

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This matter was generated from a Commission audit of Canseco for Congress
3 ("Committee"), the principal campaign committee of Francisco Canseco, a 2010 House
4 candidate in the 23rd Congressional District of Texas. On November 3, 2014, the Commission
5 approved its Final Audit Report regarding the Committee's activity from January 1, 2009
6 through December 31, 2010 ("Audit Report").³ The Audit Report included the following three
7 findings that the Audit Division referred to the Office of the General Counsel ("OGC") for
8 possible enforcement action: (1) the Committee received two prohibited foreign national
9 contributions totaling \$100,000 from Inmuebles Caza, S.A. de C.V., ("Caza"), a corporation
10 organized in Mexico; (2) the Committee received excessive contributions totaling \$170,343 from
11 four individuals; and (3) the Committee misstated its financial activity for 2009 and 2010, and
12 did not file amended disclosure reports.⁴

13 OGC notified Respondents of the Referral and gave them an opportunity to respond.
14 Responses were filed by Caza, Jorge Canseco (Francisco Canseco's brother and one percent
15 owner of Caza), Canseco Investments, Ltd. (a domestic limited partnership organized in Texas
16 that owns 99% of Caza⁵), and Rod Lewis (an associate of Francisco Canseco who made an
17 apparent \$147,600 excessive contribution to Canseco⁶).

³ See Final Audit Report of the Commission on Canseco for Congress at 7 (January 1, 2009 – December 31, 2010), Attachment I.

⁴ See Memo to Lisa J. Stevenson from Patricia C. Orrock Re: Canseco for Congress (A11-03)[sic]-Referral Matters (Nov. 12, 2014).

⁵ Canseco Investments, Ltd. is owned by Francisco Canseco and his seven brothers and sisters, either directly or through U.S. entities they own. Caza Resp. at 1-2. According to Caza, all of the Canseco family members who own interests in Canseco Investments, Ltd. are U.S. citizens and reside in Texas, Colorado, New York, or California. *Id.* at 2. A corporation, FMC Developers, Inc., is the general partner of Canseco Investments, Ltd. Audit Rpt. at 7 n. 4.

⁶ Resp. of Rod Lewis at 1 ("Lewis Response").

1108430420041001

1 The Committee did not respond to the referral notification, but Caza and Jorge Canseco
2 filed a joint response which Canseco Investments, Ltd. relied on,⁷ and Lewis filed a separate
3 response. The responses, however, present no additional substantive arguments beyond those
4 previously presented to, and considered by, the Commission during the audit process.⁸
5 Therefore, based on the discussion below and the analysis and findings set forth in the Audit
6 Report, which is herein incorporated by reference, we recommend that the Commission open a
7 MUR, make the following reason to believe findings, and enter into pre-probable cause
8 conciliation with the Committee, Francisco Canseco, Caza, Jorge Canseco, and Rod Lewis:

- 9 • The Committee violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by accepting a
10 foreign national contribution in the amount of \$100,000;
- 11 • The Committee violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
12 knowingly accepting excessive contributions in the amount of \$170,343;
- 13 • The Committee violated 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)) by
14 misstating its financial activity for calendar years 2009 and 2010;
- 15 • Rod Lewis violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)) by making a
16 \$147,600 excessive contribution to the Committee;
- 17 • Inmuebles Caza, S.A. de C.V. violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e)
18 by making a \$100,000 prohibited foreign national contribution;
- 19 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by
20 soliciting, accepting, or receiving a contribution by a foreign national;
- 21 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
22 knowingly accepting excessive contributions;
- 23 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
24 knowingly accepting excessive contributions;
- 25 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
26 knowingly accepting excessive contributions;
- 27 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
28 knowingly accepting excessive contributions;
- 29 • Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by
knowingly accepting excessive contributions;

⁷ Response of Canseco Investments, Ltd. at 1.

⁸ With regard to the alleged foreign national contributions, Caza's joint response reiterated two points that were rejected by the Commission during the audit process: (1) that the funds transferred from Caza to the candidate were the candidate's personal funds, and (2) that Caza is not a "truly foreign corporation" because it is held by an American partnership. Caza Resp. at 1-2. With regard to his alleged excessive contribution, Lewis acknowledged in his response that it was an "inadvertent violation" of the Act and requested that the Commission exercise its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss the matter as to him. Lewis Resp. at 2.

- 1 • Jorge Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by knowingly
2 providing “substantial assistance” in the solicitation, making, accepting, or receipt of
3 a contribution from a foreign national.
4

5 We also recommend that the Commission take no action against Canseco Investments, Ltd.

6 **II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

7 **A. Foreign National Contributions**

8 The Act and Commission regulations prohibit any person from knowingly soliciting,
9 accepting, or receiving a contribution from a foreign national, or from knowingly providing
10 “substantial assistance” in the solicitation, making, accepting, or receipt of a contribution from a
11 foreign national.⁹ For foreign national contributions, the Commission specifically defines
12 “knowingly” as (i) having actual knowledge that the source of funds is a foreign national, (ii)
13 being aware of facts that would lead a reasonable person to conclude that there is a substantial
14 probability that the source of funds is a foreign national, or (iii) being aware of facts that would
15 lead a reasonable person to inquire whether the source of funds is a foreign national, and failing
16 to conduct a reasonable inquiry.¹⁰

17 On January 29, 2010, and April 13, 2010, the Committee accepted receipts in the
18 amounts of \$14,000 and \$86,000, respectively. The Committee asserts that these receipts were
19 loans from the personal funds of the candidate.¹¹ The audit determined, however, that the source

⁹ 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e); 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(g), (h).

¹⁰ 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(a)(4). As the Commission has explained, in addition to section 110.20(a)(4)(i), which established actual knowledge, sections 110.20(a)(4)(ii), (iii) establish two additional *mens rea* standards: a “‘reason to know’ standard under which a person should have acted as though a fact existed until it could be proven otherwise” or a “willful blindness, which is applicable to situations in which a known fact should have prompted a reasonable inquiry, but did not.” See Explanation and Justification: Contributions and Limitations, 67 Fed. Reg. 69,928, 69,941 (Nov. 19, 2002).

