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NEW FEC PHONE NUMBERS

Effective August 26, all of the FEC's local telephone numbers changed. New numbers for selected offices are listed below.

- Note that the 800-line number (800/424-9530) remains the same.

Local Numbers (Area Code 202)

- NOTE: Out-of-town callers may also reach these offices by calling the 800 number and asking for the office needed.

Clearinghouse ............... 219-3670
Congressional Affairs ........ 219-4136
Information Services ........ 219-3420
Library ...................... 219-3312
Personnel .................... 219-4290
Press Office .................. 219-4155
Public Records ............... 219-4140
Reports Analysis ............. 219-3580

TDD Number for the
Hearing Impaired .......... 202/219-3336

Callers on the TDD line may reverse the charges when calling from outside the Washington, DC area.

REGULATIONS

FEC SEEKS COMMENTS ON PETITION TO CHANGE RULES ON USE OF CORPORATE/UNION AIRCRAFT

The Commission is seeking comments on a rulemaking petition filed by Common Cause to increase the payment that candidate committees must make to corporations and labor organizations for the use of their aircraft. Under the current rules at 11 CFR 114.9(e), the committee must pay the organization either the first class airfare or, if the trip is to a location not serviced by commercial airlines, the usual charter rate. (The payment must be made in advance of the trip.)

Common Cause alleges that the first class payment rate is lower than the

organization’s actual cost in providing the transportation and thus results in what would otherwise be an illegal contribution. Common Cause therefore proposes amending the rules to require, in all cases, payment "at the same price it would cost to charter similar aircraft."

The Commission published a Notice of Availability on the Common Cause petition in the Federal Register on August 21, 1991. The Notice summarizes the Common Cause proposal and announces that the petition is available for review and copying in the FEC's Public Records Office. Comments on the petition are due September 20 and should be addressed to Susan E. Propper, Assistant General Counsel, 999 E Street, NW, Washington, DC 20463.

(Regulations continued)
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FINAL RULES: REDESIGNATIONS AND REATTRIBUTIONS; JOINT FUNDRAISING; SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES

On July 19, 1991, the Commission sent to Congress final revisions to the rules governing public funding of Presidential candidates. Included in that rulemaking were certain changes to the general regulations that apply to all committees. These changes are summarized below. (A summary of changes to the public funding rules appears in the following article.)

The Commission will announce the effective date of the rules after 30 legislative days have elapsed. The final rules and their explanation and justification were published in the Federal Register on July 29, 1991 (56 FR 35898).

Redesignations and Reattributions

To monitor compliance with the 60-day time period for obtaining reattributions and redesignations of contributions, a change to 11 CFR 110.1(1) requires committees to retain documentation showing that the redesignation or reattribution was received within 60 days of the committee's receipt of the original contribution. This documentation may be:

- A copy of the postmarked envelope bearing the contributor's name, return address or other identifying code;
- A copy of the written redesignation or reattribution with a date stamp showing the date of the committee's receipt; or
- A copy of the redesignation or reattribution as dated by the contributor. 11 CFR 110.1(1)(6).

Joint Fundraising

The new rules revise the joint fundraising rules (11 CFR 102.17) in several respects:

- A separate committee that serves as the fundraising representative may not act as a participant in any other joint fundraising effort. 11 CFR 102.17(a)(1)(i).
- The allocation formula must indicate the amount or percentage of each contribution that will be allocated to each participant. 11 CFR 102.17(c)(1).
- The statement that participants must use the allocation formula to allocate expenses has been deleted from section 102.17(c)(1). Allocation of expenses is addressed in current section 102.17(c)(7), which remains effective. Under that paragraph, expenses must be allocated based on the percentage of total receipts allocated to each participant; this allocation may differ from the original formula.
- Expenses for a series of fundraising activities must be allocated on a per-event basis. 11 CFR 102.17(c)(7)(i)(C).

Corresponding changes are included in the joint fundraising rules applicable to Presidential primary candidates receiving matching funds (11 CFR 9034.8).

Definition of Subsistence Expenses

The new rules moved the definition of "subsistence expenses" from section 106.2 (allocation of expenditures by Presidential primary candidates) to 116.5(b), the section that addresses advances for travel and subsistence expenses on behalf of a candidate or party committee. "Subsistence expenses" are defined as an individual's personal living expenses related to his or her travel on committee business (e.g., food and lodging expenses).

FINAL RULES: PUBLIC FUNDING OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

On July 19, 1991, the Commission sent to Congress final revisions to the rules governing the public funding of Presidential primary and general election candidates. Certain changes were also made to regulations that apply to all committees.

The Commission will announce the effective date of the rules after 30 legislative days have elapsed. The final rules and their explanation and justification were published in the Federal Register on July 29, 1991 (56 FR 35898).
The material below summarizes major revisions contained in the regulations that apply to publicly funded candidates. Changes that apply to all committees are summarized in the preceding article.

Simplification of State Allocation by Primary Campaigns

The revised rules simplify the process of allocating expenses to the state spending limits, a requirement for primary candidates receiving matching funds. Under the new rules, expenses are allocable only if they fall within one of the five categories listed below. By contrast, the previous rules required allocation of all expenses unless an expense was covered by a specific exemption.

