



Contents

- 1 Litigation
- 6 Advisory Opinions
- 9 Reporting

Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Commissioners:
Ann M. Ravel, Chair
Matthew S. Petersen, Vice
Chairman
Lee E. Goodman
Caroline C. Hunter
Steven T. Walther
Ellen L. Weintraub

Staff Director:
Alec Palmer

Acting General Counsel:
Daniel A. Petalas

The FEC Record is produced
by the Information Division,
Office of Communications.

Toll free 800-424-9530
Local 202-694-1100
Email info@fec.gov

Greg Scott, Asst. Staff Director
George Smaragdis, Deputy
Asst. Staff Director,
Publications
Dorothy Yeager, Sr. Communi-
cations Specialist

Litigation

[Level the Playing Field v. FEC \(LPF II\)](#)

On August 27, 2015, Level the Playing Field (LPF), Dr. Peter Ackerman, the Green Party of the United States and the Libertarian National Committee (collectively plaintiffs) filed a new, second lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia challenging FEC regulations and actions as they relate to sponsorship and conduct of federal candidate debates. *Level the Playing Field v. FEC*, No. 1:15-cv-1397-TSC (D.D.C. filed Aug. 27, 2015) (LPF II).

In the court complaint, the plaintiffs allege that the Corporation on Presidential Debates (CPD) made prohibited contributions to presidential candidates and impermissibly accepted corporate contributions, and failed to register and report as a political committee with the FEC. Plaintiffs therefore claim that the FEC acted contrary to law when it dismissed an administrative complaint filed in 2014. Plaintiffs also claim that the FEC unlawfully denied a rulemaking petition to alter the rules governing access to presidential debates.

The new lawsuit is similar to one the plaintiffs filed in June 2015 alleging that the Commission had unlawfully failed to act upon the same rulemaking petition and administrative complaint. After the Commission denied the petition and dismissed the administrative complaint, **thus rendering plaintiffs' initial judicial claims moot**, plaintiffs filed a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice. The court ordered that suit dismissed on August 31, 2015. *Level the Playing Field v. FEC*, No. 1:15-cv-0967-TSC (dismissed Aug. 31, 2015) (LPF I).

Background

The FEC's regulations on candidate debates provide that tax-exempt 501(c)(3) and (c)(4) organizations may serve as "staging organizations" for federal candidate debates provided that they "do not endorse, support, or oppose political candidates or political parties" and that they use "pre-established objective criteria to determine which candidates may participate in a debate." Further, a staging organization "shall not use nomination by a particular political party as the sole objective criterion to determine whether to include a candidate in a debate." 11 CFR 110.13(c). While the Federal Election

Campaign Act (the Act) and FEC regulations prohibit corporations from making certain contributions or expenditures in connection with federal elections, 501(c)(3) or (c)(4) staging organizations are permitted to accept corporate or labor union funds to defray costs incurred in staging candidate debates. 11 CFR 114.4(f)(1). See also 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).

Legal Challenge

In their new court complaint, the plaintiffs allege that the CPD supports only the Democratic and Republican Parties and opposes third party and independent candidate participation in the presidential debates that it hosts. The plaintiffs assert that the CPD defers to the major parties and their candidates to determine who to invite to the general election debates and that the CPD has no rules that would prevent members of the board of the CPD from engaging in partisan activities.

The plaintiffs further allege that the CPD does not use "objective criteria" when considering which candidates will be included in debates. For instance, the plaintiffs allege that the **CPD's published criteria for participation in the general election presidential debates in 2012** required, among other things, that each candidate have a level of support of at least 15 percent of the national electorate as determined by five selected national public opinion polling organizations. The plaintiffs maintain that the 15 percent polling threshold is biased against independent and third party candidates since no third party or independent candidate has satisfied this criterion since it was implemented.

As a result of this alleged failure to establish fully objective criteria for participation in the presidential debates, the plaintiffs contend in their court complaint that the CPD has violated the Act by accepting corporate contributions to defray its expenses and has made impermissible contributions to candidates by offering them free television time. **The plaintiffs also allege that the CPD does not qualify as a "staging organization" under FEC rules,** and is instead a political committee that has failed to register and file reports with the FEC, as required by the Act. See 52 U.S.C. §§ 30103-30104.