¹¹ Audit Rpt. at 8-10. The \$14,000 receipt was not disclosed on the Committee’s reports, and the \$86,000 receipt was reported by the Committee as a loan from the personal funds of the candidate. *Id.* at 7.

100414001

1 of these funds was Caza, a foreign national corporation registered in Mexico.¹² Therefore, we
2 recommend that the Commission find reason to believe that Caza and the Committee each
3 violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by making and accepting, respectively, a
4 prohibited contribution from a foreign national.

5 Further, Francisco Canseco accepted the two deposits from Caza before transferring them
6 to the Committee.¹³ Because Canseco is a partner in Canseco Investments, Ltd., which owns
7 99% of Caza, he likely had actual knowledge that Caza is a foreign national corporation, but at
8 the least had "reason to know" the foreign nature of the funds. *See* 11 C.F.R. §
9 110.20(a)(4)(i),(ii). Therefore, we recommend that the Commission find reason to believe
10 Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by knowingly
11 accepting or receiving a contribution from a foreign national.

12 The available information also reflects that Jorge Canseco knowingly provided
13 "substantial assistance" in the making, accepting, or receipt of a contribution from a foreign
14 national. The Commission has explained that "substantial assistance" means active involvement
15 in the solicitation, making, receipt or acceptance of a foreign national contribution or donation
16 with an intent to facilitate successful completion of the transaction, and does not include "strictly
17 ministerial activity undertaken pursuant to the instructions of an employer, manager or
18 supervisor."¹⁴ According to his affidavit, Jorge Canseco, as president and part owner of Caza,
19 participated in setting the terms for making the two disbursements to Francisco Canseco from

¹² *See id.* at 5-10.

¹³ Audit Rpt. at 7-8.

¹⁴ *See* Explanation and Justification: Contributions and Limitations, 67 Fed. Reg. 69,928, 69,941 (Nov. 19, 2002).

1100440611

1 Caza's bank account in January and April 2010.¹⁵ Therefore, we also recommend that the
2 Commission find reason to believe Jorge Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C.
3 § 441e).

4 Finally, we recommend that the Commission take no action against Canseco Investments,
5 Ltd. The Commission concluded that the source of the funds received by the Committee on
6 January 29, 2010 (\$14,000) and on April 13, 2010 (\$86,000) was Caza.¹⁶ Therefore, it does not
7 appear that Canseco Investments, Ltd. made any contributions to the Committee.

8 B. Excessive Contributions

9 The Act prohibits any person from making a contribution¹⁷ to any candidate that exceeds
10 the limits of the Act (\$2,400 in 2010), and likewise prohibits any candidate or political
11 committee from knowingly accepting such contribution.¹⁸ The "knowing" acceptance of a
12 contribution requires knowledge of the underlying facts that constitute the prohibited act, but not
13 knowledge that the act itself — such as acceptance of an excessive contribution — is unlawful.¹⁹

¹⁵ Caza Resp., Affidavit of Jorge Canseco ¶¶ 6-8, 11, 15.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 7-10.

¹⁷ A contribution is any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for Federal office. 52 U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i)).

¹⁸ 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)). 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 441a(f)); *see* MUR 6417 (Jim Huffman for Senate) (candidate violated section 30116(f) (formerly section 441a(f)) by accepting funds from another source then transferring them to the Committee as "personal funds"); MUR 5408 (Sharpton 2004) (candidate violated section 30116(f) (formerly section 441a(f)) by accepting funds and using them for campaign activity).

¹⁹ *See FEC v. Dramesi*, 640 F. Supp. 985, 987 (D.N.J. 1986).

20250424061

1 \$50,231 and ending cash on hand by \$61,512, and overstated receipts by \$324,404 and
2 disbursements by \$313,123.²⁵ Therefore, we recommend that the Commission find reason to
3 believe that the Committee violated 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)).

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

1100140010001

²⁵ *Id.* at 17.

UNCLASSIFIED

3 **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4 1. Open a MUR.
- 5
- 6 2. Find reason to believe Canseco for Congress and Randy Blair in his official
7 capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by
8 receiving a foreign national contribution.
- 9
- 10 3. Find reason to believe Canseco for Congress and Randy Blair in his official
11 capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f))
12 by knowingly receiving excessive contributions.
- 13
- 14 4. Find reason to believe Canseco for Congress and Randy Blair in his official
15 capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30104(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 434(b))
16 by misstating its financial activity for calendar years 2009 and 2010.
- 17
- 18 5. Find reason to believe Rod Lewis violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a) (formerly
19 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)) by making an excessive contribution to the Committee.
- 20
- 21 6. Find reason to believe Inmuebles Caza, S.A. de C.V. violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121
22 (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by making a foreign national contribution.
- 23
- 24 7. Find reason to believe Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly
25 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by soliciting, accepting, or receiving a foreign national
26 contribution.
- 27

1004161414001

100014001

- 1 8. Find reason to believe Francisco Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30116(f) (formerly
- 2 2 U.S.C. § 441a(f)) by knowingly accepting excessive contributions.
- 3
- 4 9. Find reason to believe Jorge Canseco violated 52 U.S.C. § 30121 (formerly
- 5 2 U.S.C. § 441e) by soliciting, accepting, or receiving a contribution by a foreign
- 6 national.
- 7
- 8 10. Take no action against Canseco Investments, Ltd.
- 9
- 10 11. Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analyses.
- 11
- 12 12. Enter into conciliation with the Canseco for Congress and Randy Blair in his
- 13 official capacity and Francisco Canseco prior to a finding of probable cause to
- 14 believe and approve the attached Conciliation Agreement.
- 15
- 16 13. Enter into conciliation with Inmuebles Caza, S.A. de C.V. and Jorge Canseco
- 17 prior to a finding of probable cause to believe and approve the attached
- 18 Conciliation Agreement.
- 19
- 20 14. Enter into conciliation with Rod Lewis prior to a finding of probable cause to
- 21 believe and approve the attached Conciliation Agreement.
- 22
- 23 15. Approve the appropriate letters.