Allocable Expenses. The following categories of expenses are subject to allocation:

1. Media Expenses. Expenses for campaign advertising distributed through broadcast and print media in a particular state are allocable. Excluded from allocation are production costs, commissions for media purchases and costs for advertising distributed nationwide. 11 CFR 106.2(b)(2)(i).

2. Mass Mailings. Costs associated with mass mailings of over 500 pieces to a particular state are allocable, as are the costs of shipping other campaign materials to a state. 11 CFR 106.2(b)(2)(ii).

3. Overhead Expenses. Overhead expenses of a state campaign office—including a temporary office—and a regional campaign office are allocable. Up to 10 percent of overhead expenditures for a state office may be treated as exempt compliance expenses and thus excluded from allocation. If a regional office, the overhead expenses must be allocated to the next primary state in the region. 11 CFR 106.2(b)(2)(iii).

4. Special Telephone Programs. Section 106.2(b)(2)(iv) replaces the previous rules for interstate and intrastate telephone calls. Under the new provision, costs for telephone calls are allocable only if they are part of a special program targeted at a particular state (i.e., 10 percent or more of the calls made that month are made to that state). Special programs include voter registration, get-out-the-vote efforts, fundraising and telemarketing operations. Related allocable expenses include consultants’ fees, travel costs and office rental.

5. Public Opinion Polls. Costs of conducting a public opinion poll are allocable, unless the poll is conducted on a nationwide basis. Related expenses, such as consultants’ fees and travel costs, are also allocable. 11 CFR 106.2(b)(2)(v).

Expenses Not Allocable. Expenses that fall outside the categories listed above are not allocable to the state spending limits (but do not count against the national spending limit). For example, national consulting fees are no longer allocable to a particular state.

Recordkeeping. Under a new provision, a committee must retain all documents that support (1) allocations of expenditures to particular states and (2) claims that an expense is exempt from allocation; otherwise, the expenditures will be allocated to the state holding the next primary election after the expense is incurred. 11 CFR 106.2(d).

Moreover, under new 11 CFR 9034.4(b)(7), payments for allocable expenses will not be considered qualified campaign expenses if the committee’s records do not provide information necessary to allocate the payments to a particular state, such as the date on which the expense was incurred.

Fundraising Exemption for Primary Candidates

Primary committees may treat up to 50 percent of their allocable expenditures for a particular state as exempt fundraising costs and thus exclude them from the state spending limit. This revision replaces the previous 28-day rule under which a fundraising exemption could be claimed only if the activity occurred more than 28 days before the state’s primary, caucus or convention. There is one exception: Committees may treat up to 100 percent of mass mailing expenditures as exempt fundraising costs, but the 28-day rule applies in this case. 11 CFR 110.8(c)(2).

Amounts excluded as exempt fundraising costs at the state level, when added to amounts excluded at the national level, may not exceed 20 percent of the national spending limit. 11 CFR 100.8(b)(21).

Matching Fund Submissions

The revised rules on matching fund submissions require committees that have computerized their contributor lists to submit them on computer tapes or diskettes in accordance with FEC magnetic media (continued)
Continuation of Primary Campaign
After Date of Ineligibility

After a candidate’s date of ineligibility, the committee may no longer receive any matching funds to continue the campaign. At that point, matching funds must be used only to retire debts incurred before the date of ineligibility. Under the previous rules, however, private contributions raised after the date of ineligibility also had to be used to pay pre-ineligibility debts. Until those debts were retired, the contributions could not be used to pay the expenses of the continuing campaign; otherwise, the committee would have to repay matching funds. The revised rules now provide a method under which a candidate may use private contributions to continue campaigning without being penalized. Moreover, contributions received after the date of ineligibility may also be submitted for matching funds. 11 CFR 9034.4(a)(3)(ii).

Repayment of Matching Funds

The revised rules address two situations under which a committee may be subject to overlapping repayment determinations.

The first situation involves repayments for receiving matching funds in excess of the candidate’s entitlement and repayments for making nonqualified campaign expenses. This would occur if a committee artificially increased the candidate’s entitlement to matching funds by including nonqualified campaign expenses in its statement of net outstanding campaign obligations (NOCO). The revised regulations require the committee to repay both: (1) the entire amount that exceeds the entitlement and (2) a portion of the nonqualified campaign expenses that were paid before the committee’s accounts no longer contained any matching funds. (Nonqualified campaign expenses are subject to repayment based on the portion of matching funds—as opposed to private contributions—that were used to pay the expense.) 11 CFR 9038.2(b)(2)(iv).

The second situation concerns candidates that have exceeded both the state spending limits and the national spending limit. (Disbursements that exceed a limit are considered nonqualified campaign expenses.) The revised rules explain that, in this situation, only one repayment will be required, based on the larger of the excessive amounts. 11 CFR 9038.2(b)(2)(v).

Changes to Both Primary and General Election Public Funding Rules

In addition to the above changes, which pertain to Presidential primary candidates, the new rules contain parallel changes to the primary and general election sections of the rules.