In September 2014, plaintiffs LPF and Dr. Ackerman filed an administrative complaint with the FEC against the CPD alleging that it had violated the Act by acting as a partisan organization, by making prohibited corporate contributions to candidates, and by its use of the 15 percent polling criterion, which the plaintiffs argue is not objective. On July 14, 2015, the FEC dismissed the administrative complaint, finding that there was no reason to believe that CPD had violated the FEC's debate regulations.

Plaintiff LPF also filed a rulemaking petition with the FEC late last year. The petition, which was published for comment in November 2014, asked that the Commission amend its rules on candidate debates to require debate sponsors to use objective, unbiased criteria that do not require candidates to satisfy a polling threshold as the exclusive means of access to participating in presidential and vice presidential general election debates. On July 16, 2015, the FEC denied LPF's petition for rulemaking.

The plaintiffs ask the district court to find that the FEC's dismissal of the administrative complaint and the FEC's denial of the petition for rulemaking are both contrary to law. The plaintiffs also request that the court direct the FEC to find that CPD has violated the Act and also direct the FEC to initiate a rulemaking to revise its regulations governing presidential debates.

(Posted: 09/09/2015; By: Myles Martin)

Resources:

- *Level the Playing Field v. FEC* [Ongoing Litigation page](#)
- *Record* article (11/18/2014): [Petition for Rulemaking on Candidate Debates](#)
- [Commission Discussion on Draft Disposition of Regulation 2014-06 \(Candidate Debates\) \(July 16, 2015\)](#) 

[Pursuing America's Greatness v. FEC \(District Court\)](#)

On September 24, 2015, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia denied a motion by Pursuing America's Greatness (PAG) for a preliminary injunction to prevent the Commission from enforcing against it restrictions on unauthorized committees' use of a candidate's name.

Background

PAG is a nonconnected independent expenditure-only committee (Super PAC) supporting Governor Mike Huckabee's 2016 campaign for president. PAG controls a website and a Facebook page that use Gov. Huckabee's name and indicate PAG's support for his candidacy. PAG maintains, however, that it does not intend to use these pages to solicit contributions to PAG or otherwise engage in fundraising activities.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) states that "any political committee which is not an authorized committee [of a federal candidate]...shall not include the name of any candidate in its name." 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(4). Commission regulations further state that any political committee that is not the authorized committee of a candidate shall not include the name of any candidate in its name, which also includes "any name under which a committee conducts activities, such as solicitations or other communications, including a special project name or other designation." 11 CFR 102.14(a). Commission regulations, however, do state that an unauthorized committee **may** include the name of a candidate in the title of a special project name or other communication if the title clearly and unambiguously shows **opposition** to the named candidate. 11 CFR 102.14(b)(3).

On July 27, 2015, Pursuing America's Greatness (PAG) [filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia](#) challenging Commission regulations at 11 CFR 102.14 and a recently-issued advisory opinion ([AO 2015-04](#) (Collective Actions PAC)) that restrict an unauthorized committee's use of a candidate's name in the committee's special projects including websites supporting that candidate, and seeking a preliminary injunction to prevent the Commission from enforcing those restrictions against PAG. PAG maintains that the challenged restrictions are an unconstitutional violation of its First Amendment guarantee of freedom of speech. It also challenged AO 2015-04 as invalid under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).

District Court Decision

The district court found that PAG failed to demonstrate that it is likely to succeed on the merits of its APA and First Amendment claims and declined to grant the motion for a preliminary injunction that would prevent the Commission from enforcing those restrictions against PAG.

APA Challenge. PAG challenged the naming restrictions under the Administrative Procedure Act as arbitrary and capricious and in excess of the Commission's statutory authority. PAG argued that the Commission's naming restrictions were promulgated based on concerns about fraud and confusion in fundraising activities. PAG contended that it will not conduct fundraising activities through its websites and social media pages, and that the Commission's application of the rules to PAG is arbitrary, capricious and contrary to law.

The district court rejected PAG's suggestion that the naming restrictions could only extend to special *fundraising* projects, explaining that the rulemaking record supported the Commission's concern for confusion in all types of communications, and not just fundraising solicitations. *Slip op.* at 15. For example, the court noted that the Facebook page PAG controls itself contained numerous comments that were directly addressed to the candidate supported by PAG, thus illustrating confusion by readers about whether the committee operating the Facebook page was authorized by the candidate. *Slip op.* at 18.

