monthly income would be cut when he took time from work to pursue a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, and that making up lost income would be "vital to the plausibility" of his election efforts. Mr. Greene had planned to enter into a written contract with his campaign committee to receive a salary sufficient to offset the business income he would lose due to time spent on campaign activities.

A number of expenses that Mr. Greene wanted to cover with the campaign-paid salary—mortgage payments, utilities, groceries and clothing—are specifically mentioned in the regulations as falling within the category of personal use. The other expenses he described, while not specifically named in the regulations, would exist regardless of whether he was a candidate for federal office. In effect, Mr. Greene's plan would result in his campaign committee doing indirectly what it cannot do directly—pay for expenses that are not related to the campaign.

Past advisory opinions, addressing the issue of donating campaign funds to a charity in which the candidate played a leadership role, have similarly prevented the personal use of campaign funds in an indirect manner, concluding that donated campaign funds may not be used for salary or compensation to a candidate or candidate's family member. AOs 1997-1, 1996-40, 1985-30 and 1983-27.

Despite Mr. Greene's assertion that the necessity of his full-time

(continued on page 6)

Advisory Opinions

(continued from page 5)

service to the campaign would cause financial difficulties, the Commission notes that candidates have traditionally taken a significant role in their campaigns regardless of remuneration. Further, the Commission distinguishes between salary payments to a candidate (which cannot be covered with campaign funds) and payments for additional expenses incurred by a candidate in connection with conducting the campaign, such as travel to campaign events and additional child care related to those events. The latter may be paid with campaign funds. AO 1995-42.

Date: February 25, 1999; Length: 5 pages. ♦

AO 1999-2 Corporate Sponsorship of Candidate Lunch Forums

Premera Blue Cross may conduct candidate forums before all of its employees, and serve lunch to those who attend, provided it follows the requirements for such events established by 11 CFR 114.4(b)(1).

Premera plans to hold forums in 1999 and 2000 that would feature congressional candidates speaking about nonpartisan issues. Candidates competing for the same seats would be invited to speak at separate forums. Premera plans to invite all employees to attend the forums during their lunch hour, and to provide meals for all who participate. Participation is voluntary. To publicize the forums, Premera intends to post flyers throughout the corporate campus. None of the flyers would include any campaign language, such as "Elect" or "Re-elect," but rather would inform employees that the events are nonpartisan and intended to educate them on relevant issues. Candidates would not be permitted to distribute campaign literature; nor would they

be able to solicit employees for contributions while on the corporate campus.

Commission Regulations

Commission regulations prohibit contributions and expenditures by a corporation in connection with a federal election. 11 CFR 114.2(b). The regulations, however, provide that corporations may make certain communications—including candidate and political party appearances on corporate premises—to its employees. 11 CFR 114.4(b)(1). If a corporation sponsors a candidate appearance before all employees (rather than just its executive and administrative personnel), then the corporation must follow these guidelines:

- If one candidate vying for a particular congressional seat is permitted to address all employees, then the corporation must give a similar opportunity to any other candidate for that seat who requests to appear.
- A corporation must provide comparable time and facilities to candidates who appear before employees unless it can demonstrate that such actions are impractical.
- The candidate, his/her representative or a party representative—but not a representative of the corporation—may solicit contributions for the candidate, but no one may collect contributions before, during or after a candidate appearance. A candidate, however, may leave behind campaign materials or envelopes for the audience.
- Neither the corporation nor the PAC may expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate or encourage employees to do so.
- Coordination between a corporation and a candidate, candidate's agent and candidate committee can include discussions about the structure, format and timing of the candidate's appearance. Such

discussions must not, however, include talk of the candidate's plans, projects or needs relating to the campaign.

- News media may be present during the appearances.
- A corporation may not reproduce or distribute candidate campaign materials.

Permissibility of Forums

So long as Premera follows the guidelines listed above, its planned forums are permissible. Although Premera may not use any campaign signs to announce the forums, it can, on its own, produce and distribute forum announcements that identify the speakers by name and the office they are seeking. Premera may use, in these announcements, campaign-provided photos and biographical information. 11 CFR 114.4(b)(1)(vii). Premera may also provide free lunch to forum attendees. The Commission views the expenses associated with providing lunch to forum participants as a cost directly related to sponsoring the event and thus permissible under Commission regulations.