Candidate Agreements. Presidential candidates seeking public funds must sign letters in which they agree to comply with certain conditions. The revised rules add two conditions to the candidate agreement provisions:

- If the committee maintains computerized records, it must submit required materials in a computer format that complies with the FEC’s magnetic media requirements. (See 11 CFR 9003.6 and 9033.12.) 11 CFR 9003.1(b)(4) and 9033.1(b)(5).

- The campaign committee must provide documentation on funds received and spent on the candidate’s behalf by other committees and organizations associated with the candidate (e.g., candidate PACs), if the Commission so requests. 11 CFR 9003.1(b)(5) and 9033.1(b)(6).

Reimbursements for Transportation.

Primary and general election candidates receiving public funds may seek reimbursement from media personnel for the costs of providing transportation and services to media representatives accompanying the candidate on campaign trips. Those provisions contain several changes, including the following:

- Because the Treasury Department’s reimbursement rates may not cover the prorata share of costs attributable to Secret Service personnel, the committee must pay the difference. Under the revised rules, the unreimbursed amount does not count toward any expenditure.
The material below highlights the changes contained in the new rules.

Grandfathered Candidates: Personal Use of Excess Campaign Funds

Grandfathered candidates, who were previously allowed to convert unlimited excess campaign funds to personal use, may no longer do so. This change is contained in the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, enacted August 16, 1989.

2 The Commission first approved and then rejected an approach that would have permitted a committee, when calculating the media representative's share of expenses, to include a pro rata portion of: (1) unreimbursed expenses for the Secret Service personnel and (2) expenses of committee staff whose sole purpose was to provide travel services for the media.

Other Changes. The revised regulations contain other changes that apply to both primary and general election candidates:

- The rules incorporate the conclusion reached in AO 1988-5 that transfers made by a publicly funded candidate committee to another committee of the same candidate are nonqualified campaign expenses. 11 CFR 9004.4(b)(7) and 9034.4(b)(6).
- The revised rules make clear that, in the course of conducting audits of publicly funded candidate committees, the Commission may invoke the investigative procedures set forth at 11 CFR Part 111, including the issuance of subpoenas. 11 CFR 9007.1(b)(1)(v) and 9038.1(b)(1)(v).
- The current rules state that the Commission will notify candidates of repayment determinations no later than three years after the end of the matching payment period (primary candidates) or the expenditure report period (general election candidates). The new rules explain that the issuance of the interim audit report constitutes notification for purposes of the three-year period. 11 CFR 9007.2(a)(2) and 9038.2(a)(2).
- Grandfathered Members of Congress who served in the 103rd or a later Congress will be unable to convert any excess funds to personal use once the 103rd Congress convenes on January 3, 1993.
- Until then, "grandfathered" Members may convert only an amount equal to the campaign's unobligated balance as of November 30, 1989.

The revised regulations reflect the Ethics Reform Act amendments and provide alternative methods of calculating the November 30, 1989, campaign balance.

Under the first method, the campaign of a "qualified" (i.e., grandfathered) Member simply determines its cash on hand, minus outstanding debts, as of November 30, 1989. The second method permits the campaign to include noncash campaign assets and committee receivables in its November 30, 1989, balance, but additional reporting is required. These methods follow the Commission's determination in AO 1990-26.

Other Candidates: Personal Use of Noncash Assets

Terminating committees are already required to report how residual funds will be used. 11 CFR 102.3(a). The revised rules add a new paragraph to section 102.3 under which the committee of a non-grandfathered candidate must include in its termination report a statement that noncash committee assets will not be converted to personal use. The statement must be signed by the treasurer.

LEGISLATION

BAN ON HONORARIA NOW APPLIES TO SENATE

On August 14, 1991, President Bush signed into law an amendment to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 that prohibits U.S. Senators and Senate officers and employees from receiving honoraria. The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, Public Law 102-90, also repeals 2 U.S.C. §441i, the Federal Election Campaign Act's provision on honoraria. The honorarium ban became effective when the President signed the bill.

Before this recent amendment, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 had amended the Ethics in Government Act to prohibit the receipt of honoraria by U.S. House Members and all federal officers and employees except those in the Senate. That prohibition became effective January 1, 1991.

In addition to extending the honorarium ban to the Senate, the August amendment expands the definition of honoraria under the Ethics in Government Act (5 U.S.C. §505(3)) to include stipends, that is, payments for a series of appearances, speeches or articles if the subject matter is directly related to the individual's official duties or if the payment is made because of the individual's status with the federal government. However, Senators who are currently under agreements to receive stipends may continue to receive them through the end of 1991.

Still in effect is the Ethics in Government Act provision on donating honoraria to charity (5 U.S.C. §501(c)). Under this provision, an individual will not be considered to have received an honorarium if he or she asks that it be donated to a designated charity, although the donation may not exceed $2,000, and the individual may not receive any tax benefit. Moreover, the charity selected may not be an organization from which the individual, or his or her family, derives any financial benefit.