Daniel A. Petalas
Associate General Counsel for Enforcement

26 2-24-14

27 Date

Kathleen Guith

Kathleen Guith
Deputy Associate General Counsel for
Enforcement

William A. Powers

William A. Powers
Assistant General Counsel

Peter Reynolds

Peter Reynolds
Attorney

42 Attachments:

- 43 (1) Final Audit Report of the Commission on Canseco for Congress (January 1, 2009 –
- 44 December 31, 2010)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

1504430428



Final Audit Report of the Commission on Canseco for Congress

(January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2010)

Why the Audit Was Done

Federal law permits the Commission to conduct audits and field investigations of any political committee that is required to file reports under the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act).¹ The Commission generally conducts such audits when a committee appears not to have met the threshold requirements for substantial compliance with the Act.² The audit determines whether the committee complied with the limitations, prohibitions and disclosure requirements of the Act.

Future Action

The Commission may initiate an enforcement action, at a later time, with respect to any of the matters discussed in this report.

About the Campaign (p. 2)

Canseco for Congress is the principal campaign committee for Francisco R. Canseco, Republican candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives from the State of Texas, 23rd District, headquartered in San Antonio, Texas. For more information, see the chart on the Campaign Organization, p. 2.

Financial Activity (p. 2)

• Receipts	
○ Contributions from Individuals	\$ 972,233
○ Contributions from Other Political Committees	316,035
○ Candidate Loans	321,880
○ Other Receipts	9,794
Total Receipts	\$ 1,619,942
• Disbursements	
○ Operating Expenditures	\$ 1,481,985
○ Repayment of Candidate Loans	58,505
Total Disbursements	\$ 1,540,490

Commission Findings (p. 3)

- Receipt of Prohibited Contributions (Finding 1)
- Receipt of Contributions that Exceed Limits (Finding 2)
- Misstatement of Financial Activity (Finding 3)

¹ On September 1, 2014, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"), was transferred from Title 2 of the United States Code to the new Title 52 of the United States Code.

² 52 U.S.C. §30111(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. §438(b)).

Final Audit Report of the Commission on Canseco for Congress

(January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2010)

1900141642001



Table of Contents

	Page
Part I. Background	
Authority for Audit	1
Scope of Audit	1
Audit Hearing	1
Part II. Overview of Campaign	
Campaign Organization	2
Overview of Financial Activity	2
Part III. Summaries	
Commission Findings	3
Part IV. Commission Findings	
Finding 1. Receipt of Prohibited Contributions	5
Finding 2. Receipt of Contributions that Exceed Limits	10
Finding 3. Misstatement of Financial Activity	15

11002404420001

Part I

Background

Authority for Audit

This report is based on an audit of Canseco for Congress (CFC), undertaken by the Audit Division of the Federal Election Commission (the Commission) in accordance with the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the Act). The Audit Division conducted the audit pursuant to 52 U.S.C. §30111(b) (formerly 2 U.S.C. §438(b)), which permits the Commission to conduct audits and field investigations of any political committee that is required to file a report under 52 U.S.C. §30104 (formerly 2 U.S.C. §434). Prior to conducting any audit under this subsection, the Commission must perform an internal review of reports filed by selected committees to determine whether the reports filed by a particular committee meet the threshold requirements for substantial compliance with the Act. 52 U.S.C. §30111(b), (formerly 2 U.S.C. §438(b)).

Scope of Audit

Following Commission-approved procedures, the Audit staff evaluated various risk factors and as a result, this audit examined:

1. the receipt of excessive contributions and loans;
2. the receipt of contributions from prohibited sources;
3. the disclosure of contributions received;
4. the disclosure of individual contributors' occupation and name of employer;
5. the consistency between reported figures and bank records;
6. the completeness of records; and
7. other campaign operations necessary to the review.

Audit Hearing

CFC requested a hearing before the Commission. The request was granted and the hearing was held on June 12, 2014. At the hearing, Counsel addressed two issues, one related to the receipt of prohibited contributions in Finding 1 and the second, outstanding amounts owed to contributors for excessive contributions identified in Finding 2.

Part II Overview of Campaign

Campaign Organization

Important Dates	
• Date of Registration	January 7, 2004
• Audit Coverage	January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2010
Headquarters	San Antonio, Texas
Bank Information	
• Bank Depositories	Two
• Bank Accounts	Two Checking Accounts
Treasurer	
• Treasurer When Audit Was Conducted	Randy Blair
• Treasurer During Period Covered by Audit	Randy Blair
Management Information	
• Attended Commission Campaign Finance Seminar	No
• Who Handled Accounting and Recordkeeping Tasks	Paid Staff

Overview of Financial Activity (Audited Amounts)

Cash-on-hand @ January 1, 2009	\$ 0
Receipts	
o Contributions from Individuals	972,233
o Contributions from Other Political Committees	316,035
o Candidate Loans	321,880
o Other Receipts	9,794
Total Receipts	\$1,619,942
Disbursements	
o Operating Expenditures	1,481,985
o Repayment of Candidate Loans	58,505
Total Disbursements	\$1,540,490
Cash-on-hand @ December 31, 2010	\$ 79,452

Part III Summaries

Commission Findings

Finding 1. Receipt of Prohibited Contributions

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified two contributions totaling \$100,000 that appear to be prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation. CFC Counsel (Counsel) stated that these transactions were loans from the candidate; however, the funds appear to have originated from the account of a foreign national corporation. Counsel later stated these funds represent draws from partnership capital accounts of the candidate and his sister.

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel disputed this finding and disagreed with the classification of these loans as contributions from a foreign national corporation. However, on May 1, 2013, CFC issued a check for \$55,395 to refund the contribution received from the foreign national corporation. The remaining \$44,605 is a prohibited contribution that has not been resolved.

The Commission approved a finding that CFC accepted prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation in the amount of \$100,000, of which \$44,605 remains unresolved, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed. (For more detail, see p. 5.)