Date Issued: March 8, 1999; Length: 6 pages. ♦

Advisory Opinion Requests

Advisory opinion requests are available for review and comment in the Public Records Office.

AOR 1999-3

Use of digital signatures by restricted class to authorize payroll deductions (Microsoft Corporate Political Action Committee, February 9, 1999; 3 pages)

AOR 1999-4

Applicability of contribution limits to local party organization conducting federal activity and affiliated with state party committee (Republican Party of Minnesota, February 25, 1999; 4 pages)

AOR 1999-5

Revising state party ballot composition ratio for new executive office (Democratic Party of New Mexico, February 25, 1999; 2 pages)

AOR 1999-6

Use and publication of information about annuity allotment program permitting union member retirees to make contributions to separate segregated fund (National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, February 26, 1999; 2 pages plus 18-page attachment)

AOR 1999-7

Free hyperlinks on government web site to web sites of candidates (Minnesota Office of the Secretary of State, March 12, 1999; 7 pages) ♦

Request for Reconsideration of Advisory Opinion

1999-1

The requester has asked the Commission to reconsider this advisory opinion. The opinion, issued February 25, concluded that Mark Greene could not use campaign funds from his authorized committee to pay himself a salary. See page 5 in this issue for a summary of the opinion. ♦

Regulations

Commission Opens Comment Period for Electronic FOIA Amendments

On February 25, the Commission approved a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to seek comments on proposed amendments to the FEC's Freedom of Information Act regulations. The amendments comply with the Electronic

(continued on page 8)

Louisiana Special General Election Reporting

Committees¹ involved in the May 1 special general election and/or the May 29 special runoff election to fill the 1st Congressional District seat that was vacated by former Congressman Robert Livingston must follow the reporting schedules below. Note that 48-hour notices are required of authorized committees that receive contributions (including loans) of \$1,000 or more between April 12 and April 28 in the special general election and between May 10 and May 26 in the special runoff election (if the runoff is required).

For Committees Involved Only in Special General When No Runoff is Held:

	Close of Books	Certified/ Registered Mail Date	Filing Date
Pre-General	April 11	April 16	April 19
Post-General	May 21	June 1	June 1

For Committees Involved in Special General and Special Runoff:

	Close of Books	Certified/ Registered Mail Date	Filing Date
Pre-General	April 11	April 16	April 19
Pre-Runoff	May 9	May 14	May 17
Post Runoff	June 18	June 28	June 28

For Committees Involved Only in Special General When Both Special General and Runoff Elections Are Held:

	Close of Books	Certified/ Registered Mail Date	Filing Date
Pre-General	April 11	April 16	April 19
Mid-Year	June 30	July 31	July 31

For Committees Involved Only in Special Runoff:

	Close of Books	Certified/ Registered Mail Date	Filing Date
Pre-Runoff	May 9	May 14	May 17
Post-Runoff	June 18	June 28	June 28

¹These committees include authorized committees of candidates running in the election and other political committees that support these candidates and do not file monthly.

Regulations

(continued from page 7)

Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996 (EFOIA), which was enacted to make covered documents available by electronic means.

The deadline for comments is April 5.

Among the proposed changes:

- Add to Commission regulations a requirement that requesters specify the format in which they wish to receive their requested information, including electronic formats.
- Make available any records previously released as a result of a FOIA request where the Commission determines that it is likely that the same records will be requested again, as well as an index of these records.
- Conform FEC regulations to reflect that the Commission has 20 working days to decide whether to comply with a FOIA request.
- Incorporate EFOIA's new procedures for handling a delay or denial of a FOIA request.
- Aggregate related FOIA requests by a single requester or group of requesters when the Commission determines that the requests actually constitute a single request or involve clearly related matters.
- Implement the EFOIA's expedited processing procedures in cases of "compelling need." This would be limited to situations where there is an imminent threat to the life or safety of an individual or when there is an urgency to inform the public about a government activity.
- Notify requesters of the volume of requested materials to which they have been denied access.
- Prioritize records requests for faster processing.

The Commission is also proposing several amendments unrelated to EFOIA. The NPRM includes a proposal to delete a reference to two Commission ex officio positions

that were declared unconstitutional. Additionally, the NPRM proposes to distinguish between those records available under the FOIA and those available under other statutes, which are available from the Commission's Public Records Office. The affected regulations are at 11 CFR Parts 2, 4 and 5.

