



# Interim Audit Report of the Audit Division on Steve Daines for Montana

(January 1, 2019 - December 31, 2020)

## 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). The Commission generally conducts such audits when a committee appears not to have met the threshold requirements for substantial compliance with the Act.<sup>1</sup> 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)

Steve Daines for Montana is the principal campaign committee for Steve Daines, Republican candidate for the United States Senate from the state of Montana, and is headquartered in Helena, Montana. For more information, see the Campaign Organization Chart, p. 2.

## Financial Activity (p. 2)

- **Receipts**

○ Contributions from Individuals	\$ 27,131,569
○ Contributions from Political Committees	3,304,667
○ Transfers from Authorized Committees	1,371,488
○ Other Receipts	71,802
<b>Total Receipts</b>	<b>\$ 31,879,526</b>
- **Disbursements**

○ Operating Expenditures	\$ 29,508,162
○ Transfers to Authorized Committees	7,754
○ Contribution Refunds to Individuals	498,117
○ Contribution Refunds to Political Committees	34,003
○ Other Disbursements	3,173,883
<b>Total Disbursements</b>	<b>\$ 33,221,919</b>

## Findings and Recommendations (p. 3)

- Receipt of Contributions in Excess of the Limit (Finding 1)
- Disclosure of Debts and Obligations (Finding 2)
- Disclosure of Receipts (Finding 3)

---

<sup>1</sup> 52 U.S.C. §30111(b).



# **Interim Audit Report of the Audit Division on Steve Daines for Montana**

---

(January 1, 2019 - December 31, 2020)

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Part I. Background</b>	
Authority for Audit	1
Scope of Audit	1
<b>Part II. Overview of Campaign</b>	
Campaign Organization	2
Overview of Financial Activity	3
<b>Part III. Summaries</b>	
Findings and Recommendations	4
<b>Part IV. Findings and Recommendations</b>	
Finding 1. Receipt of Contributions in Excess of the Limit	5
Finding 2. Disclosure of Debts and Obligations	9
Finding 3. Disclosure of Receipts	10

# **Part I**

## **Background**

### **Authority for Audit**

This report is based on an audit of Steve Daines for Montana (SDFM), 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), 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. Prior to conducting any audit under this subsection, the Commission shall perform an internal review of reports filed by selected committees to determine if the reports filed by a particular committee meet the threshold requirements for substantial compliance with the Act. 52 U.S.C. §30111(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;
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 disclosure of debts and obligations;
6. the consistency between reported figures and bank records;
7. the completeness of records; and
8. other committee operations necessary to the review.

## Part II

# Overview of Campaign

### Campaign Organization

<b>Important Dates</b>	
• Date of Registration	November 12, 2010
• Audit Coverage	January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2020
<b>Headquarters</b>	Helena, Montana
<b>Bank Information</b>	
• Bank Depositories	Three
• Bank Accounts	Three checking, One money market, One CD
<b>Treasurer</b>	
• Treasurer When Audit Was Conducted	Lorna Kuney
• Treasurer During Period Covered by Audit	Lorna Kuney
<b>Management Information</b>	
• Attended FEC Campaign Finance Seminar	No
• Who Handled Accounting and Recordkeeping Tasks	Paid Staff

## Overview of Financial Activity (Audited Amounts)

<b>Cash on hand @ January 1, 2019</b>	<b>\$ 1,450,176</b>
<b>Receipts</b>	
○ Contributions from Individuals	27,131,569
○ Contributions from Political Committees	3,304,667
○ Transfers from Authorized Committees	1,371,488
○ Other Receipts	71,802
<b>Total Receipts</b>	<b>\$ 31,879,526</b>
<b>Disbursements</b>	
○ Operating Expenditures	29,508,162
○ Transfers to Authorized Committees	7,754
○ Contribution Refunds to Individuals	498,117
○ Contribution Refunds to Political Committees	34,003
○ Other Disbursements	3,173,883
<b>Total Disbursements</b>	<b>\$ 33,221,919</b>
<b>Cash on hand @ December 31, 2020</b>	<b>\$ 107,783</b>

## **Part III**

### **Summaries**

#### **Findings and Recommendations**

##### **Finding 1. Receipt of Contributions in Excess of the Limit**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reviewed contributions from individuals to determine if any exceeded the contribution limit. This review indicated that SDFM received apparent excessive contributions totaling \$501,804. These errors occurred as a result of SDFM not resolving the excessive portions of contributions by requesting and receiving signed reattribution letters from its contributors, issuing refunds for the excessive portion of contributions in a timely manner, or ensuring that issued refunds were resolved in a timely manner. The Audit staff recommends that SDFM provide documentation demonstrating that the contributions were not excessive, or if excessive, that the contributions were resolved in a timely manner. Absent such a demonstration, SDFM should obtain a signed reattribution letter from the contributors, refund any remaining excessive amounts, or disgorge any refunds it has been unable to process to the U.S. Treasury.