In examining the Commission's past deliberations on the naming restriction, the district court found there was "a rational connection between the facts found" by the FEC during the rulemaking processes and "the choice[s] made" by the FEC in promulgating the current version of 11 CFR 102.14 and issuing AO 2015-04. The court also found that there is no indication that the Commission's interpretation of section 102.14 in AO 2015-04 is contrary to law or to the agency's intent at the time it revised the regulation. Thus, the court found that PAG did not establish that it is likely to succeed in its case on the merits of its APA claim.

First Amendment Challenge. PAG also argued that prohibiting it from using a candidate's name in the name of its websites and other social media platforms when the name of such media do not clearly show opposition to that named candidate amounts to an unconstitutional prior restraint, in violation of the First Amendment. PAG further argued that the exception in 11 CFR 102.14(b)(3), which permits an unauthorized committee to use a federal candidate's name in a special project name that clearly and unambiguously shows opposition to the named candidate, renders the general naming requirements an unconstitutional content-based restriction on speech, which should not withstand strict scrutiny.

The court disagreed, stating that the naming restrictions in question are "part and parcel of FECA's disclosure regime" and "substantially related to the government's interests in limiting confusion, fraud, and abuse" by "serv[ing] to clarify the candidate-authorization status of political committees." *Slip op.* at 23, 29. The court again pointed to the above-referenced public comments posted on the Facebook page PAG controls as an example of the need for such a regulation that avoids confusion as to whether the communication is made by a campaign or not by restricting the use of a candidate's name by an unauthorized committee in its name or the names or titles of its communications or projects.

Moreover, as the naming restriction does not actually prevent the committee from supporting or opposing candidates, but merely from using the name of a candidate in the name of the committee or the names of its special projects, the court noted that it only "minimally burdens political committee speech" while satisfying legitimate government interests in ensuring the public knows "who is speaking about a candidate shortly about an election" (*Citizens United*, 558 U.S. at 369) and limiting "the possibility of fraud, confusion and abuse in federal elections." The court thus found that the naming restrictions satisfied constitutional scrutiny.

Because the court found that PAG's claims did not establish a likelihood of success for its challenge to the naming restrictions of 11 CFR 102.14 and AO 2015-04, it declined to grant PAG's motion for an injunction to enjoin the Commission from enforcing those restrictions on PAG and its projects and communications. The court also briefly addressed the other factors needed to prevail on a preliminary injunction, noting the reliance by PAG on its First Amendment claims was insufficient to demonstrate that:

- PAG would suffer irreparable injury if the injunction was not granted;
- PAG had established that the balance of equities tips in its favor; and
- The public interest would be furthered by the issuance of the injunction.

PAG filed a notice of appeal on September 28, 2015, with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

(Posted 09/29/2015; By: Dorothy Yeager)

Resources:

- *Pursuing America's Greatness v. FEC* [Ongoing Litigation Page](#)
- [Record article on AO 2015-04](#)

[Stop Hillary PAC, et al. v. FEC \(New\)](#)

On September 22, 2015, Stop Hillary PAC and Dan Backer filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia challenging provisions of the Act and Commission regulations that prohibit an unauthorized political committee from using a federal **candidate's name in the committee's name. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that** the naming restrictions are unconstitutional under the First Amendment and seek an injunction barring the FEC from enforcing the provisions.

Background

The Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) states that "any political committee which **is not an authorized committee [of a federal candidate]...shall not include the name of** any candidate in its name." 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(4). Commission regulations further state that any political committee that is not the authorized committee of a candidate shall not include the name of any candidate in its name, which also includes "any name under which a committee conducts activities, such as solicitations or other communications, including a special project name or other designation." 11 CFR 102.14(a). However, Commission regulations state that an unauthorized committee may include the name of a candidate in the title of a special project name or other communication if the title clearly and unambiguously shows opposition to the named candidate. 11 CFR 102.14(b)(3).

Stop Hillary PAC is a nonconnected committee that maintains a non-contribution account (Hybrid PAC). Its stated mission is "to engage in political advocacy, make political contributions and expenditures, and organize supporters to help stop Hillary Rodham Clinton from becoming President of the United States." The committee registered with the FEC on May 16, 2013. Dan Backer serves as its attorney and treasurer.