The notice, published in the March 4 *Federal Register* (64 FR 10405), is available from the following sources:

- Public Records at 800/424-9530 (press 3); and
- FEC Faxline at 202/501-3413 (request document 238).

Public comments must be submitted in either written or electronic form to Susan E. Propper, Assistant General Counsel. Written comments should be mailed to the Federal Election Commission, 999 E St., NW, Washington, DC 20463. Faxed comments should be transmitted to 202/219-3923, with a copy mailed to the preceding address to ensure legibility. Comments also may be sent by e-mail to EFOIA@fec.gov. Electronic submissions must include the commenter's full name, e-mail address and postal mail address. ♦

Federal Register

Federal Register notices are available from the FEC's Public Records Office.

Notice 1999-5

Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (64 FR 10405, March 4, 1999)

Notice 1999-6

Filing Dates for the Louisiana Special Election (64 FR 13582, March 19, 1999)

Outreach

FEC 1999-2000 Conference Series Begins April 22

The FEC is again sponsoring a series of conferences on campaign finance. At each conference, Commissioners and FEC staff will conduct practical workshops on various aspects of the law.

The first conference, a Corporate and Labor Conference scheduled for April 22-23, will be held in Washington, DC, at the Hyatt Regency on Capitol Hill. The registration fee of \$250 covers the conference, materials, breakfasts, lunches and refreshments.

The second conference, the Membership and Trade Association Conference, will be held on June 7-8 in Arlington, VA, at the Doubletree Hotel Pentagon City. The registration fee for this conference is \$225.

To register for a conference, call 800/246-7277 or send an e-mail to tsylvester@worldnet.att.net. All registration forms and fees for the Corporate and Labor Conference must be postmarked by April 8. Registration forms and fees must be postmarked by May 24 for the Membership and Trade Association Conference. Late registrations will be assessed an additional \$10 fee.

For information about programs and workshops being featured at the conferences, call the FEC's Information Division at 800/424-9530 (press 1) or 202/694-1100.

A tentative schedule for conferences in 1999 and 2000 appears on the next page. The schedule, a list of workshops and registration forms are also available at the FEC's web site—<http://www.fec.gov> (click on "What's New!"). The *Record* will announce more details about the conferences once plans have been finalized. ♦

(Outreach continued on page 10)

FEC Conference Schedule

Type	Place	Date
Corporate and Labor Conference	Washington, DC	April 22-23, 1999
Membership and Trade Association Conference	Washington, DC	June 7-8, 1999
Partnership Conference	Washington, DC	July 1999
Regional Conference (Includes candidate, corporate/labor and party workshops)	Chicago, IL	September 1999
Regional Conference (Includes candidate, corporate/labor and party workshops)	San Francisco, CA	November 15-17, 1999
Candidate Conference	Washington, DC	February 2000
Regional Conference (Includes candidate, corporate/labor and party workshops)	Miami, FL	March 2000
Corporate and Labor Conference	Washington, DC	May 2000
Membership and Trade Association Conference	Washington, DC	June 2000

PACronyms, Other PAC Publications Available

The Commission annually publishes *PACronyms*, an alphabetical listing of acronyms, abbreviations and common names of political action committees (PACs).

For each PAC listed, the index provides the full name of the PAC, its city, state, FEC identification number and, if not identifiable from the full name, its connected, sponsoring or affiliated organization.

The index is helpful in identifying PACs that are not readily identified in their reports and statements on file with the FEC.

To order a free copy of *PACronyms*, call the FEC's Disclosure Division at 800/424-9530 (press 3) or 202/694-1120. *PACronyms* also is available on diskette for \$1 and can be accessed free under the "Using FEC Services" icon at the FEC's web site—<http://www.fec.gov>. Other PAC indexes, described below, may be ordered from the Disclosure Division. Prepayment is required.

- An alphabetical list of all registered PACs showing each PAC's identification number, address, treasurer and connected organization (\$13.25).
- A list of registered PACs arranged by state providing the same information as above (\$13.25).
- An alphabetical list of organizations sponsoring PACs showing the PAC's name and identification number (\$7.50).

The Disclosure Division can also conduct database research to locate federal political committees when only part of the committee name is known. Call the telephone numbers above for assistance or visit the Public Records Office in Washington at 999 E St., N.W.

