Record

October 2000 | Federal Election Commission | Volume 26, Number 10

Table of Contents

Reports
1 On-line 48-Hour Notices Available for the General Election
1 Web Access to Senate Candidates' Campaign Finance Reports

Compliance
1 FEC Implements Administrative Fines Program
9 Nonfilers

2 **Advisory Opinions**

Court Cases
6 On Appeal?

Public Funding
6 Public Funding for Gore-Lieberman
6 Public Funding for Buchanan-Foster
7 August Matching Fund Payments

Election Administration
8 Revised National Mail Voter Registration

Outreach
8 FEC Roundtables
8 Public Appearances

Statistics
9 Midyear PAC Count Shows Slight Decrease from December 1999

Reports

On-line 48-Hour Notices Available for the General Election

In order to reduce the number of faxed, mailed and hand-delivered 48-Hour Notices (Form 6), a Web-based filing system is being developed to enable filers to create and submit their 48-Hour Notices entirely on line. Even committees that do not currently file electronically and those that use software that does not allow for the creation of Form 6 will be able to use the on-line filing system to file their 48-Hour Notices electronically.

This Web-based filing system is different from the current electronic filing system, which allows committees to file Form 6 through the file upload process built into electronic filing software packages. Under those software systems, the transactions are keyed into the software, and the data reside on the local or network drive. By contrast, the new Browser-based version allows filers to log onto the FEC filing Web site and enter the transactions directly.

(continued on page 2)

Compliance

FEC Implements Administrative Fines Program

As part of its new Administrative Fines Program, the Federal Election Commission sent notices to committees that failed to file their July Quarterly Report, or filed this report late, informing them that the Commission had found reason to believe they had violated the Federal Election Campaign Act. Civil money penalties, ranging from $125 to $12,000, were included in the "Reason to Believe" notices. Committees had 40 days to either

(continued on page 2)

Web Access to Senate Candidates' Campaign Finance Reports

Senate campaign finance reports are now available to the public on the FEC Web site. All Senate reports received after May 15, 2000, are currently accessible on the site, and the FEC will make future reports available within 48 hours of receiving them.

To view these reports, go to www.fec.gov, click on "Campaign Finance Reports and Data," and then select "View Financial Reports."

Reports

(continued from page 1)

With this new system, the information is stored in local memory until the committee treasurer presses the "submit" button, thereby sending the report to the FEC.

The FEC will soon be sending, by mail, electronic filing passwords (PIN numbers) to treasurers for House and Presidential campaign committees that are running in the General Election[1] but do not yet have PIN numbers. With this PIN number, treasurers will have the option to log into the FEC Web site and fill out and submit a 48-Hour notice electronically. (Paper notices will also be accepted.)

For more information, visit the FEC Web site at www.fec.gov and click on the Electronic Filing logo.✦

[1] *Senate committees file with the Secretary of the Senate and cannot participate in electronic filing. They must continue to file 48-hour notices on paper with the Secretary of the Senate.*

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

800/424-9530
202/694-1100
202/501-3413 (FEC Faxline)
202/219-3336 (TDD for the hearing impaired)
800/877-8339 (FIRS)

Darryl R. Wold, Chairman
Danny L. McDonald, Vice Chairman
David M. Mason, Commissioner
Karl J. Sandstrom, Commissioner
Bradley Smith, Commissioner
Scott E. Thomas, Commissioner

James A. Pehrkon, Staff Director
Lawrence M. Noble, General Counsel

Published by the Information Division
Louise D. Wides, Director
Amy L. Kort, Editor

http://www.fec.gov

Compliance

(continued from page 1)

pay the penalties or submit written responses challenging the alleged violations or the amount of the penalties.

The July Quarterly Report was the first report handled under the new Administrative Fines program, and the number of late filers dropped significantly. While 30 percent of filers were late for the April quarterly filing, only 18 percent of filers were late for the July quarterly filing.

For more information on the Administrative Fines Program, see the May Record, page 1, and the July Record, page 1. Information is also available at the FEC's Web site at www.fec.gov.

Free copies of the final rules as they appeared in the *Federal Register* (65 FR 31787, May 19, 2000) are available through the FEC's Faxline (202/501-3413, document 247) and on the FEC's Web site at http://www.fec.gov/pdf/00%20Administrative%20Fines%20E&J.pdf.✦

(continued on page 9)

Do You Need Copies of *Campaign Guides?*

The FEC publishes four Campaign Guides—each for a different type of committee—that explain the Federal Election Campaign Act and Commission regulations and their practical application to your committee. These guides are available free of charge.