(For more detail, see p. 5)

##### **Finding 2. Disclosure of Debts and Obligations**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff noted that SDFM failed to disclose debts and obligations to five vendors totaling \$373,967. The Audit staff recommends that, absent documentation demonstrating that these expenditures did not require reporting on Schedule D (Debts and Obligations), SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission) to disclose these debts.

(For more detail, see p. 9)

##### **Finding 3. Disclosure of Receipts**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reviewed receipts to verify the accuracy of the information disclosed on SDFM's reports. The review indicated that SDFM did not correctly disclose contributions from individuals and political committees, totaling \$568,804 and \$39,000, respectively, on Schedule A (Itemized Receipts). In addition, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$1,409,254 in net proceeds from joint fundraising activity from 22 joint fundraising committees. However, SDFM did not itemize or correctly disclose transfers and memo entries totaling \$843,231 on Schedule A, as required. Finally, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$9,400 in net proceeds through one conduit. The conduit was itemized on Line 12 (Transfers from Other Authorized Committees) instead of disclosed as a memo entry, and the original contributors totaling \$9,400 were not itemized. The Audit staff recommends that SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission) to correctly disclose these receipts.

(For more detail, see p. 10)

## Part IV

# Findings and Recommendations

### **Finding 1. Receipt of Contributions in Excess of the Limit**

#### **Summary**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reviewed contributions from individuals to determine if any exceeded the contribution limit. This review indicated that SDFM received apparent excessive contributions totaling \$501,804. These errors occurred as a result of SDFM not resolving the excessive portions of contributions by requesting and receiving signed reattribution letters from its contributors, issuing refunds for the excessive portion of contributions in a timely manner, or ensuring that issued refunds were resolved in a timely manner. The Audit staff recommends that SDFM provide documentation demonstrating that the contributions were not excessive, or if excessive, that the contributions were resolved in a timely manner. Absent such a demonstration, SDFM should obtain a signed reattribution letter from the contributors, refund any remaining excessive amounts, or disgorge any refunds it has been unable to process to the U.S. Treasury.

#### **Legal Standard**

- A. Authorized Committee Limits.** For the 2020 election, an authorized committee may not receive more than a total of \$2,800 per election from any one person or \$5,000 per election from a multicandidate political committee. 52 U.S.C. §§30116(a)(1)(A) and (a)(2)(A); 11 CFR §§110.1(a) and (b) and 110.9.
- B. Handling Contributions That Appear Excessive.** If a committee receives a contribution that appears to be excessive, the committee must either:
- Return the questionable check to the donor; or
  - Deposit the check into its federal account and:
    - Keep enough money in the account to cover all potential refunds;
    - Keep a written record explaining why the contribution may be illegal;
    - Include this explanation on Schedule A if the contribution has to be itemized before its legality is established;
    - Seek a reattribution or a redesignation of the excessive portion, following the instructions provided in the Commission regulations (see below for explanations of reattribution and redesignation); and
    - If the committee does not receive a proper reattribution or redesignation within 60 days after receiving the excessive contribution, refund the excessive portion to the donor. 11 CFR §§103.3(b)(3), (4) and (5) and 110.1(k)(3)(ii) (B).
- C. Joint Contributions.** Any contribution made by more than one person (except for a contribution made by a partnership) must include the signature of each contributor on the check, money order, or other negotiable instrument or in a separate writing. A



joint contribution is attributed equally to each donor unless a statement indicates that the funds should be divided differently. 11 CFR §110.1(k)(1) and (2).

**D. Reattribution of Excessive Contributions.** The Commission regulations permit committees to ask donors of excessive contributions (or contributions that exceed the committee's net debts outstanding) whether they had intended their contribution to be a joint contribution from more than one person and whether they would like to reattribute the excess amount to the other contributor. The committee must inform the contributor that:

- The reattribution must be signed by both contributors;
- The reattribution must be received by the committee within 60 days after the committee received the original contribution; and
- The contributor may instead request a refund of the excessive amount. 11 CFR §110.1(k)(3).