Outreach

(continued from page 8)

FEC Conducts Monthly Roundtable Sessions

The FEC is conducting monthly roundtable sessions for the regulated community at its offices in Washington. The roundtable sessions, limited to 12 participants per session, focus on a range of topics. See the table below for dates and topics.

Registration is \$25 and will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. Please call the FEC before registering or sending money

to be sure that openings remain in the session of your choice. Prepayment is required. The registration form is available at the FEC’s web site (<http://www.fec.gov>) and from Faxline, the FEC’s automated fax system (202/501-3413, request document 590). For more information, call 800/424-9530 (press 1) or 202/694-1100.

Individuals who have signed up for a roundtable but who will be unable to attend are strongly encouraged to call the FEC and cancel their registration so that the next person on the waiting list may attend in their place. ♦

Date	Subject	Intended Audience
April 7 9:30 -11 a.m.	FEC Rules on Use of the Internet to Raise Funds (Code #499)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates • Political Party Staff • Nonconnected PACs
May 5 9:30 -11 a.m.	Fundraising Through Payroll Deductions and Combined Dues/PAC Solicitations (Code #599)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate/Labor/Trade PAC Staff • Lawyers, Accountants and Consultants to Above PACs
June 2 9:30 -11 a.m.	Candidate Reporting Basics (Code #699)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House and Senate Candidates



Public Appearances

April 2	Medill News Service Washington, DC Kevin Salley, Deputy Assistant Staff Director, Public Records Branch
April 7	Women in Government Relations, Inc. Washington, DC Scott Thomas, Chairman
April 23-25	Radio and Television News Directors Foundation San Francisco, CA Eileen Canavan, Deputy Assistant Staff Director, Public Disclosure Division

Index

The first number in each citation refers to the “number” (month) of the 1999 *Record* issue in which the article appeared. The second number, following the colon, indicates the page number in that issue. For example, “1:4” means that the article is in the January issue on page 4.

Advisory Opinions

- 1998-22: Application of expenditure definition and disclaimer requirements to web site containing express advocacy, 1:16
- 1998-23: Status as state committee of political party, 1:16
- 1998-26: Candidate committee’s acceptance of loan repayment from contested election trust fund that contains funds loaned to it by candidate, 3:5
- 1998-27: Status as state committee of political party, 3:6
- 1999-1: Use of campaign funds to pay salary to candidate, 4:5
- 1999-2: Use of corporate treasury funds to provide meals to employees attending candidate forums, 4:6

Compliance

- MUR 4750: Excessive contributions, 1:13
- MUR 4751: Excessive and improper transfers of nonfederal funds, excessive contributions, corporate contributions, 2:2
- MUR 4796: Corporate contributions, contributions in the names of others, 1:13
- MUR 4834: Foreign national contribution, contribution in the name of another, 3:7

Court Cases

- FEC v. _____
- Al Salvi for Senate Committee (98C-4933), 4:5
- Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 4:1
- Forbes, 4:5

- _____ v. FEC
- Judd, 1:3; 4:5
- Mariani, 2:1
- National Committee of the Reform Party, 4:4
- RNC (98-5263), 1:2
- Other
- Burris v. Russell, 1:3
- Cincinnati v. Kruse, 1:3

Regulations


- Definition of “Member” of Membership Association, 1:10; 3:1
- Electronic FOIA, 4:7
- Express Advocacy, 3:2
- Limited Liability Companies, 1:11
- Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Candidates, 1:7; 3:1
- Soft money, 1:12
- Status of, 3:3

Reports

- Electronic filing, 1:6; 2:1
- Reports due in 1999, 1:4
- Special election, Georgia, 2:3
- Special election, Louisiana, 4:7

Statistics

- Congressional, 2:4
- PAC, 3:11
- Party, 3:4



FECFile Order Form

Do you want to file your FEC reports electronically? The FEC will mail you a copy of its new, free electronic filing software—FECFile. Mail or fax this form to the address/number below. Currently, FECFile operates on Windows95 and WindowsNT platforms.

FEC Identification Number _____

Committee Name _____

Electronic Filing Contact Name _____

Address: Street 1 _____

Address: Street 2 _____

City _____

State _____

Zip Code _____

Phone Number _____

Fax Number _____

E-mail Address _____

Federal Election Commission
 Data Division—Room 431
 999 E Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20463
 Fax: 202/219-0674

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, \$300



Printed on recycled paper

Bulk Rate Mail
Postage and Fees Paid
Federal Election Commission
Permit Number G-31