Also still in effect is the provision in the Ethics in Government Act that excludes travel and subsistence expenses from the definition of honoraria (5 U.S.C. §505(3)).

NEW PUBLICATION ON FEDERAL VOTING LAWS

The National Clearinghouse on Election Administration recently released Federal Election Law 91, a summary of federal laws pertaining to registration and voting.

Although elections— including federal elections—are for the most part governed by the laws of each individual state, there are some Constitutional provisions and federal statutes that affect state election procedures. The new publication summarizes selected federal provisions on registration and voting, providing federal government sources where readers can obtain further information.

To order a free copy of Federal Election Law 91, call 800/424-9530 (ask for the Clearinghouse) or 202/219-3670.
ADVISORY OPINIONS

ADVISORY OPINION REQUESTS

Recent requests for advisory opinions (AORs) are listed below. The full text of each AOR is available for review and comment in the FEC’s Public Records Office.

AOR 1991–26
Independent company’s billing and collection services for 900-line fundraising programs. (Date Made Public: August 9, 1991; Length: 10 pages plus attachments)

AOR 1991–27
Effect of U.S. Supreme Court decision on inclusion of nonpartisan local offices in state party’s ballot composition ratio. (Date Made Public: August 15, 1991; Length: 8 pages)

ALTERNATE DISPOSITION OF
ADVISORY OPINION REQUEST

AOR 1991–11: Activities to Determine Viability of New Political Party
This AOR was withdrawn by the requester on July 26, 1991.

ADVISORY OPINION SUMMARIES

AO 1991–18: Telemarketing Services Provided by Corporate Vendor
The New York State Democratic Committee has entered into an agreement with an incorporated telemarketing company, Gordon and Schwenkmeyer, Inc. (GSI), to conduct two types of telephone solicitation programs to raise funds for the Committee’s federal accounts. Subject to certain conditions, the Current Donor Program will not result in prohibited corporate contributions from GSI because the Committee will pay any compensation owed to GSI by the end of a short, defined time period. By contrast, the Prospecting Program could result in a long-term payment shortfall to GSI; the program must therefore be modified to avoid a prohibited advance of corporate funds in the form of unpaid compensation.

Application of Corporate Prohibition.

Subject to certain conditions, the Current Donor Program will not result in prohibited corporate contribution from GSI. Although the program may involve a temporary withholding of payment to GSI in some months, this does not necessarily constitute an advance of corporate funds since the Committee is obligated to pay GSI in full at the end of a short, defined period (i.e., the two-and-a-half-month cycle). See AO 1979–36.

The Commission therefore approved the Current Donor Program, subject to three conditions:

1. GSI’s estimates—the basis for determining the amount remitted to the Committee each month—should be good faith projections; they should not be altered to accommodate the Committee’s needs for funds at certain times (e.g., close to the general election).

2. The Committee therefore approved the Current Donor Program, subject to three conditions:

a. The Committee will pay any compensation owed to GSI by the end of a short, defined time period.

b. The Committee will pay any compensation owed to GSI by the end of a short, defined time period.

(continued)
Prospecting Program

Description. The prospecting program actually began in the fall of 1989, when GSI made initial telephone calls to prospective donors. In spring 1990, GSI resolicited new donors who responded to the first solicitation. The agreement provides that new donors be solicited three times each nonelection year and four times in the election year.

Unlike the Current Donor Program, full compensation to GSI under the Prospecting Program is tied to long-range contingencies. In the early stages of the program, the amount raised is unlikely to cover GSI’s expenses. Moreover, if the program runs its course without yielding sufficient contributions to pay GSI in full, GSI has no recourse to the Committee for payment. Instead, GSI may continue to solicit donations in the Committee’s name for five years, retaining any proceeds until it recovers full payment. GSI will also receive compensation in the form of half ownership of the new donor list, which it may use on behalf of other clients.

Application of Corporate Prohibition. Because of the program’s speculative nature and the consequent possibility of a shortfall to GSI, the Commission could not approve the Prospecting Program without some record that GSI or companies like it conduct similar programs in the ordinary course of business. In the absence of such a record, the Committee must modify the program to avoid a possible unlawful advance of corporate funds over an extended period of time. The Committee may advance funds to cover GSI’s expenses or, alternatively, pay GSI full compensation at the end of short, defined periods of time. Under either alternative, the Committee would also have to satisfy the conditions that apply to the Current Donor Program, described above.

Other Considerations

Custodial Account. The custodial account set up by GSI is an account of the Committee and must therefore be established at a state bank or federally chartered or insured depository. If necessary, the Committee must amend its Statement of Organization to list the bank as a designated campaign depository. 2 U.S.C. §§432(h)(1) and 433(b)(6); 11 CFR 103.2 and 102.2(a)(vi). Each contribution is considered to be received by the Committee on the date GSI receives it. Within 10 days of receiving a contribution, GSI must deposit it in the custodial account. 11 CFR 103.3(a). The Committee must report GSI’s withdrawals from the custodial account as operating expenditures. 2 U.S.C. §434(b)(5)(A).