After Hillary Rodham Clinton registered as a candidate for president in April 2015, the **FEC asked Mr. Backer and Stop Hillary PAC to amend the committee's Statement of Organization (FEC Form 1) so that its name would not include the name of a federal candidate. Mr. Backer and Stop Hillary PAC refused to change the committee's name.**

Legal Challenge

The Plaintiffs make several facial and as-applied challenges to the naming restrictions set forth in the Act and Commission regulations. First, the plaintiffs claim that the name of a political committee is a constitutionally protected form of political speech, and that the naming restrictions impose a substantial burden on their First Amendment rights without furthering an important or compelling government interest. They state that "Stop Hillary PAC" **reflects the PAC's mission, purpose and values and that no other name would have a comparable effect.** They also state that the name shows clear opposition to Hillary Rodham Clinton and that no reasonable person would believe that the name "Stop Hillary PAC" is **Hillary Rodham Clinton's authorized committee.**

Plaintiff Dan Backer also alleges that he intends to serve as treasurer of other unauthorized committees that will include the names of federal candidates. He alleges that the naming restrictions, **as-applied to the plaintiffs' current and future conduct, substantially burden** their First Amendment rights and chill future speech.

Finally, the Plaintiffs allege that the exceptions to the naming restrictions (allowing for the **use of a federal candidate's name in the title of a special project name or other communication** if the title shows opposition to the named candidate) are unconstitutional speaker- and content-based exceptions that violate their Equal Protections rights by allowing some **committees to use a candidate's name while prohibiting other committees from doing the same.**

The Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the naming restrictions violate the First Amendment and an injunction prohibiting the FEC from enforcing the naming restrictions against unauthorized committees whose names show clear opposition to a federal candidate.

(Posted 09/30/2015; By: Zainab Smith)

Resources:

- *Stop Hillary PAC, et al. v. FEC* [Ongoing Litigation Page](#)
- *Special Fundraising Projects and Other Use of Candidate Names by Unauthorized Committees*, [57 Fed. Reg. 31,424, 31,425 \(July 15, 1992\)](#)
- *Record* article: [Pursuing America's Greatness v. FEC \(District Court\)](#)

Advisory Opinions

[Advisory Opinion Request 2015-03 \(Democracy Rules, Inc.\)](#)

On September 17, 2015, the Commission considered an Advisory Opinion Request (AOR) from Democracy Rules, Inc., concerning a proposal by a non-profit corporation to create a website to collect and transmit funds from its members to candidates. The Commission was unable to render an opinion by the required four affirmative votes and concluded its consideration of the request.

(Posted 09/21/2015; By: Dorothy Yeager)

Resources:

- Commission consideration of AOR 2015-03 
- [Advisory Opinion Request 2015-03](#) (Democracy Rules, Inc.) [PDF]

AO 2015-06: Contributions from a Candidate to a Foreign Candidate

The Act and Commission regulations do not bar a federal candidate, her authorized committee or her leadership PAC from donating to a candidate for elected office in a foreign country.

Background

Rep. Maxine Waters, a candidate for re-election to the U.S. House of Representatives, asks if she may use her own individual funds to donate to campaigns of candidates for office in Haiti. She further asks if her authorized committee may use campaign funds and her leadership PAC may use PAC funds to make a donation to a candidate for office in a foreign country.

Analysis

Under the Act and Commission regulations, an authorized committee may use its funds **for donations to state and local candidates, as well as for “any other lawful purpose”** that does not otherwise convert campaign funds to personal use. 52 U.S.C. § 30114(a)(5), (6), (b); 11 CFR 113.1(g), 113.2(e). Donations to candidates for office in a foreign country are not *per se* personal use under the Act and regulations. 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b)(2); 11 CFR 113.1(g)(1)(i). The donation would constitute a lawful purpose akin to donating to a state or local candidate. Foreign candidates and nonfederal domestic candidates are both excluded from the Act’s definition of candidate and are similarly situated with regard to donations from federal campaign funds. Accordingly, the proposed donation is permissible.

The Commission further notes that the proposed contribution from Rep. Waters’s personal funds to a foreign candidate is permissible and would not implicate the Act’s prohibition on contributions *from* foreign nationals in connection with Federal, State, and local elections. See 52 U.S.C. § 30121(a)(1)(A); 11 CFR 110.20(b); [AO 2015-02](#) (Grand Trunk Western Railroad). Therefore, Rep. Waters may use her personal funds to make an individual contribution to a candidate for office in a foreign country.

Finally, the Commission concluded that Rep. Waters’s leadership PAC may use PAC funds to make a contribution to a candidate for office in a foreign country. However, the Commission could not agree as to the legal basis for this conclusion by the required four affirmative votes.

The Commission cautioned that its opinion is based solely on the Act and Commission regulations and does not address foreign or domestic laws, rules or policies that fall outside its jurisdiction.