Within 60 days after receiving the excessive contribution, the committee must either receive the proper reattribution or refund the excessive portion to the donor. 11 CFR §§103.3(b) (3) and 110.1(k)(3)(ii)(B). Further, a political committee must retain written records concerning the reattribution in order for it to be effective. 11 CFR §110.1(l)(5).

Notwithstanding the above, any excessive contribution that was made on a written instrument that is imprinted with the names of more than one individual may be attributed among the individuals listed unless instructed otherwise by the contributor(s). The committee must inform each contributor:

- How the contribution was attributed; and
- The contributor may instead request a refund of the excessive amount. 11 CFR §110.1(k)(3)(ii)(B).

**E. Redesignation of Excessive Contributions.** When an authorized candidate committee receives an excessive contribution (or a contribution that exceeds the committee's net debts outstanding), the committee may ask the contributor to redesignate the excess portion of the contribution for use in another election. The committee must inform the contributor that:

- The redesignation must be signed by the contributor;
- The redesignation must be received by the committee within 60 days after the committee received the original contribution; and
- The contributor may instead request a refund of the excessive amount. 11 CFR §110.1(b)(5).

Within 60 days after receiving the excessive contribution, the committee must either receive the proper redesignation or refund the excessive portion to the donor. 11 CFR §§103.3(b) (3) and 110.1(b) (5) (ii) (A). Further, a political committee must retain written records concerning the redesignation in order for it to be effective. 11 CFR §110.1(l)(5).

When an individual makes an excessive contribution to a candidate's authorized committee, the campaign may presumptively redesignate the excessive portion to the general election if the contribution:

- Is made before that candidate's primary election;
- Is not designated in writing for a particular election;
- Would be excessive if treated as a primary election contribution; and
- As redesignated, does not cause the contributor to exceed any other contribution limit. 11 CFR §110.1(b)(5)(ii)(B)(1)-(4).

The committee is required to notify the contributor of the redesignation within 60 days of the treasurer's receipt of the contribution and must offer the contributor the option to receive a refund instead.

## Facts and Analysis

### A. Facts

#### 1. Facts

The Audit staff utilized sample testing and a review of other contributions not included in the sample population to identify apparent excessive contributions from individuals, as noted below.

<b>Excessive Contributions - Testing Method</b>	
Sample Projection Amount <sup>2</sup>	\$291,803
100% Review of High Dollar Contributions	\$157,651
100% Review of Contributions Received Through Joint Fundraisers	\$52,350
<b>Total Amount of Excessive Contributions</b>	<b>\$501,804</b>
<b>Reason for Excessive Contributions</b>	
Contributions not resolved via signed reattribution letter or refund	\$501,804
<b>Total Amount of Excessive Contributions</b>	<b>\$501,804</b>

#### 2. Additional Information

The errors were primarily a result of SDFM not resolving the excessive portions of contributions made on single/joint account checks, credit card, or through a joint fundraiser by requesting signed reattribution letters or a refund. SDFM did issue some refunds, however, some of the refunds were not cashed by the contributors. The total amount of refunds issued, but not cashed, is \$60,327.

<sup>2</sup> The sample error amount (\$291,803) was projected using a Monetary Unit Sample with a 95 percent confidence level. The sample estimate could be as low as \$143,260 or as high as \$583,597.

SDFM did not maintain a separate account for questionable contributions. Based on its cash on hand at the end of the audit period, it appears that SDFM did not maintain sufficient funds to refund the apparent excessive contributions.

### **B. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation**

The Audit staff discussed this matter with SDFM representatives at the exit conference and provided a schedule of the apparent excessive contributions. SDFM representatives questioned the use of sampling in the audit, and the Audit staff explained that the Audit Division has used statistical sampling for many years and that it is a widely used tool in accounting and auditing. The Audit staff then walked SDFM representatives through each excessive contribution, at their request.

In response to the exit conference, SDFM representatives stated that they object to the use of sampling to project errors. The Audit staff notes that the use of statistical sampling has been approved by the Commission for use in Title 52 audits for over 30 years.

SDFM representatives also contend that contributions, for which it issued a refund but the refund check was not cashed by the contributor, should be treated as a separate category from contributions that were never refunded. The Audit staff acknowledges that SDFM issued refund checks, which were not cashed, for excessive contributions; however, these checks should have been re-issued, or the excessive amounts disgorged to the U.S. Treasury so that the amount of the excessive contribution did not remain in SDFM's bank accounts.