Finding 2. Receipt of Contributions that Exceed Limits

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified three transactions that Counsel stated were loans from the candidate. However, these transactions appear to be excessive contributions from four individuals who loaned the candidate funds. The total amount in excess of the individual contribution limit is \$170,343.

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel provided documentation demonstrating that \$160,293 was refunded to the appropriate contributors in an untimely manner. However, the documentation was not sufficient to demonstrate that CFC had repaid the remaining \$10,050 to the appropriate contributors ($\$170,343 - \$160,293 = \$10,050$). The Audit staff considers the remaining \$10,050 to be excessive contributions from two individuals that are not resolved.

The Commission approved a finding that CFC accepted excessive contributions in the amount of \$170,343, of which \$10,050 remains unresolved, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed. (For more detail, see p. 10.)

Finding 3. Misstatement of Financial Activity

During audit fieldwork, a comparison of CFC's reported financial activity with its bank records revealed misstatements of beginning and ending cash-on-hand, as well as, misstatements of receipts and disbursements for calendar years 2009 and 2010. For 2009, CFC overstated beginning cash-on-hand by \$32,344, understated receipts by \$13,161, understated disbursements by \$31,048, and overstated ending cash-on-hand by \$50,231. For 2010, CFC overstated beginning cash-on-hand by \$50,231, overstated receipts by \$324,404, overstated disbursements by \$313,123, and overstated ending cash-on-hand by \$61,512.

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel stated that, in order to avoid multiple filings of amendments, CFC would comply with all the recommendations once the Commission had finalized the audit.

The Commission approved a finding that CFC misstated its financial activity for calendar years 2009 and 2010, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed. (For more detail, see p. 15.)

1002410014001

Part IV

Commission Findings

Finding 1. Receipt of Prohibited Contributions

Summary

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified two contributions totaling \$100,000 that appear to be prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation. CFC Counsel (Counsel) stated that these transactions were loans from the candidate; however, the funds appear to have originated from the account of a foreign national corporation. Counsel later stated these funds represent draws from partnership capital accounts of the candidate and his sister.

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel disputed this finding and disagreed with the classification of these loans as contributions from a foreign national corporation. However, on May 1, 2013, CFC issued a check for \$55,395 to refund the contribution received from the foreign national corporation. The remaining \$44,605 is a prohibited contribution that has not been resolved.

The Commission approved a finding that CFC accepted prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation in the amount of \$100,000, of which \$44,605 remains unresolved, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed.

Legal Standard

A. Receipt of Prohibited Contributions – General Prohibition. Candidates and committees may not accept contributions (in the form of money, in-kind contributions, or loans):

- In the name of another;
- From the treasury funds of the following sources:
 - Corporations (i.e., any incorporated organization, including a non-stock corporation, an incorporated membership organization, and an incorporated cooperative);
 - Labor Organizations; and
 - National Banks;
- From Federal Government Contractors (including partnerships, individuals, and sole proprietors who have contracts with the federal government); or
- From Foreign nationals (including individuals who are not U.S. citizens and not lawfully admitted for permanent residence; foreign governments and foreign political parties; and groups organized under the laws of a foreign country or groups whose principal place of business is in a foreign country, as defined in 22 U.S.C. §611(b)), 52 U.S.C. §§30118, 30119, 30121 and 30122 (formerly 2 U.S.C. §§441b, 441c, 441e and 441f).

B. Contribution. A gift, subscription, loan (except a loan made in accordance with 11 CFR §§100.82 and 100.83), advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for federal office is a contribution. The term *loan* includes a guarantee, endorsement, and any other form of security. A loan

130842001

that exceeds the contribution limitations of 52 U.S.C. §30116 (formerly 2 U.S.C. §441a) and 11 CFR part 110 shall be unlawful whether or not it is repaid. A loan is a contribution at the time it is made and is a contribution to the extent that it remains unpaid. The aggregate amount loaned to a candidate or committee by a contributor, when added to other contributions from that individual to that candidate or committee, shall not exceed the contribution limitations set forth at 11 CFR part 110 and 11 CFR §100.52(a) and (b).

C. Authorized Committee Limits. An authorized committee may not receive more than a total of \$2,400 per election from any one person or \$5,000 per election from a multicandidate political committee. 52 U.S.C. §30116 (a)(1)(A), 2(A) and (F), (formerly 2 U.S.C. §441a(a)(1)(A), (2)(A) and (F)); 11 CFR §§110.1(a) and (b) and 110.9(a).

D. Partnership Contributions. In addition to counting against the partnership's limits, a contribution from a partnership must be attributed to individual partners:

- According to each partner's share of the partnership's profits; or
- On another basis agreed to by the partners.

If the partnership attributed contributions on the basis of option 2 above, it must reduce only the contributing partners' profits (or increase their losses) and the profits must be reduced in proportion to the contribution attributed to the partner. Under both options listed above, the portion attributed to each partner must not, when aggregated with other contributions from that person, exceed his or her contribution limit. 11 CFR §110.1(e).

E. Questionable Contributions. If a committee receives a contribution that appears to be prohibited (a questionable contribution), it must follow the procedures below:

- Within 10 days after the treasurer receives the questionable contribution, the committee must either:
 - Return the contribution to the contributor without depositing it; or
 - Deposit the contribution (and follow the steps below).
11 CFR §103.3(b)(1).
- If the committee deposits the questionable contribution, it may not spend the funds and must be prepared to refund it. Therefore sufficient funds to make the refunds must be maintained or a separate account in a campaign depository must be established for possibly illegal contributions. 11 CFR §103.3(b)(4).
- The committee must keep a written record noting the basis for the appearance of illegality, and it must include this information when reporting the receipt of the contribution. 11 CFR §103.3(b)(5).
- Within 30 days of the treasurer's receipt of the questionable contribution, the committee must make at least one written or oral request for evidence that the contribution is legal. Evidence of legality includes, for example, a written statement from the contributor explaining why the contribution is legal or an oral explanation that is recorded by the committee in a memorandum.
11 CFR §103.3(b)(1).
- Within the 30-day period, the committee must either:
 - Confirm the legality of the contribution; or
 - Refund the contribution to the contributor and note the refund on the report covering the period in which the refund was made.
 - 11 CFR §103.3(b)(1), (5).