If you would like to receive copies of any of the guides, please fill out and mail the order form on the inside of the back cover of this issue of the *Record* (see page 11).

Advisory Opinions

AO 2000-16

Placing Political Advertisements on Internet for Academic Study

Third Millennium: Advocates for the Future, Inc., (Third Millennium) may place advertisements for Presidential candidates on the Internet to study their effects on voter participation among young adults.

Third Millennium—a nonprofit corporation that encourages younger Americans to participate in the electoral and legislative process—proposes to study the effect of Internet advertising on young voters. To this end, it has retained the services of Juno, an established Internet service provider that offers free Internet access to subscribers who agree to provide demographic information to Juno and to view on-line advertisements. Using Juno's demographic data, Third Millennium intends to randomly select subscribers to view advertisements supporting one or all of the current, ballot-qualified Presidential candidates, and then measure these subscribers' voting patterns through a post-election survey.[1]

Third Millennium will either use the content and design of advertisements created by each Presidential campaign or create its own advertisements from available materials.

In doing so, Third Millennium will treat each candidate equally as it obtains or develops the ads, giving none a qualitative or quantitative

[1] *The range of candidates for whom ads will be shown will include all the general election presidential candidates who appear on enough state ballots to win an Electronic College majority.*

advantage. It will not pay the campaigns for materials provided, and it reserves the right to reject material that mentions or alludes to another candidate. Third Millennium will present the study's results at a cross-disciplinary conference it will host in December 2000.

The Commission found Third Millennium's proposal permissible under the Federal Election Campaign Act and Commission regulations. Individual Commissioners explained their reasons for voting to approve this opinion in separate concurring statements.

Date issued: August 28, 2000; Length: 5 pages.✦

AO 2000-18
Closing Date of Matching Fund Period for Nader 2000

The primary matching fund payment period for Ralph Nader's primary campaign committee, the Nader 2000 Primary Committee, Inc. (the Committee), ended August 12, 2000, which was the day he received the South Carolina United Citizen's Party's (UCP) Presidential nomination.

Mr. Nader's effort to get on the general election ballot in substantially all states had three components:

- His convention nomination by the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP)—the final step in securing ballot access in 14 states where the Green Party or its state affiliate had previously attained ballot access for its Presidential candidate.[1]
- The submission of petitions seeking ballot access for either Mr. Nader (as an independent) or the state Green Party in states where neither the Party nor its state affiliate had previously attained ballot access for its candidates. In 30 of these states, the petition process was not complete until after the ASGP convention and, in six states, the deadline fell after the Presidential convention held by the Democratic National Convention on August 14-17, 2000.
- His convention nomination by the South Carolina United Citizen's Party (UCP) on August 12, 2000.

Under the Matching Act[2] and Commission regulations, the term "matching payment period" means the period beginning at the start of the calendar year in which a Presidential general election is held and ending on the date the national convention of the candidate's party nominates its Presidential candidate. In the case of a party that does not nominate its Presidential candidate by national convention, the matching payment period ends on the date the party nominates its Presidential candidate or on the last day of the last national convention held by a major party, whichever is earlier. 26 U.S.C. §9032(6) and 11 CFR 9032.6.

In several past advisory opinions (AOs), the Commission has applied the statute to situations where candidates sought the nomination of several non-major parties. In two of these cases, candidates of non-major parties asked whether their matching payment periods ended on either the date of their nomination by the last state party to make its nomination or the last date of the last major party Presidential nomination convention, whichever date was earlier.[3] In these cases, the Commission found that neither the Matching Act nor Commission regulations require that the matching payment period for one non-major party Presidential candidate be shorter than that for another such candidate solely because one was seeking a national party nomination by national convention and the other was seeking nomination by several state political parties.

In Mr. Nader's case, the Commission found that his matching payment period would end August 12, 2000, the date he received the nomination of the UCP, which predated the close of the Democratic National Convention (the last national convention held by a major party).

Date Issued: August 11, 2000; Length: 4 pages.✦

(continued on page 4)

[1] *The Commission did not consider the question of whether the June 25 Green Party convention was a national convention or whether the procedure used to nominate Mr. Nader at that convention represented the culmination of the Green Party's nomination process.*

[2] *Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account Act, 26 U.S.C. §9031 through §9042.*

[3] *For example, the Commission considered the matching fund status of an individual seeking the Presidential nomination of several minor parties that were active in several states. AO 1984-11. The Commission also considered the status of a candidate seeking the nomination of a minor party with a recognized national committee and national nominating convention while at the same time pursuing the nomination of several minor parties at the state level that had no national conventions. AO 1984-24.*