SDFM representatives also objected to the inclusion of a contribution that they stated was not actually excessive. SDFM's database records and its disclosure reports show the receipt of three contributions on the same date from a single contributor, one in the amount of \$5,600, and two in the amount of \$2,800 each. The \$5,600 contribution was refunded timely via a credit card chargeback, so SDFM does not believe this contributor made excessive contributions. However, the Audit staff reviewed the credit card records provided by SDFM and found three contributions from this same contributor all on the same date, each for \$5,600, for a total of \$16,800. There was one chargeback that refunded one of the \$5,600 contributions in a timely manner. SDFM may designate one of the remaining two \$5,600 contributions as \$2,800 for the primary election and presumptively redesignate \$2,800 to the general election. However, the final \$5,600 contribution remains excessive and must be refunded.

The Audit staff recommends that, within 30 calendar days of service of this report, SDFM:

- Provide evidence demonstrating that the contributions, totaling \$501,804, were not excessive, or if excessive, were resolved in a timely manner. This evidence should include documentation that was not previously made available to the Audit staff, including copies of receipt of authorization from its contributors for reattribution; or timely refunds (copies of the front and back of each negotiated refund check).

- Absent such demonstration, SDFM should obtain a signed authorization letter from the contributor, refund any remaining excessive amounts, or disgorge any refunds, which were not cashed by the contributors, to the U.S. Treasury. SDFM must provide evidence of such refunds or disgorgement (copies of front and back of negotiated checks).
- If funds are not available to make such refunds, SDFM should report the excessive contributions as debts owed on Schedule D (Debts and Obligations) until funds become available to make the refunds.

## **Finding 2. Disclosure of Debts and Obligations**

### **Summary**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff noted that SDFM failed to disclose debts and obligations to five vendors totaling \$373,967. The Audit staff recommends that, absent documentation demonstrating that these expenditures did not require reporting on Schedule D (Debts and Obligations), SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission) to disclose these debts.

### **Legal Standard**

- A. Continuous Reporting Required.** A political committee must disclose the amount and nature of outstanding debts and obligations until those debts are extinguished. 52 U.S.C. §30104(b)(8) and 11 CFR §§104.3(d) and 104.11(a).
- B. Separate Schedules.** A political committee must file separate schedules for debts owed by the committee and debts owed to the committee, together with a statement explaining the circumstances and conditions under which each debt and obligation was incurred or extinguished. 11 CFR §104.11(a).
- C. Itemizing Debts and Obligations.**
- A debt of \$500 or less must be reported once it has been outstanding 60 days from the date incurred (the date of the transaction); the committee reports it on the next regularly scheduled report.
  - A debt exceeding \$500 must be disclosed in the report that covers the date on which the debt was incurred. 11 CFR §104.11(b).

### **Facts and Analysis**

#### **A. Facts**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reviewed SDFM's disbursement records and disclosure reports for proper reporting of debts and obligations. This review identified debts owed to five vendors totaling \$373,967<sup>3</sup> that SDFM failed to report on Schedule D during the audit period. Based on a review of the records, these vendors provided advertising, fundraising, direct mail, website and listing services, shipping, event catering, and consulting services. SDFM reported debt totaling \$758,664 on Schedule D

<sup>3</sup> Each debt was counted only once, even if it was required to be disclosed over multiple periods.

during the audit period. The Audit staff calculated the debts owed to the vendors based on the invoice date and the subsequent payment date. Debts were outstanding for periods ranging from 13 to 108 days.

### **B. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation**

The Audit staff discussed this matter with SDFM representatives at the exit conference and provided a schedule detailing those transactions requiring disclosure on Schedule D. The SDFM representatives had no comments at that time.

In response to the exit conference, SDFM provided additional documentation for \$23,907 of the outstanding debt showing that the invoices were provided at a later date than the invoice date. As a result, this amount was deducted from the overall undisclosed debt balance discussed at the exit conference and is not included in this finding. SDFM did not provide comments on the remaining undisclosed debts.

The Audit staff recommends that, within 30 calendar days of service of this report, SDFM provide additional documentation demonstrating that the transactions totaling \$373,967 were not obligations which required reporting on Schedule D. Absent such documentation, the Audit staff recommends that SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission)<sup>4</sup> to disclose these debts and obligations.