Outstanding Compensation Reported as Debts. With respect to the Current Donor Program, the Committee must report as a debt (on Schedule D) any compensation earned by GSI that was not paid during the reporting period. (The same procedure would apply to the Prospecting Program if the remedies and conditions discussed above are satisfied; otherwise, the debt would constitute a prohibited contribution from GSI.) If GSI normally charges interest on unpaid balances, then the Committee must pay the usual interest to avoid a corporate contribution. 11 CFR 116.3(b) and (c).

AO 1991-19: Employee Payroll Deductions After Corporate Merger

As a result of a corporate merger, Contel Corporation (CONTEL) is now a wholly owned subsidiary of GTE Corporation. GTE plans to consolidate the PACs of both corporations into one PAC at some future date. In the meantime, payroll deduction contributions that were previously authorized by CONTEL employees for CONTELPAC may now be remitted to GTE’s PAC, but the employees must receive advance notice of the change.

GTE’s proposed activity is permissible under Commission regulations, which permit a corporation to solicit the executive and administrative employees of a wholly owned subsidiary and which also permit the use of payroll deductions to collect employee contributions to the corporation’s PAC. 11 CFR 114.5(g)(1) and 114.5(k)(1).

However, when providing advance notice to CONTEL employees, GTE must follow the solicitation rules at 11 CFR 114.5(a)(2).
and (3) to ensure that contributions are made on a voluntary basis. Additionally, GTE must notify employees of their right to revoke their original authorizations for payroll deduction at any time, without reprisal. 11 CFR 114.5(a)(4); ACs 1991-1 and 1981-14.

GTE does not have to obtain new authorizations from the CONTEL employees, since they will be contributing to the PAC of an affiliated corporation. That was not the case in AC 1989-16, where the Commission concluded that employees had to execute new authorizations when they became employees of a spin-off corporation not affiliated with their original employer.

(Date issued: July 26, 1991; Length: 3 pages)

### AUDITS

**FEC RELEASES KEMP AUDIT REPORT**

On July 25, 1991, the Commission made an initial determination that the Jack Kemp for President committee (the Kemp Committee) must repay $187,069 in federal matching funds. The Committee had received $5.985 million in primary matching funds for Mr. Kemp's 1988 Presidential primary campaign.

The initial repayment determination was based on the audit of the Kemp Committee and two joint fundraising committees (Kemp/Dannemeyer and Victory '88) that had raised funds for the Kemp Presidential campaign. The repayment amount includes a $60,259 repayment for exceeding the Iowa and New Hampshire expenditure limits (see below). The remainder of the repayment—$126,811—is the total of stale-dated Committee checks that were never cashed by the payees. Under 11 CFR 9038.6, the total of outstanding checks must be repaid. (Should the checks be negotiated, this total will be revised accordingly.)

If the Committee does not dispute the initial determination within 30 days, the repayment amount becomes final and is payable within 90 days of the initial determination. 11 CFR 9038.2(c) and (d).

Final audit reports are available for review in the Public Records Office.

### Expenditures in Excess of the Iowa and New Hampshire Limits

**Calculation of Repayment.** The Commission determined that the Kemp Committee had exceeded the Iowa and New Hampshire spending limits by a total of $188,600:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Spend-</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
<th>Over Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$775,218</td>
<td>$114,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$461,000</td>
<td>$73,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEC Audit staff applied a formula to the excessive amount to determine what portion of that amount was paid with public funds as opposed to private contributions in the Committee's account. (The formula is explained at 11 CFR 9038.2(b)(2)(iii).) The formula yielded a repayment amount of $60,259.

**Allocation of Expenditures.** Based on audit findings, the Commission increased the amounts the Committee originally allocated to the Iowa and New Hampshire limits by $135,847 and $75,099, respectively. The material below explains why the Commission adjusted the allocations in selected categories of expenses.

**Vendor Payments.** The Committee's breakdown of allocations contained a category of expenses consisting of payments for office overhead and other expenses. In this category, the Commission allocated additional amounts to the Iowa and New Hampshire limits for the following reasons:

- The Committee took a 10 percent compliance exemption and a 10 percent fundraising exemption on certain expenses that were not overhead expenses and therefore did not qualify for the exemptions under 11 CFR 106.2(c)(5).
- The Committee improperly depreciated furniture and equipment costs when calculating the allocable amount.
- The Committee improperly excluded certain post-primary expenses from the Iowa and New Hampshire limits: overhead expenses (e.g., rent, utilities, equipment lease payments) and a consultant's fee for time spent closing down the New Hampshire office.
- The Committee allocated certain expenses as regional expenses but failed to provide supporting documentation that the expenses were not entirely allocable to the New Hampshire limit.
- The Committee failed to allocate, as Iowa expenditures, payments to the Iowa

(continued)
The Committee claimed that payments for staff to attend party-sponsored events in New Hampshire were covered by the fund-raising exemption since staff could meet potential contributors. However, the Committee failed to provide supporting documentation that solicitations took place.

The Committee failed to allocate the costs of producing campaign buttons for Iowa and New Hampshire, claiming the costs could be excluded as production costs for "advertising media." 11 CFR 106.2(e)(2). Campaign buttons, however, are not considered "advertising media."