Date Issued: 9/28/2015; 4 pages

(Posted 09/25/2015; By: Christopher Berg)

Resources:

- [Advisory Opinion 2015-06](#) [PDF]
- [Commission Discussion of Advisory Opinion 2015-06](#) 

[Pending Advisory Opinion Requests as of September 30, 2015](#)

Advisory Opinion Requests (AORs) pending before the Commission as of the end of the month are listed below. Procedures for commenting on pending AORs are [described here](#).

- [AOR 2015-07](#) [PDF] Payment for food, beverages and valet parking at campaign events (Hillary for America, August 7, 2015)
- [AOR 2015-08](#) [PDF] Use of web platform to collect pledges for and make contributions to candidates (Repledge, August 19, 2015)
- [AOR 2015-09](#) [PDF] Interaction between independent-expenditure-only committees and federal candidates and prospective federal candidates (Senate Majority PAC and House Majority PAC, September 11, 2015)
- [AOR 2015-10](#) [PDF] Calculation of viewers for purposes of electioneering communication definition (21st Century Fox, September 11, 2015)
- [AOR 2015-11](#) [PDF] Vendor collecting and forwarding contributions to political committees (FYP LLC, September 22, 2015)
- [AOR 2015-12](#) [PDF] Use of FEC contributor information in mobile application (Ethiq, September 29, 2015)

(Posted 09/30/2015; By: Dorothy Yeager)

Resources:

- [Advisory Opinion Search](#)



Visit www.fec.gov or click picture for more information on the San Diego conference.

Reporting

October Reporting Reminder

The following reports are due in October:

- All authorized committees of House and Senate candidates must file a quarterly report by October 15, 2015. The report covers financial activity from July 1 (or the day after the closing date of the last report) through September 30;
- Authorized committees of Presidential candidates must file a report by October 15, if they are quarterly filers (the report covers financial activity from July 1 through September 30), or by October 20, if they are monthly filers (the report covers activity for the month of September); and
- National party committees, political action committees (PACs) following a monthly filing schedule and state, district and local party committees that engage in reportable “federal election activity” (see the “State, District and Local Party Committees” section below) must file a monthly report by October 20. This report covers activity for the month of September.

All other PACs and party committees must file a Year-End Report by January 31, 2016 (the report covers financial activity from July 1 through December 31, 2015). 11 CFR 104.5.^[FN1]

Committees that participate in [special elections](#) may need to file additional pre- and post-election reports that are not accounted for above. Remember, reporting periods always begin the day after the closing date of the last report filed.

The Commission will host a [FECFile webinar](#) for candidates on September 30 to help electronic filers prepare their report.

Notification of Filing Deadlines

In addition to publishing this article and the online reporting tables, the Commission notifies committees of filing deadlines through reporting reminders called prior notices. Prior notices are distributed exclusively by electronic mail, so every committee should ensure that the email address on its [Statement of Organization \(FEC Form 1\)](#) is current. Each committee may list up to two email addresses. To amend Form 1, electronic filers must submit Form 1 filled out in its entirety. Paper filers should include only the committee’s name, address, FEC identification number and the updated or changed portions of the form.

Treasurer’s Responsibilities

The Commission provides reminders of upcoming filing dates as a courtesy to help committees comply with the filing deadlines set forth in the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) and Commission regulations. Committee treasurers are responsible for filing committee reports on time. Not receiving a prior notice does not excuse committee treasurers for failing to comply with any filing deadline.

¹ Notice that this filing deadline falls on a weekend. Filing deadlines are not extended when they fall on nonworking days. Accordingly, paper reports filed by methods other than registered, certified or overnight mail, must be received by close of business on the last business day before the deadline (i.e., Friday, January 29).

Filing Electronically

Under the Commission's mandatory electronic filing regulations, individuals and organizations required to file with the FEC that receive contributions or make expenditures, including independent expenditures, aggregating in excess of \$50,000 in a calendar year — or have reason to expect to do so — must file all reports and statements electronically.^[FN2] Reports filed electronically must be received and validated by the Commission by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the filing date. 11 CFR 100.19(c). Electronic filers who file on paper or submit an electronic report that does not pass the Commission's validation program by the filing deadline will be considered nonfilers and may be subject to enforcement actions, including administrative fines. 11 CFR 104.18(a)(2) and (e).

Senate campaigns and other committees that file with the Secretary of the Senate must file their FEC reports on paper, but may file an additional unofficial electronic copy of their report with the Commission in order to enhance disclosure.