## **Finding 3. Disclosure of Receipts**

### **Summary**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff reviewed receipts to verify the accuracy of the information disclosed on SDFM's reports. The review indicated that SDFM did not correctly disclose contributions from individuals and political committees, totaling \$568,804 and \$39,000, respectively on Schedule A (Itemized Receipts). In addition, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$1,409,254 in net proceeds from joint fundraising activity from 22 joint fundraising committees. However, SDFM did not itemize or correctly disclose transfers and memo entries totaling \$843,231 on Schedule A, as required. Finally, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$9,400 in net proceeds through one conduit. The conduit was itemized on Line 12 (Transfers from Other Authorized Committees) instead of disclosed as a memo entry, and the original contributors totaling \$9,400 were not itemized. The Audit staff recommends that SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission) to correctly disclose these receipts.

### **Legal Standard**

**A. Itemization Required for Contributions from Individuals.** An authorized candidate committee must itemize any contribution from an individual if it exceeds \$200 per election cycle, either by itself or when combined with other contributions from the same contributor. 52 U.S.C. §30104(b)(3)(A). (Authorized)

<sup>4</sup> If SDFM chooses to file a Form 99 instead of amending its disclosure reports, the form must contain all pertinent information that is required on each schedule.

- B. Election Cycle.** The election cycle begins on the first day following the date of the previous general election and ends on the date of the next general election. If contributions and expenditures are designated for another election cycle, then the election cycle begins when the first contribution is received or expenditure is made. 11 CFR §100.3(b).
- C. Required Information for Contributions from Individuals.** For each itemized contribution from an individual, the committee must provide the following information:
- The contributor’s full name and address (including zip code);
  - The contributor’s occupation and the name of his or her employer;
  - The date of receipt (the date the committee received the contribution);
  - The amount of the contribution; and
  - The calendar year-to-date (Unauthorized) election cycle-to-date (Authorized) total of all contributions from the same individual. 11 CFR §§100.12 and 104.3(a)(4) and 52 U.S.C. §30104(b)(3)(A).
- D. Best Efforts Ensures Compliance.** When the treasurer of a political committee shows that the committee used best efforts (see below) to obtain, maintain, and submit the information required by the Act, the committee’s reports and records will be considered in compliance with the Act. 52 U.S.C. §30102(i).
- E. Definition of Best Efforts.** The treasurer and the committee will be considered to have used “best efforts” if the committee satisfied all of the following criteria:
- All written solicitations for contributions included:
    - A clear request for the contributor's full name, mailing address, occupation, and name of employer; and
    - The statement that such reporting is required by Federal law.
  - Within 30 days after the receipt of the contribution, the treasurer made at least one effort to obtain the missing information, in either a written request or a documented oral request.
  - The treasurer reported any contributor information that, although not initially provided by the contributor, was obtained in a follow-up communication or was contained in the committee’s records or in prior reports that the committee filed during the same two-year election cycle. 11 CFR §104.7(b).
- F. Itemization of Contributions from Joint Fundraising Efforts.** After the joint fundraising representative distributes the net proceeds, each participating political committee reports its share as a transfer-in from the joint fundraising representative and itemizes the transfer on a separate schedule A for that Line. Using the records received from the joint fundraising representative, a participating committee also must itemize its share of gross receipts as contributions from the original donors on a memo entry Schedule A to the extent required under 11 CFR §104.3(a).

When itemizing gross contributions, the participant must report the date of receipt as the day the joint fundraising representative received the contribution. 11 CFR §102.17(c)(3)(iii) and (c)(8)(i)(B).

## **Facts and Analysis**

### **A. Disclosure of Receipts**

#### **1. Facts**

The Audit staff utilized sample testing and a review of other contributions not included in the sample population to identify contributions from individuals, totaling \$568,804, and political committees, totaling \$39,000, which were not correctly disclosed on Schedule A of SDFM's disclosure reports. These reporting errors consisted of the following.

<b>Disclosure of Contributions - Testing Method</b>	
Sample Projection Amount <sup>5</sup>	\$535,012
100% Review of High Dollar Contributions from Individuals	\$33,792
100% Review of Contributions from Political Committees	\$39,000
<b>Total Error Amount</b>	<b>\$607,804</b>

<sup>5</sup> The sample error amount (\$535,012) was projected using a Monetary Unit Sample with a 95 percent confidence level. The sample estimate could be as low as \$273,748 or as high as \$970,100.

The types of errors discovered in the sample review include incorrect disclosure of receipt date, name, and/or disclosure without a partnership attribution.