F. Personal Funds. Personal funds of a candidate consist of assets, income, or jointly owned spousal assets. Assets are amounts derived from any asset that, under applicable state law, at the time the individual became a candidate, the candidate had legal right of access to or control over, and with respect to which the candidate had legal and rightful title or an equitable interest. Personal funds may also be income received during the current election cycle of the candidate, including salary and other earned income from bona fide employment and income from stocks or investments, including interest, dividends or proceeds from the sale of such stocks or investments. 11 CFR §100.33.

G. Expenditures by Candidates. Candidates for Federal office may make unlimited expenditures from personal funds as defined in the paragraph above. 11 CFR §110.10.

H. Reporting Loans. All loans received by a committee must be itemized and continuously reported until repaid. All repayments made on a loan must also be itemized. 11 CFR §§104.3(a)(4)(iv), (b)(4)(iii) and 104.11.

Facts and Analysis

A. Facts

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified two transactions totaling \$100,000 (\$14,000 + \$86,000), which Counsel stated were loans the candidate made to CFC. The source of these funds appear to be prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation and not the candidate's personal funds.

Prohibited Contribution-\$14,000

On January 29, 2010, \$14,000 was transferred into a CFC bank account. This transaction was not disclosed on CFC's reports (See Finding 3- Misstatement of Financial Activity, Loans Not Reported). Counsel stated that this amount was a loan to the candidate from his partnership. In support of this statement, Counsel provided a letter stating that the loan was made to the candidate from Inmuebles Caza, S.A.de C.V ("Caza").³ Caza is 99 percent owned by Canseco Investments, Ltd. ("Canseco Investments"), while 1 percent is owned by Jorge Canseco, a brother of the candidate. In addition, the candidate is a limited partner of Canseco Investments.⁴ Counsel also provided several e-mails between other partners and from the president of Caza, which taken together explain that this amount was borrowed from Caza, based on the candidate's capital account in the partnership. The Audit staff did not review bank documentation relating to the source of these funds because it came from an account that was not owned by CFC. CFC did not make any repayments on this loan prior to the audit.

Prohibited Contributions-\$86,000

On April 13, 2010, a check for \$86,000 was deposited into a CFC bank account. This transaction was disclosed as a loan from the candidate on CFC's reports. A copy of the deposit documentation shows that this was a cashier's check remitted by Caza. Counsel provided two signed promissory notes showing that \$58,000 was a loan to the candidate from his sister, and \$28,000 as a loan to the candidate from Canseco Investments. The

³ Caza is a foreign national corporation registered in Mexico.

⁴ According to its filings with The Texas Secretary of State, Canseco Investments, Ltd. is a domestic limited partnership with FMC Developers, Inc., a corporation, as its general partner.

e-mails described in the preceding paragraph also explain that these amounts represent the balance of each partner's capital account in Caza.

CFC reported repayments totaling \$44,605 to the candidate on its disclosure reports. However, Counsel did not provide documentation demonstrating that these payments were paid to either the candidate or Caza. Additionally, the Audit staff could not trace payments, as reported, to CFC's bank account.

The Audit staff concludes that the amounts of \$14,000 and \$86,000 represent apparent prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation. Counsel maintains that these amounts represent personal investments in the partnership;⁵ however, Counsel did not provide documentation to support that these were distributions to partners from Canseco Investments. Furthermore, the business registration of Canseco Investments does not indicate whether any of these individuals are partners; the only listed partner is a corporation.

B. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation

At the exit conference, the Audit staff presented these apparent prohibited contributions to CFC. Counsel said that CFC would take another look at this matter.

The Interim Audit Report recommended that CFC demonstrate that the sources of funds for the amounts deposited were made with the candidate's personal funds or other permissible funds. Absent such a demonstration, it was recommended that CFC refund the \$14,000 apparent prohibited contribution and the \$41,395⁶ remaining of the \$86,000 apparent prohibited contribution. Additionally, the Audit staff recommended that CFC amend its reports to correctly disclose the source of these funds.

C. Committee Response to the Interim Audit Report

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel disagreed with the classification of these loans as prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation. Counsel said that the loans represent the candidate and his sister's equitable interest in Canseco Investments and, therefore, represent their personal funds. Furthermore, Counsel said that Canseco Investments acts as a holding company for its only investment, Caza, and Canseco Investments relies on Caza to provide for its banking needs. All transactions for Canseco Investments are processed by Caza and through Caza's accounts. Specifically, Counsel said that (1) "all of the expenses and payments on behalf of Canseco Investments are made directly by Caza in the ordinary course of business; (2) Caza pays dividends directly to the owners of Canseco Investments, which are treated for tax purposes as dividends from Canseco Investments and not Caza; and (3) tax payments and expenses

⁵ If the funds received from Caza are deemed permissible and not prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation, the amount of funds from the candidate's sister and/or the partnership may be considered an excessive contribution.

⁶ Information provided by Counsel in response to the Interim Audit Report showed that a \$30,000 repayment and two repayments totaling \$14,600 were erroneously applied to the \$86,000 CFC reported as a candidate loan. The \$30,000, was in fact a repayment of excessive contributions from individuals noted in Finding 2. Repayments totaling \$14,600 have not been applied to the prohibited contribution amounts in either finding because Counsel has not provided documentation to verify receipt by the appropriate payee.

incurred by Canseco Investments are paid for by Caza." Counsel said the loans made to the candidate and his sister were paid by Caza, akin to other expenses paid on behalf of Canseco Investments. Moreover, the loans represent the candidate's and his sister's proportional interests in the assets of Canseco Investments, less an estimated tax liability.^{7,8}

Counsel stated that, "while these loans may not meet the technical requirements set forth in 11 CFR §100.83, they are fundamentally different than a contribution for two key reasons." First, Counsel considered the loans derived from an asset for which the candidate had a legal ownership share and an equitable interest. He compared the loans to borrowing against a retirement plan or a life insurance policy. Second, Counsel stated that the interest rates charged by Caza on these loans to the candidate and his sister were above commercially available lending rates; hence, the candidate was not given an unfair lending advantage or a "sweetheart deal."