Advisory Opinions
(continued from page 3)

AO 2000-19
Retroactively Reallocating Party's Ballot Composition Ratio

The Republican Party of Florida (the RPF) may retroactively adjust its federal-to-nonfederal allocation ratio to reflect the addition of two state offices, which became vacant in recent months. Further, in accordance with its request, the RPF may retroactively reallocate its administrative expenses for the period starting on June 1, 1999, using a ballot composition ratio that includes points for the two state offices that are now on the November 2000 ballot

Under Commission regulations, state and local party committees are required to allocate their administrative expenses and costs of generic voter drives using the "ballot composition method." 11 CFR 106.5(d). Under this method, committees determine their ballot composition ratios at the start of the election cycle "based on the ratio of federal offices expected on the ballot to total federal and nonfederal offices expected on the ballot in the next general election to be held in the committee's state or geographic area."[1]

In this case, two state officials (Commissioners Bill Nelson and Tom Gallagher) decided to run for the Senate when Senator Connie Mack announced, on May 5, 1999, that he would not seek another term. Florida has a "resign-to-run" law that requires state office holders to resign from state office in order to run for federal office.[2] The two officers were not required to resign, however, until the governor officially declared their candidacies for the Senate opening. By law in Florida, the governor may not make this declaration until federal ballot qualification week, which began on May 8, 2000. The two state officials remained in their state positions until their candidacies were officially announced. Consequently, the state vacancies did not occur until May of 2000.

The RPF adjusted its ballot composition ratio to reflect the vacancies in May of 2000. It may now retroactively adjust its ratio for the period from June 1, 1999, to May of 2000 as well. In reaching this determination, the Commission noted several events that support the RFP's assertion that, in fact, it began supporting candidates for these two state offices prior to June 1, 1999:

- One of the state officials filed his Statement of Candidacy for the Senate on March 22, 1999, and the other established a testing-the-waters committee in April 1999;
- On May 13 and 14, 1999, state candidates began registering for the anticipated vacancies in the state offices held by Commissioners Nelson and Gallagher; and
- Both Commissioners had collected enough federal contributions by June 1, 1999, to cross the threshold for federal candidacy.

Under these circumstances, the RFP may retroactively reallocate its administrative expenses for the period between June 1, 1999, and May 8, 2000. The RFP has 30 days from the August 11, 2000, publication of this advisory opinion to submit an amended schedule H1 for the period in question and to transfer funds between its federal and nonfederal accounts to correct its prior allocation for this period.

Date Issued: August 11, 2000; Length: 6 pages.✦

[1] *The regulations explain how federal and state offices should be counted for purposes of the ratio. When anticipated on the next general election ballot, the offices of President, U.S. Senator and U.S. Representative each count as one federal point, while the offices of Governor, State Senator and State Representative are counted as one nonfederal point each. The rules further require committees to count the total of all other partisan statewide executive candidates expected on the ballot as a maximum of two nonfederal offices and include up to two points for those offices in their ratios. State party committees may also include an additional nonfederal point. 11 CFR 106.5(d)(1)(ii). See also the* Campaign Guide for Political Party Committees, *pages 47-64.*

[2] *Florida's "resign-to-run" law states that "the resignation creates a vacancy in office to be filled by election, thereby permitting persons to qualify as candidates for nomination and election as if the officer's term were otherwise scheduled to expire." FLA STAT. Ch, 99.012(4)(g). Thus, prior to the office holders' submission of their resignations, no vacancy existed.*

Back Issues of the Record Available on the Internet

This issue of the *Record* and all other issues of the *Record* starting with January 1996 are available through the Internet as PDF files. Visit the FEC's World Wide Web site at http://www.fec.gov and click on "What's New" for this issue. Click "Campaign Finance Law Resources" to see back issues. Future *Record* issues will be posted on the web as well. You will need Adobe® Acrobat® Reader software to view the publication. The FEC's web site has a link that will take you to Adobe's web site, where you can download the latest version of the software for free.

AO 2000-21

New York Conservative Party Qualifies as State Committee of Political Party

The State Committee of the New York State Conservative Party meets all of the Federal Election Commission's (the Commission) requirements for state committee status, even though it is not affiliated with a recognized national committee or other national political party organization.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) defines a state committee as "the organization which, by virtue of the bylaws of a political party, is responsible for the day-to-day operation of such political party at the State level, as determined by the Commission." 2 U.S.C. §431(15).