<b>Disclosure Errors for Individuals</b>	
Type of Review	100%
Contributions Disclosed without Partnership Attribution	\$19,600
Contributions Disclosed with Incorrect Receipt Date	\$5,600
Contributions Disclosed with Incorrect Amount	\$5,592
Contributions Disclosed with Incorrect Name	\$3,000
<b>Total Error Amount</b>	<b>\$33,792</b>

<b>Disclosure Errors for PACs<sup>6</sup></b>	
Type of Review	100%
Contributions Disclosed without an Address	\$27,000
Contributions Disclosed with Incorrect Name	\$16,000
Contributions Disclosed with an Incorrect Election Designation	\$1,000
<b>Total Error Amount</b>	<b>\$39,000</b>

## **2. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation**

The Audit staff discussed the disclosure errors at the exit conference and provided schedules detailing the incorrectly disclosed contributions. SDFM representatives inquired, and the Audit staff confirmed the method for determining date errors, and that contemporaneous documentation would be sufficient to show the date of the contribution receipt.

In response to the exit conference, SDFM stated that the date reported was correct for two contributions. The Audit staff accepted SDFM's explanation, and those contributions are not included in the error amounts within the report. Additionally,

<sup>6</sup> This group of errors and their respective dollar value exceed total errors (\$39,000) because one contribution totaling \$5,000 had multiple disclosure errors. Each contribution was only counted once toward the total error amounts, even if there were multiple errors.



SDFM representatives stated that they object to the use of sampling to project errors. The Audit staff notes that the use of statistical sampling has been approved by the Commission for use in Title 52 audits for over 30 years. Finally, SDFM indicated that it would amend disclosure reports to correct the errors.

The Audit staff recommends that, within 30 calendar days of service of this report, SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission)<sup>4</sup> to correctly disclose these contributions.

## **B. Disclosure of Joint Fundraising Transfers and Memo Entries**

### **1. Facts**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$1,409,254 in net proceeds from joint fundraising activity from 22 joint fundraising committees. However, SDFM did not itemize or correctly disclose transfers and memo entries totaling \$843,231 on Schedules A (Itemized Receipts). These reporting errors consisted of the following.

<b>Disclosure Errors<sup>7</sup></b>	
Type of Review	100%
Transfers Disclosed on Schedule A – Missing Address	\$84,110
Transfers Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect Receipt Date	\$78,941
Transfers Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect Amount	\$111
Memo Entries Not Itemized	\$306,585
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A - Incorrect Receipt Date	\$345,034
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A – Apparent Duplicate Entries	\$22,250
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect Address	\$5,100
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect or Missing Name	\$3,200

<sup>7</sup> These groups of errors and their respective dollar value exceed total errors (\$843,231) because three contributions, totaling \$5,100, had multiple disclosure errors. Each contribution was only counted once toward the total error amounts, even if there were multiple errors.

<b>Disclosure Errors<sup>7</sup></b>	
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect Election Designation	\$2,400
Memo Entries Disclosed on Schedule A – Incorrect Aggregate Total	\$600
<b>Total Error Amount</b>	<b>\$843,231</b>

## **2. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation**

The Audit staff discussed this matter with SDFM representatives at the exit conference and provided schedules detailing the missing and incorrectly disclosed contributions. SDFM representatives did not directly comment on these errors in response to the exit conference.

The Audit staff recommends that, within 30 calendar days of service of this report, SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission)<sup>4</sup> to correctly disclose the joint fundraising transfers and memo entries.

### **C. Disclosure of Contribution from a Conduit**

#### **1. Facts**

During audit fieldwork, the Audit staff determined that SDFM received a total of \$9,400 in net proceeds through one conduit. The conduit was itemized on Line 12 (Transfers from Other Authorized Committees), however, the original contributors totaling \$9,400 were not itemized. This resulted in a total of \$18,800 of incorrectly disclosed contributions. These reporting errors consisted of the following.

<b>Disclosure Errors</b>	
Type of Review	100%
Conduit Incorrectly Itemized on Line 12	\$9,400
Contributors not Itemized	\$9,400
<b>Total Error Amount</b>	<b>\$18,800</b>

## **2. Interim Audit Report & Audit Division Recommendation**

The Audit staff discussed this matter with SDFM representatives at the exit conference and provided schedules detailing the missing and incorrectly disclosed contributions. SDFM representatives did not directly comment on these errors in response to the exit conference.

The Audit staff recommends that, within 30 calendar days of service of this report, SDFM amend its disclosure reports or file a Form 99 (Miscellaneous Electronic Submission)<sup>4</sup> to itemize the required contributions and report the conduit as a memo entry.