While CFC's explanation expanded on previous statements made during fieldwork, the information did not establish that the funds at issue constituted the candidate's personal funds (11 CFR §100.33(b)). Funds originating from Caza, a foreign national corporation, do not lose their character merely because the company is an asset held by a U.S. limited partnership, i.e., Canseco Investments. The Audit staff concluded that Caza was the source of funds for the candidate's \$100,000 loan to CFC.

Subsequently, on May 1, 2013, Counsel submitted documentation demonstrating that CFC made untimely repayments of the loan to Caza totaling \$55,395. CFC has not filed amended reports to correctly disclose the loan indicating the source of the loan as Caza. Counsel stated that, in order to avoid multiple filings of reports, CFC would comply with all the recommendations, once the audit had been finalized. Below are details explaining the resolution of these repayments.

Prohibited Contribution-\$14,000

On May 1, 2013, CFC issued a check to Caza repaying what Counsel had said was a \$14,000 loan. The Audit staff considers this amount a repayment of a prohibited contribution that was resolved in an untimely manner.

Prohibited Contributions-\$86,000

On May 1, 2013, CFC issued a check to Caza repaying \$41,395 of what was disclosed by CFC as an \$86,000 loan. The Audit staff considers this amount a prohibited contribution that was resolved in an untimely manner.

On June 5, 2013, Counsel stated that a portion (\$30,000) of the \$44,605 reported as a repayment to the candidate was attributable to another candidate loan (See Finding 2). The Audit staff requested documentation to substantiate that the remaining \$44,605 was repaid to the candidate or Caza. Counsel has not provided this documentation. As such, the Audit staff considers the remaining \$44,605 to be a prohibited contribution that has not been resolved in response to the Interim Audit Report.

⁷ Counsel provided a redacted K-1 for the candidate showing his partnership interest in Canseco Investments. Counsel also stated that the funds were loaned to the candidate and not distributed due to various tax concerns.

⁸ Counsel asserted that the borrowers' percentage of ownership interest is at risk for non-payment of loans that are secured by their ownership interest in Canseco Investments.

D. Draft Final Audit Report

The Draft Final Audit Report disagreed with the CFC's argument that the funds received were from the personal funds of the candidate, but did acknowledge that CFC repaid \$55,395 of the prohibited contribution, leaving an outstanding balance of \$44,605. In addition, the Draft Final Audit Report noted that CFC did not file amended reports to correctly disclose the source of these funds.

E. Committee Response to the Draft Final Audit Report

CFC responded to the Draft Final Audit Report by requesting an audit hearing.

F. Audit Hearing

At the audit hearing, Counsel did not introduce any new information. Counsel disagreed with the classification of these loans as prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation. Counsel stated that the funds, totaling \$100,000, represented the candidate and his sister's personal funds because they were drawn from their respective equitable interests in Canseco Investments.

Counsel said that Canseco Investments preferred not to make a personal funds distribution to the candidate and his sister for tax reasons; and therefore, preferred to distribute the funds as a loan. Counsel said that while these loans might not have met the technical requirements of 11 CFR §100.83, they were fundamentally different than contributions for two reasons. First, the funds were derived from an asset for which the candidate had a legal ownership share or equitable interest. Moreover, that these loans were identical to loans where an individual borrows from a retirement plan or whole life insurance policy in which the individual has invested funds in those plans. Second, the loans were not a "sweetheart" deal because they were collateralized by the candidate's equitable interest in Canseco Investments (and therefore less risky than other loans), the terms were commercially reasonable, and the interest rates charged were above market rates.

Counsel also stated during the audit hearing, that the promissory notes securing the \$100,000 in loans reflected agreements between the candidate and Canseco Investments. Furthermore, Counsel stated that the candidate did not know that the funds he loaned to CFC were from Caza.

Commission Conclusion

On September 18, 2014, the Commission considered the Audit Division Recommendation Memorandum in which the Audit staff recommended the Commission find that CFC accepted prohibited contributions from a foreign national corporation in the amount of \$100,000, of which \$44,605 remains unresolved, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed.

The Commission approved the Audit staff's recommendation.

Finding 2. Receipt of Contributions that Exceed Limits**Summary**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified three transactions that Counsel stated were loans from the candidate. However, these transactions appear to be excessive

Facts and Analysis

A. Facts

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff identified three transactions that Counsel stated were loans from the candidate; however, they appear to be excessive contributions from four individuals. The total amount that exceeds the individual contribution limit is \$170,343.

Excessive Contribution-\$150,000

On April 27, 2010, a deposit of \$150,000 was made to the CFC bank account. The deposit documentation showed that this was a check from an individual written to the candidate, but deposited directly into CFC's bank account.

The \$150,000 transaction was disclosed as a loan from the candidate on CFC's reports. The Audit staff requested documentation showing that this loan was made with the candidate's personal funds. Counsel responded that the funds were derived from the sale of the candidate's stock. Later, Counsel stated that this was a personal loan made to the candidate from an individual and provided a copy of a signed promissory note.

The Audit staff concluded, in accordance with 52 U.S.C. §30102(e)(2) (formerly 2 U.S.C. §432(e)(2)), that the candidate had received a personal loan as an agent for CFC. Therefore, absent further explanation and documentation, this transaction resulted in an excessive contribution of \$147,600⁹ from the individual.

CFC disclosed a repayment of \$10,000 to the candidate on April 28, 2010, in connection with the reported \$150,000 loan. However, CFC has not provided sufficient documentation to substantiate that the funds were repaid to the original contributor. Although CFC disclosed the repayment transaction on a report to the Commission, the only document provided to the Audit staff was a bank statement showing a \$10,000 check. No documentation was provided to identify the payee.

