

12 March 2005

Adam M. Taff  
177 Hillcrest West  
Lake Quivira, KS 66217

Federal Elections Commission  
OGC  
Complaints Examination and Legal Administration  
999 E. St NW  
Washington, DC 20463

Re: MUR 5649

RECEIVED  
FEDERAL ELECTION  
COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF GENERAL  
COUNSEL  
2005 MAR 16 P 12:44

Dear Complaints Examination and Legal Administration:

Thank you for your letter received March 3<sup>rd</sup>. Your letter describes a complaint lodged against the Taff for Congress Campaign Committee. Please accept this letter as the Committee's response to your letter.

1. The Committee has always made every attempt to comply with FEC rules. The Committee has a history of frequent calls to the Commission, prior to report filings, inquiring about correct reporting procedures. With the new campaign finance laws in place for the 2004 election cycle, the Committee engaged in its absolute best faith efforts to understand and comply with the new requirements.
2. Numerous questions and phone calls by the Committee to the FEC regarding new rules were answered, in effect, with "We are not sure – this is a new regulation and no one exactly knows."

It was our understanding on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004, the date of one particular phone call, and in subsequent conversations with other campaigns, that our Committee and other campaigns did not know or understand that they were required to indicate who paid for the calls. It is the Committee's understanding, after conversations with other campaigns, consultants, and national party representatives, that numerous other campaigns were not putting a paid for claim on their automated phone calls.

85759206152

- 25190263239
3. When questioned the following day, August 3<sup>rd</sup>, by the local press, we readily and publicly acknowledged that the Committee paid for the call. This acknowledgement was printed in the newspaper.
  4. This complaint was sent to the FEC over six months after the phone call was made on August 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004. The Committee questions why this issue was not raised by Ms. Rothman immediately. In fact, she was a staunch supporter of my opponent in the 2004 primary election, and this complaint appears to be "sour grapes" on her part.
  5. The call was accurately recorded on the Committee's Third Quarter 2004 FEC report as an expense to E-Media in Davis, California. The total cost of the call was \$2,961.30, and was made during a primary election.
  6. The Committee, while paying all third party expenses, still maintains significant debt largely in the form of a personal loan from me. In addition, I intend to discontinue the Committee at the conclusion of the upcoming quarter and will submit a request to the Commission to discontinue further reporting requirements (accepting the personal debt as unrecoverable).
  7. Given the effort to immediately acknowledge the call to the press, and the small amount of expense of this call, we believe this is not the sort of matter that warrants the expenditure of valuable Commission resources.
  8. If I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me anytime. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very Respectfully,



Adam M. Taff