The Committee improperly excluded interstate shipping costs for campaign materials.

Finally, the Commission made several miscellaneous adjustments that increased the amounts allocable to the Iowa and New Hampshire limits; the Commission also rejected a number of insufficiently documented adjustments the Committee had made to reduce allocable amounts.

Travel. The Commission allocated additional amounts to the Iowa spending limit for travel, subsistence and payroll expenses of campaign staff who spent five consecutive days or more in Iowa. 11 CFR 106.2(b)(2)(iii).

Testing-the-Waters Expenditures by Campaign for Prosperity. The Commission allocated certain amounts spent by Campaign for Prosperity (CFP), a PAC associated with Jack Kemp, to the Iowa and New Hampshire limits. CFP had paid for costs associated with events Mr. Kemp attended before he announced his candidacy. Because the events appeared to be connected with his prospective Presidential bid, the payments became campaign expenditures—allocable to the state spending limits—when Mr. Kemp became a candidate. 11 CFR 9034.4(a)(2).

FEC RELEASER INFORMATION ON 1992 SENATE CANDIDATES

The FEC recently issued a press release providing a reference guide on the financial activity of 1992 Senate candidates. The guide includes a chart summarizing the activity of 1992 Senate candidates through the end of 1990. Divided into two-year cycles (1987-88, 1980-90), the chart lists information on total receipts, disbursements and cash on hand. The guide also ranks 1992 Senate candidates based on the size of their cash on hand at the end of 1990. Finally, the guide compares cash-on-hand totals of incumbent Senate candidates for the preceding election cycle (1984) and the current election cycle.


SEMIANNUAL PAC COUNT

As of July 1, 1991, the number of registered political action committees (PACs) registered with the FEC totaled 4,123, the lowest point in four years. The number of PACs decreased by 49 since the last semiannual survey, taken on December 31, 1990. The number of corporate-sponsored PACs dropped by 50. Nonconnected PACs, however, increased by 34, as shown in the table below. For statistics on PAC counts taken semiannually since 1975, order a free copy of the FEC press release dated July 11, 1991, from the Public Records Office. Call 800/424-9530 (ask for Public Records) or 202/219-4140.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of PAC</th>
<th>Number as of 7/1/91</th>
<th>Gain/Loss Since 12/31/90</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Member-</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconnected</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 "Other" category consists of PACs formed by corporations without capital stock and PACs formed by incorporated cooperatives.
PUBLICATIONS

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

IN BOSTON, CHICAGO

This fall, the FEC is holding two-day regional conferences in Boston and Chicago to assist candidates, political party organizations and PACs with their preparations for the 1992 elections.

- The Boston conference will be held on September 11-12.
- The Chicago conference will be held on November 14-15.

Workshops

In addition to workshops on the federal campaign laws, the conferences will include a workshop on state campaign finance laws presented by the state election office (in Boston, the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance; in Chicago, the Illinois State Board of Elections).

At both conferences, a representative of the Internal Revenue Service will be available to answer election-related tax questions.

Registration Information

The $130 registration fee for each conference covers the cost of the conference, materials and meals for both days (continental breakfast, lunch). Call the FEC to order a registration form and schedule of workshops (800/424-9530 or 202/219-3420).
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1992 PRIMARY ELECTION
AND BALLOT ACCESS DATES

The FEC's Public Records Office recently compiled the accompanying chart that lists, for each state, the preliminary 1992 primary dates and filing deadlines for ballot access. The chart covers Presidential and Congressional primaries for major party candidates; it also includes deadlines for independent candidates seeking ballot access for the 1992 general election (November 3). Please consult your state office for information on ballot access requirements.

### 1992 PRIMARY DATES AND FILING DEADLINES FOR BALLOT ACCESS

As of July 19, 1991; all dates are subject to change by state legislatures.

**NOTE:** States with Senate elections are printed in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Presidential Candidates</th>
<th>U.S. House and Senate Candidates</th>
<th>Independent Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot Access</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Ballot Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3/31 noon</td>
<td>5/26</td>
<td>3/31 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. 3/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut*</td>
<td>2/7 4pm</td>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>pending**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Col.</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>7/10 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/11 runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>5/26</td>
<td>4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois*</td>
<td>Rep. 12/16/91</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>12/16/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dem. 1/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2/21</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey returns for these states mention possible legislative changes in primary and ballot access dates.

**In Connecticut, the ballot access date for the Congressional primary is 14 days after the date on which the party (Democratic or Republican) holds its convention; convention dates will be set in late 1991.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Presidential Candidates</th>
<th>U.S. House and Senate Candidates</th>
<th>Independent Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot Access</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Ballot Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2/12 noon</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>6/10 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>7/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>11/3 runoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1/10 4pm</td>
<td>5/12 4pm</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota**</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri*</td>
<td>Rep. 12/23/91</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>12/31/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>3/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>2/27-3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>12/23/91</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>6/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4/9 4pm</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>4/9 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York*</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>2/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico*</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island*</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>7/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina*</td>
<td>Dem. 2/1</td>
<td>Dem. 3/7</td>
<td>4/30 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina*</td>
<td>Republican pending</td>
<td>6/23 runoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>12/31/91</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>5/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah***</td>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia****</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>8/21 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1/28</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>8/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey returns for these states mention possible legislative changes in primary and ballot access dates.