Excessive Contributions-\$30,000

On December 10 and 18, 2009, \$22,000 and \$8,000, respectively, were transferred into CFC's bank account from the candidate's personal bank account. The \$22,000 was incorrectly disclosed on CFC's reports as a loan; the \$8,000 loan was not reported. (The misreporting of these loans are included in Finding 3, Misstatement of Financial Activity, under Loans Not Reported of \$15,330.) Counsel stated that these amounts represented loans from the candidate. However, additional documentation provided by CFC showed that the funds used to make these transfers did not come from the candidate's personal funds. The funds were personal loans from different individuals made to the candidate and deposited into the candidate's personal account. Since these funds were used for campaign activity, the personal loans resulted in contributions to CFC. The Audit staff performed a cash balance analysis on the candidate's personal account and determined that the funds transferred to CFC (\$22,000 and \$8,000) could only have come from three individuals. Absent further documentation and explanation, CFC's receipt of these funds results in contributions by three individuals that exceed the contribution limits by \$22,743.¹⁰

⁹ This amount was derived by subtracting \$2,400, the contribution limit for an individual, from the contribution amount, \$150,000.

¹⁰ The excessive amount reflects contributions of \$15,093, \$7,157, and \$7,693, minus a \$2,400 contribution limit for three individuals (\$7,200).

150644061

B. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation

During an interim fieldwork meeting, the Audit staff requested further information to support that the contributions described above were permissible. At the exit conference, Counsel stated that the candidate had already repaid some of the contributions that comprised the \$22,000 and \$8,000 contributions. The Audit staff commented that CFC may need to make further refunds. CFC has not reported repayments to these individuals and the Audit staff has not received documentation to support the repayments.

The Interim Audit Report recommended that CFC demonstrate that the contributions were not excessive or that they originated from the candidate's personal funds. Absent such a demonstration, the Audit staff recommended that CFC refund the excessive contributions, \$147,600 and \$22,743, to the original contributors or provide documentation showing that refunds had already been made and that the refund checks were negotiated. Furthermore, the Audit staff recommended that CFC amend its reports to correctly disclose the source of funds for these loans.

C. Committee Response to the Interim Audit Report

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel submitted documentation demonstrating that CFC made repayments totaling \$160,293, as outlined below. CFC did not file amended reports. Counsel stated that, in order to avoid multiple filings of reports, CFC would comply with all the recommendations once the Commission had finalized the audit.

In a subsequent meeting held with Counsel to discuss report changes made since the issuance of the Interim Audit Report, Counsel expressed concern regarding the repayment of the two excessive contributions for \$10,050. Counsel felt that an affidavit submitted by an intermediary payee, a Mr. Beckelhymer,¹¹ supporting the repayment should be sufficient documentation and that CFC should not have to make a second repayment. In addition, Counsel thought this might be an issue CFC would want to raise with the Commission.

Excessive Contribution-\$150,000

On May 1, 2013, CFC issued a check¹² to the contributor for \$147,600 to repay the excessive contribution amount. The Audit staff considers the \$147,600 an excessive contribution that was refunded untimely.

Excessive Contributions-\$30,000

Counsel submitted documentation showing that a cashier's check for \$28,000 was issued to Mr. Beckelhymer on September 22, 2010, who then paid other individuals who had loaned the candidate funds or whom CFC owed interest on their loans. Counsel did not provide sufficient documentation to demonstrate repayment to the other two contributors who made excessive contributions. The Audit staff considers \$12,693 to one of the three contributors as an excessive contribution that was refunded in an untimely manner and

¹¹ Mr. Beckelhymer was not only an Intermediary payee, but obtained loans for the candidate that were deposited into CFC's accounts.

¹² The Audit staff was provided a copy of the canceled check and the corresponding bank statement that supported the contributor's repayment.

100547400144

the remaining \$10,050 from two contributors to be excessive contributions that CFC has not refunded.¹³

D. Draft Final Audit Report

The Draft Final Audit Report acknowledged that CFC repaid \$160,293 to the appropriate contributors in an untimely manner. However, the documentation was not sufficient to demonstrate that CFC had repaid the remaining \$10,050 to the appropriate contributors (\$170,343 - \$160,293 = \$10,050). The Audit staff considers the remaining \$10,050 to be excessive contributions from two individuals that were not resolved.

E. Committee Response to the Draft Final Audit Report

CFC responded to the Draft Final Audit Report by requesting an audit hearing.

F. Audit Hearing

At the audit hearing, Counsel disputed the Audit staff's conclusion that \$10,050 remains unresolved and said sufficient documentation had been provided to demonstrate that excessive contributions totaling \$10,050 were repaid to the original contributors. Counsel stated that the Commission was provided a signed affidavit by Mr. Beckelhymer,¹⁴ who coordinated raising funds to make the loan to the candidate and that the affidavit showed that Mr. Beckelhymer repaid the other excessive contributors.

Counsel, in responding to questions concerning why records were not available to support the repayments described in the affidavit said, it was his understanding that Mr. Beckelhymer was repaid with a cashier's check for \$28,000¹⁵, because he was responsible for the repayment to the other original contributors. Counsel also said he had never spoken to the original contributors and did not have their personal banking records, which made it a challenge to provide adequate documentation to the Audit staff.

Counsel also explained why the original contributors were repaid via Mr. Beckelhymer and not directly by CFC. Counsel stated that the excessive contributions were returned to the original contributors in the same manner in which they were received and recorded by CFC; that is, the funds were received from the candidate, recorded and reported as a loan from the candidate; and therefore, refunded to the candidate, who then issued the cashier's check to Mr. Beckelhymer.

In conclusion, Counsel stated that amounts considered unresolved by the Audit staff were already repaid to the original contributors and that if the Commission determines that CFC must repay another \$10,050, then double payments will have been made with campaign funds in violation of the personal use regulations at 52 U.S.C. §30114(b)(1)) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 439 (b)(1)).

¹³ CFC should provide documentation for the remaining \$10,050 to support that the two other contributors received refunds.

¹⁴ Mr. Beckelhymer provided a signed declaration that stated it was made, "under penalty of perjury."

¹⁵ A copy of the Cashier's check was provided to the Audit staff.