The Commission's electronic filing software, FECFile, is free and can be downloaded at <http://www.fec.gov/electfil/updatelist.html>. All reports filed after March 13, 2014, must be filed in Format Version 8.1.0.1. Reports filed in previous formats will not be accepted. Filers may also use commercial or privately developed software as long as the software meets the Commission's format specifications, which are available on the Commission's website. Committees using commercial software should contact their vendors to ensure their software meets the latest specifications.

Timely Filing for Paper Filers

Registered and Certified Mail. Quarterly reports sent by registered or certified mail are considered to be filed on the date of their postmark. 52 U.S.C. § 30104(a)(5) and 11 CFR 104.5(e). Accordingly, quarterly reports sent by registered or certified mail must be postmarked on or before the filing deadline to be considered timely filed. 11 CFR 100.19(b). A committee sending its reports by certified or registered mail should keep its mailing receipt with the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) postmark as proof of mailing because the USPS does not keep complete records of items sent by certified or registered mail. 11 CFR 104.5(i). **Overnight Mail.** Reports sent via overnight mail^[FN3] will be considered timely filed if the report is postmarked on or before the filing deadline. A committee sending its reports by Priority Mail or Priority Express Mail, or by an overnight delivery service, should keep its proof of mailing or other means of transmittal of its reports. See 52 U.S.C. § 30104(a)(5) and 11 CFR 100.19(b) and 104.5(e).

²The regulation covers individuals and organizations required to file reports of contributions and/or expenditures with the Commission, including any person making an independent expenditure. 11 CFR 104.18(a). Disbursements for "electioneering communications" are not considered "expenditures" and thus do not count toward the \$50,000 threshold for mandatory electronic filing. See 11 CFR 104.18(a).

³As used here, "overnight mail" includes Priority or Priority Express Mail having a delivery confirmation, or an overnight service with which the report is scheduled for next business day delivery and is recorded in the service's online tracking system. See 11 CFR 100.19(b)(1) and (b)(3)(i). Note that "Express Mail" as referred to in FEC regulations has been renamed "Priority Express Mail" by the USPS.

Other Means of Filing. Reports sent by other means — including first class mail and courier — must be received by the FEC (or the Secretary of the Senate) before close of business on the filing deadline. See 11 CFR 100.19(b) and 104.5(e). (If the deadline falls on a weekend or federal holiday, such filers should plan accordingly and file reports by the close of business on the last business day before the filing deadline.)

Forms may be downloaded at <http://www.fec.gov/info/forms.shtml> and are available from FEC Faxline, the agency's automated fax system (202/501-3413).

State, District and Local Party Committees

State, district and local party committees that engage in reportable "federal election activity" must file on a monthly schedule. See 11 CFR 300.36(b) and (c)(1). Other state, district and local party committees may file on a semi-annual schedule in 2015. See 11 CFR 104.5(c)(2)(i).

National Party Committees

National committees of political parties must file on a monthly schedule. 52 U.S.C. § 30104(a)(4)(B) and 11 CFR 104.5(c)(4).

Political Action Committees

PACs (separate segregated funds, committees with non-contribution accounts (Hybrid or Carey PACs), independent expenditure-only committees (Super PACs) and other nonconnected committees) that filed on a quarterly basis in 2014 file on a semi-annual basis in 2015. Monthly filers continue on a monthly schedule. PACs may change their filing schedule, but must first notify the Commission in writing. Electronic filers must file this request electronically. A committee may change its filing frequency only once a year. 11 CFR 104.5(c). The committee will receive a letter from the Commission approving the frequency change.

Additional Information

The [2015 Reporting Schedule](http://www.fec.gov/info/report_dates_2015.shtml) is also available on the FEC's website at http://www.fec.gov/info/report_dates_2015.shtml. For more information on reporting, call the FEC at 800/424-9530 or 202/694-1100. To obtain a list of 2015 reporting dates:

- Call and request the reporting tables from the FEC at 800/424-9530 or 202/694-1100;
- Fax the reporting tables to yourself using the FEC's Faxline (202/501-3413, document 586); or
- Visit the FEC's web page at http://www.fec.gov/info/report_dates_2015.shtml to view the reporting tables online.

(Posted 09/15/2015; By: Katherine Carothers)

Resources:

- [2015 Reporting Dates](#)
- [Compliance Map](#)
- [FEC Electronic Filing](#)
- *Record* article: [FEC to Host September Webinar for Campaign Committees](#)