**In Minnesota, the date for affidavits is 12/31/91; the date for petitions is 1/28/92.

***In Utah, each political party holds a convention to select two candidates to run in the primary. The primary winner becomes the party’s general election nominee. If, however, a candidate receives 70 percent of the vote at the convention, that candidate becomes the general election nominee, and the primary is not held. AD 1978-30.

****In several Virginia Congressional Districts, political parties nominate candidates at caucuses rather than through primary elections.
MURS RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC

Listed below are MURs (FEC enforcement cases) recently released for public review. The list is based on the FEC press releases of June 27 and July 10 and 15, 1991. Files on closed MURs are available for review in the Public Records Office.

Unless otherwise noted, civil penalties resulted from conciliation agreements reached between the respondents and the Commission.

MUR 2795
Respondents: (a) Dukakis/Bentsen Committee, Inc. (MA); (b) Hubert M. Leonard (NC); (c) Senator Terry Sanford (NC); (d) Madison County Democratic Executive Committee, Flossie Bell, treasurer (NC)
Complainant: Larry Roger Swan (NC)
Subject: Failure to disclose contributions
Disposition: (a) $2,500 civil penalty; (b) and (c) reason to believe but took no further action; (d) no reason to believe; (e)-(i) no action

MUR 2935
Respondents: (a) District of Columbia Democratic State Committee, Jack Evans, treasurer; (b) Vestharn N. Scales (DC)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Excessive contributions; failure to: file reports on time, maintain federal campaign depository, disclose receipts and disbursements properly, file debt settlement statement and pay federal account debt with federal account funds
Disposition: (a) $1,000 civil penalty; (b) no probable cause to believe

MUR 3019
Respondents: (a) Intelligem of Raleigh, North Carolina (Robert Rodman, President); (b) Democratic Party of North Carolina
Complainant: William B. Canfield, Legal Counsel, National Republican Senatorial Committee (DC)
Subject: Failure to file Statement of Organization and reports; disclaimer
Disposition: (a) $1,000 civil penalty; (b) no reason to believe

MUR 3025
Respondents: RUFF Political Action Committee, Tommy J. Lyles, treasurer (DC)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to disclose debts accurately, itemize information, disclose activity timely and sign reports
Disposition: $7,500 civil penalty

MUR 3162
Respondents: Citizens for Informed Voting in the Commonwealth (CIVIC), Glen Harold Stassen, treasurer (NY)
Complainant: Larry J. Steinberg (KY)
Subject: Disclaimer
Disposition: No action (divided vote)

MUR 3166
Respondents: Bob Lawrence for Congress, William C. Hennessy, Jr., treasurer (NY)
Complainant: John Nolan, Chairman, Republican County Committee of Saratoga County (NY)
Subject: Failure to disclose contributions on time
Disposition: Reason to believe but took no further action

MUR 3174
Respondents: LaRocco for Congress Committee, John R. Tait, treasurer
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file 48-hour notices on time
Disposition: $2,500 civil penalty

MUR 3203
Respondents: Lonzdale for Senate, Shirley Richards, treasurer (OR)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file 48-hour notice
Disposition: $700 civil penalty

MUR 3221
Respondents: Friends of Frank Hutchinson, Carl Berger, treasurer (HI)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: Reason to believe but took no further action

MUR 3222
Respondents: (a) David K. McCloud (DC); (b) Robert Watson (VA); (c) Robb for the Senate, Alson R. Smith, Jr., treasurer (VA)
Complainant: Joseph Elton, Executive Director, Republican Party of Virginia
Subject: Enforcement confidentiality
Disposition: (a)-(c) No reason to believe

MUR 3230/3219/3210
Respondents: (a) Citizens United, Floyd Brown, President; et al. (b)-(c)
Complainant: Ruth Cymber, on behalf of Friends of Phil Gramm (TX)
Subject: Improper solicitations based on candidate’s contributor list
Disposition: (a)-(c) No reason to believe

MUR 3266
Respondents: Hamp Hodges for Congress Committee, Paul T. Wells, treasurer (TX)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file 48-hour notices on time
Disposition: $2,500 civil penalty

MUR 3272
Respondents: H & R Block PAC, Sherry Van Dorn, treasurer (MO)

Disposition: (a) $250 civil penalty; (b) and (c) reason to believe but took no further action; (d)(1) no reason to believe (conduit); (2) took no action (contributions in name of another); (e)-(i) took no action
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Subject: Improper solicitations based on candidate’s contributor list

Subject: Improper solicitations based on candidate’s contributor list
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file reports on time
Disposition: $3,000 civil penalty

MUR 3279
Respondents: Association of Flight Attendants PAC, R. Fred Casey, treasurer (NY)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $750 civil penalty

