

RECEIVED
2010 DEC 17 AM 11:47
FEC MAIL CENTER

Perkins
Coie

607 Fourteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-2003
PHONE: 202.628.6600
FAX: 202.434.1690
www.perkinscoie.com

Brian G. Svoboda
PHONE: (202) 434-1654
FAX: (202) 654-9150
EMAIL: BSvoboda@perkinscoie.com

December 16, 2010

Jeff S. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination & Legal Administration
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 6411

Dear Mr. Jordan:

On behalf of Majority Action PAC and Judy Zamore, as treasurer, we submit this letter in response to the Complaint filed by Let Freedom Ring, Inc., dated October 22, 2010. This Complaint falsely alleges that expenditures made by Majority Action PAC following statements made by Democratic candidates and aides constitute coordinated communications. The Complaint fails to provide any credible support for this claim, and fails to state any facts that, if true, would constitute a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (the "Act").

The Commission may find "reason to believe" only if a complaint sets forth sufficient specific facts, which, if proven true, would constitute a violation of the Act. See 11 C.F.R. § 111.4(d). Unwarranted legal conclusions from asserted facts or mere speculation will not be accepted as true, and provide no independent basis for investigation. See Commissioners Mason, Sandstrom, Smith and Thomas, Statement of Reasons, MUR 4960 (Dec. 21, 2001). The Commission therefore should find no reason to believe that the Committee violated the Act, and should dismiss the matter immediately.

I. Facts

Majority Action PAC is a federally registered political action committee. Throughout October 2010, Majority Action PAC made independent expenditures in support of Democratic candidates. These independent expenditures were all properly reported by Majority Action PAC to the Commission. As these reports demonstrate, none were in support of Speaker Nancy Pelosi

58502-0001/LEGAL19792933.1

ANCHORAGE · BEIJING · BELLEVILLE · BOISE · CHICAGO · DENVER · LOS ANGELES
MENLO PARK · PHOENIX · PORTLAND · SAN FRANCISCO · SEATTLE · SHANGHAI · WASHINGTON, D.C.

Perkins Coie LLP and Affiliates

11044294512

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
2010 DEC 17 PM 1:23
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

Jeff S. Jordan
December 16, 2010
Page 2

or Representative John Larson – the only two federal candidates identified in the body of the Complaint – or in opposition to either of their opponents.

The Complaint alleges that, before Majority Action PAC made these independent expenditures, news reports were published detailing the disparity in spending by outside groups supporting Republican and Democratic candidates in the November 2, 2010, election. The Complaint highlights two such reports which attribute comments to Speaker Pelosi and Representative Larson about the need for outside groups to "do more" in support of Democratic candidates. Complaint 2-4. Neither report refers to Majority Action PAC, nor indicates any contact between either Member and Majority Action PAC.

Relying *solely* on the fact that these comments were made before Majority Action PAC made independent expenditures, Let Freedom Ring, Inc. filed the present Complaint. The Complaint makes no specific allegation of any contact between Majority Action PAC and the two Democratic Members of Congress. And it offers no other fact to support the inference that Majority Action PAC coordinated its spending with any third party, other than that its spending occurred after the comments attributed to Speaker Pelosi and Representative Larson.

II. Legal Analysis

To determine whether a communication is coordinated with a candidate, authorized committee, political party committee, or any agent of the foregoing, Commission regulations provide a three-pronged test: (1) the communication must be paid for by a person other than that candidate, authorized committee, or political party committee; (2) one or more of the content standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. 109.21(c) must be satisfied; and (3) one or more of the conduct standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. 109.21(d) must be satisfied. See 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a).

Majority Action PAC does not dispute that it paid for public communications that expressly advocated the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for federal office, and therefore satisfied at least one of the elements of 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a). But, the communications paid for by Majority Action PAC do not satisfy any of the conduct standards set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d).

The only conduct standard cited in the Complaint involves a communication made at the "request or suggestion" of a candidate, authorized committee, or political party committee. 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d)(1). The standard is satisfied if (i) the communication is created, produced, or distributed at the request or suggestion of a candidate, authorized committee, or political party committee or (ii) the communication is created, produced, or distributed at the suggestion of a person paying for the communication and the candidate, authorized committee, or political party committee assents to the suggestion. *Id.*

Jeff S. Jordan
December 16, 2010
Page 3

The Complaint presents no evidence that the communications paid for by Majority Action PAC were made at the "request or suggestion" of any candidate, candidate's committee, or political party committee. The "request or suggestion" conduct standard covers only "requests or suggestions made to a select audience, but not those offered to the public generally." Explanation and Justification, Coordinated and Independent Expenditures, 68 Fed.Reg. 432 (Jan. 3, 2003). Here, the public comments attributed to Speaker Pelosi and Representative Larson were not directed to Majority Action PAC or any other specific entity. Furthermore, the comments referred only to Democrats in general, and were reported by *Roll Call* and *Politico*, publications available to the public at large. The Complaint alleges no private communication between Speaker Pelosi or Representative Larson and Majority Action PAC.

Additionally, even if it were true that a "request or suggestion" was made, the Complaint presents no evidence that any such request or suggestion was made with respect to the specific candidates supported or opposed by the communications paid for by Majority Action PAC. The Commission has expressly stated that "[n]either of the two prongs of this conduct standard can be satisfied without some link between the request or suggestion and the candidate or political party who is, or that is, clearly identified in the communication." Explanation and Justification, Coordinated and Independent Expenditures, 68 Fed.Reg. 431 (Jan. 3, 2003). The only candidates mentioned in the Complaint are Speaker Pelosi and Representative Larson; neither of whom is identified in any of the communications made by Majority Action PAC. Indeed, the Complaint presents no evidence of any contact whatsoever between Majority Action PAC and any candidate or party.

Finally, the only evidentiary basis for the coordination alleged in the complaint is the timing of the public comments made by Speaker Pelosi and Representative Larson and the communications made by Majority Action PAC. The timing of activities cannot be relied upon as evidence of coordination where, as here, spending on independent expenditures would necessarily increase during the month before the general election. The Commission itself has recognized that "nearly all Senate and House candidate advertising takes place within 60 days of an election." See Explanation and Justification, Coordinated Communications, 71 Fed. Reg. 33194 (June 8, 2006). If the rules did not require a specific allegation of contact between a candidate and a third-party spender, but allowed an investigation based simply on the fallacy of "after this, therefore because of this," then they would chill large amounts of lawful conduct.

Thus, the Complaint presents no violation of the Act. It alleges no communication sponsored by Majority Action PAC that referred to Representatives Pelosi or Larson, or to their opponents. Nor does it allege that Representatives Pelosi or Larson were agents of anyone else with respect to Majority Action PAC's communications. See 11 C.F.R. § 109.3. It presents public comments attributed to the two officeholders, and speculates from those comments that some sort of private contact may have occurred. But it alleges no contact whatsoever between anyone and Majority

Jeff S. Jordan
December 16, 2010
Page 4

Action PAC. Instead, it simply presumes that every independent expenditure in support of any Democratic candidate by any non-party group – including Majority Action PAC – must have been made at Representative Pelosi or Larson's request or suggestion. This is a far cry from the "sufficiently specific allegation" that the Commission requires to proceed on a complaint. See Statement of Reasons, MUR 4960.

For the reasons set forth above, the Committee respectfully requests that the Commission find no reason to believe that Majority Action PAC has violated the Act, and dismiss this matter immediately.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. G. Svoboda", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brian G. Svoboda
Ezra W. Reese
Counsel to Majority Action PAC