Commission Conclusion

On September 18, 2014, the Commission considered the Audit Division Recommendation Memorandum in which the Audit staff recommended the Commission find that CFC had accepted excessive contributions in the amount of \$170,343, of which \$10,050 remains unresolved, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed.

The Commission approved the Audit staff's recommendation.

Finding 3. Misstatement of Financial Activity

Summary

During audit fieldwork, a comparison of CFC's reported financial activity with its bank records revealed misstatements of beginning and ending cash-on-hand, as well as, misstatements of receipts and disbursements for calendar years 2009 and 2010. For 2009, CFC overstated beginning cash-on-hand by \$32,344, understated receipts by \$13,161, understated disbursements by \$31,048, and overstated ending cash-on-hand by \$50,231. For 2010, CFC overstated beginning cash-on-hand by \$50,231, overstated receipts by \$324,404, overstated disbursements by \$313,123, and overstated ending cash-on-hand by \$61,512.

In response to the Interim Audit Report, Counsel stated that, in order to avoid multiple filings of amendments, CFC would comply with all the recommendations once the Commission had finalized the audit.

The Commission approved a finding that CFC misstated its financial activity for calendar years 2009 and 2010, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed.

Legal Standard

Contents of Reports. Each report must disclose:

- The amount of cash-on-hand at the beginning and end of the reporting period;
- The total amount of all receipts for the reporting period and for the election cycle;
- The total amount of all disbursements for the reporting period and for the election cycle; and
- Certain transactions that require itemization on Schedule A (Itemized Receipts) or Schedule B (Itemized Disbursements). 52 U.S.C. §30104(b)(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) (formerly 2 U.S.C. §434(b)(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5)).

Facts and Analysis

A. Facts

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reconciled CFC's reported financial activity with its bank records for calendar years 2009 and 2010. The following chart outlines the discrepancies for the beginning cash balance, receipts, disbursements, and ending cash balance for 2009. Succeeding paragraphs address the reasons for the misstatements.

2009 Activity			
	Reported	Bank Records	Discrepancy
Beginning Cash Balance @ January 1, 2009	\$ 32,344	\$ 0	\$ 32,344 Overstated
Receipts	\$160,551	\$173,712	\$ 13,161 Understated
Disbursements	\$101,630	\$132,678	\$ 31,048 Understated
Ending Cash Balance @ December 31, 2009	\$ 91,265	\$ 41,034	\$ 50,231 Overstated

The beginning cash balance on January 1, 2009, was overstated by \$32,344. The Audit staff's analysis could not explain this overstatement but it likely resulted from prior period discrepancies.

The understatement of receipts resulted from the following:

• Receipts not reported	\$ 1,000
• Loans received by CFC not reported or incorrectly reported (Net)	15,330
• Reported contributions from individuals not supported by deposits	(2,025)
• Unexplained difference	(1,144)
Net Understatement of Receipts	\$ 13,161

The understatement of disbursements resulted from the following:

• Disbursements not reported	\$ 41,912
• Reported disbursements not supported by a check or debit	(10,864)
Net Understatement of Disbursements	\$ 31,048

CFC overstated the ending cash balance on December 31, 2009, by \$50,231 as a result of the misstatements described above.

2010 Activity			
	Reported	Bank Records	Discrepancy
Beginning Cash Balance @ January 1, 2010	\$ 91,265	\$41,034	\$ 50,231 Overstated
Receipts	\$1,770,634	\$1,446,230	\$ 324,404 Overstated
Disbursements	\$1,720,935	\$1,407,812	\$ 313,123 Overstated
Ending Cash Balance @ December 31, 2010	\$ 140,964	\$ 79,452	\$ 61,512 Overstated

The overstatement of receipts resulted from the following:

• Receipts not reported	\$ 1,676
• Return deposit items reported as loans	(305,000)
• Loans received by CFC not reported	14,000
• Duplicate reporting of contributions	(22,121)
• Unexplained difference	(12,959)
Net Overstatement of Receipts	<u>\$ (324,404)</u>

The overstatement of disbursements resulted from the following:

• Disbursements not reported	\$ 36,250
• Return deposit items reported as loan repayments	(305,000)
• Reported disbursements not supported by a check or debit	(44,369)
• Unexplained different	(4)
Net Overstatement of Disbursements	<u>\$ (313,123)</u>

As a result of the above discrepancies, CFC overstated the ending cash balance on December 31, 2010, by \$61,512.

B. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation

At the exit conference, the Audit staff provided Counsel with a list of discrepancies and report adjustments. Counsel acknowledged the adjustments. The Audit staff informed Counsel that it would recommend these adjustments in the Interim Audit Report.

The Interim Audit Report recommended that CFC amend its FEC filings to correct misstatements and amend its most recently filed report to correct its cash-on-hand balance.¹⁶ The Audit staff also recommended that CFC reconcile the cash balance of its most recent report to identify any subsequent discrepancies that might affect its adjustments.

C. Committee Response to the Interim Audit Report

In response to the Interim Audit Report, CFC did not file amended reports. Counsel stated that, in order to avoid multiple filings of reports, CFC would comply with all the recommendations once the Commission had finalized the audit.

D. Draft Final Audit Report

The Draft Final Audit Report acknowledged CFC's response, that it would comply with all the recommendations once the Commission had finalized the audit.

E. Committee Response to the Draft Final Audit Report

Although, CFC requested a hearing on other matters in this report, no additional comments were provided relating to this matter.

F. Audit Hearing

This finding was not addressed at the audit hearing.

¹⁶ Some of the adjustments changed based on subsequent information received from CFC and the Audit staff's determination of the proper handling of these misstatements. CFC was subsequently notified of these adjustments and informed that the changes would be incorporated in the Draft Final Audit Report.

190444364748

Commission Conclusion

On September 18, 2014, the Commission considered the Audit Division Recommendation Memorandum in which the Audit staff recommended the Commission find that CFC misstated its financial activity for calendar years 2009 and 2010, and amended disclosure reports have not been filed.

The Commission approved the Audit staff's recommendation.

140044MONTN 419