MUR 3282
Respondents: Committee for Good Government of Temple-Inland Forest Products Corporation, M. Richard Warner, treasurer (TX)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $565 civil penalty

MUR 3286
Respondents: Enterprise Leasing Company Political Action Committee, Van-Lear Black, III, treasurer (MO)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $725 civil penalty

MUR 3288
Respondents: Gun Owners of America Campaign Committee, David Bauer, treasurer (CA)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $625 civil penalty

MUR 3295
Respondents: Lockheed Employee's Political Action Committee, Robert W. Cannon, treasurer (CA)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $375 civil penalty

MUR 3298
Respondents: Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company Political Action Committee (3M PAC), Scott T. Henderson, treasurer (MN)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $375 civil penalty

MUR 3299
Respondents: NAPUS PAC for Postmasters (AKA Political Education for Postmasters), Gerri Logan, treasurer (VA)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $500 civil penalty

MUR 3305
Respondents: Preston Gates Ellis & Rouvelas Meeds PAC (AKA Preston, Thorgrimson, Ellis & Holman PAC), Rosanne Phillips, treasurer (DC)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $375 civil penalty

MUR 3308
Respondents: Soft Drink PAC, Mark N. Ramond, treasurer (DC)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Failure to file report on time
Disposition: $375 civil penalty

INDEX

The first number in each citation refers to the "number" (month) of the 1991 Record issue in which the article appeared; the second number, following the colon, indicates the page number in that issue.

ADVISORY OPINIONS
1990-14: AT&T's 900-line fundraising service, 2:4
1990-19: Vendor/committee relationship; sale and repurchase of fundraising items, 1:8
1990-22: Blue Cross/Blue Shield's solicitation of member plans' personnel, 1:9
1990-25: Parent corporation's obligations to labor organization under twice-yearly provisions, 2:5
1990-26: Sale of campaign assets; personal use of excess funds after November 30, 1989, 3:7
1990-27: Transfer to party's federal account of funds mistakenly deposited in state account, 3:9
1990-29: Return to federal account of funds transferred to state account, 4:5
1990-30: Designation of post-election contributions to retire debts, 4:6
1991-1: Credit card contributions to nonconnected PAC of federal contractor partnership, 5:4
1991-3: Designation of possibly illegal funds raised through 900-line telephone calls, 5:5
1991-3: PAC newsletter distributed outside restricted class, 6:6
1991-4: Payment to Senate employee for two-week teaching appointment, 5:5
1991-5: Party office building fund; preemption issues, 7:4
1991-8: Payment to Senator for radio series, 6:8
1991-9: Retroactive interest payments on loans made by candidate, 7:5
1991-10: Candidate's use of assets jointly held with spouse, 6:8
1991-12: Transfer from candidate's multi-purpose committee to campaign committee, 8:6
1991-13: Labor union jointly established by two other unions, 7:5
1991-14: State tax checkoff funds used for party's federal activity, 6:7
1991-15: Party committee's transfer to correct federal account's overpayment of allocated expenses, 8:7
(continued)
1991-15: Sale/Use restriction applied to FEC forms filed under Indiana law, 8:8
1991-16: Corporate sponsorship of "good citizenship" video tape featuring Member of Congress, 8:9
1991-17: Telemarketing services provided by corporate vendor, 9:7
1991-18: Employee payroll deductions after corporate merger, 9:8

COURT CASES

Dole v. International Association Managers, Inc., 6:9
FEC v.
- Augustine for Congress, 2:7
- Drzewiecki for Congress, 3:10
- Fletcher, Friends of Isaiah, 4:6
- Lawson, 6:10
- Legi-Tech, Inc., 3:11

- Mann for Congress Committee, 5:7
- Mid-America Conservative PAC, 2:10
- National Republican Senatorial Committee, 6:10
- NRA Political Victory Fund, 3:10
- Political Contributions Data, Inc., 2:8; 5:7
- Populist Party, 8:11
- Schaefer, Friends of, 7:6
- Smith, Dennis, for Congress, 5:7
- Speelman, 3:10
- Webb for Congress Committee, 2:10
- West Virginia Republican State Executive Committee, 3:10
- Working Names, Inc. (90-1009-GAG and 87-2467-GAG), 5:7

- v. FEC
- Common Cause, National Republican Senatorial Committee, Appellant (90-5317), 1:7
- Faucher and Maine Right to Life Committee, Inc. (90-1832), 5:8
- International Association Managers, Inc., 7:8
- Republican Party of Kentucky, 7:8
- Schaefer, 6:11
- Spannaus (91-0681), 6:11
- Stern, 2:7
- Stern v. General Electric Company, 7:6

800 LINE
Allocating expenses through ballot composition, 2:1
Debt retirement by candidate committees, 4:7
PACs: allocating federal and nonfederal expenses, 6:1
Redistricting, 8:12
Staff advances and salaries, 2:6

IN THIS ISSUE:

New FEC Telephone Numbers..................................................page 1
FEC Boston and Chicago Conferences..........................................page 11
1992 Ballot Access and Primary Dates.......................................page 12