Through a series of advisory opinions, the Commission has established two criteria necessary for an organization to qualify as a state committee. First, the organization must engage in activities that "are commensurate with" the day-to-day operations of a party at a state level. Second, the state organization must gain ballot access for its federal candidates who, in turn, must qualify as "candidates" as defined at 2 U.S.C. §431(2).[1]

The New York Party meets both of these requirements:

- Its rules describe activity commensurate with the day-to-day functions and operations of a political party on a state level; and
- Representative Vito Fossell—a "candidate" under 2 U.S.C. §431(2)—appeared on the ballot as a Conservative Party House candidate in the 1998 election and will again in the 2000 election.

Date Issued: August 28, 2000; Length: 5 pages.✦

[1] *Under 2 U.S.C. §431(2), an individual becomes a candidate for the purposes of the Act if he or she receives contributions aggregating in excess of $5,000, or makes expenditures in excess of $5,000.*

Reconsideration of Advisory Opinion

AO 2000-08

Donations to Federal Candidates for Personal Living Expenses

On August 24, 2000, the Commission denied Philip D. Harvey's request that it reconsider its June 14, 2000, advisory opinion (AO 2000-08), which stated that Mr. Harvey's proposed anonymous donations to federal candidates for their personal living expenses would count as contributions under the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act). The Commission found that Mr. Harvey did not offer arguments that were substantively different from those offered in the initial Advisory Opinion Request (AOR).

In his AOR, Mr. Harvey had proposed giving monetary gifts—up to $10,000—to show his gratitude to individuals willing to engage in the difficult and time-consuming process of running for federal office. He planned to donate the funds anonymously, thereby avoiding any appearance that he was trying to curry favor with the recipient candidates. He also intended to instruct the recipients to use the funds only for personal living expenses, not for their campaigns.

Under the Act and Commission regulations, gifts given for the purpose of influencing a federal election are considered contributions, while those given for other purposes may or may not be. 2 U.S.C. §431(8)(A)(i) and 11 CFR 100.7(a)(1). For example, gifts of a personal nature are not considered contributions if they have been customarily given prior to candidacy. If not, they are considered contributions. 11 CFR 110.10(b)(2).

Similarly, under the Commission's personal use regulations, payment of a candidate's personal expenses by anyone other than the candidate constitutes a contribution, unless the payment would have been made irrespective of the candidacy. 11 CFR 113.1(g)(6).

In this case, Mr. Harvey's proposed donations would not be made irrespective of the individuals' candidacies and would not be "gifts of a personal nature which had been customarily received prior to candidacy." As a result, the gifts would be considered contributions under the Act and, as such, would be limited to $1,000 per candidate, per election.✦

Alternative Disposition of Advisory Opinion Requests

AOR 2000-9

The requester withdrew the request for this advisory opinion on August 29, 2000. The request, submitted on May 2, 2000, sought the Commission's opinion on the application of FEC regulations and advisory opinions to a commercial Web site that sells space and other Web site services to federal and local candidates and issue organizations.✦

(continued on page 6)

Advisory Opinions
(continued from page 5)

Advisory Opinion Requests

AOR 2000-20
Nonconnected PAC established by individuals associated with several trade associations (Organizers of the proposed Committee for Quality Cancer Care, July 18, 2000)

AOR 2000-22
Use of electronic signature to grant prior approval for trade association solicitation (Air Transportation Association of America, et al., July 31, 2000)

AOR 2000-23
Preemption of state election law prohibiting party contributions to candidates during primary election campaign period (New York State Democratic Committee, August 28, 2000)

AOR 2000-24
Preemption of state election law mandating fixed allocation ratio for payment by political party of administrative and voter drive expenses (Alaska Democratic Party, August 30, 2000)

AOR 2000-25
Transfer of funds between the nonfederal and federal accounts of a newly formed nonconnected political committee (Minnesota House of representatives Democratic Farmer-Labor Caucus, September 8, 2000)

AOR 2000-26
State party committee's refund to candidate of "party assessment" portion of state ballot qualification fee (Joel Deckard, September 11, 2000)

AOR 2000-27
Qualification as state committee of political party (United Citizen's Party, South Carolina, September 15, 2000)

Court Cases

On Appeal?

FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee
The Federal Election Commission has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to review this case. The Commission seeks review of a 10th Circuit opinion that found that coordinated party expenditure limits at 2 U.S.C. 441a(d)(3) are unconstitutional. See July 2000 *Record*, p. 1.

Public Funding

Public Funding for Gore-Lieberman

On August 18, 2000, the Federal Election Commission approved public funding for the general election campaign of Democratic Presidential nominee Al Gore and his running mate Joseph Lieberman. The U.S. Treasury Department made the payment of $67.56 million in federal funds shortly thereafter.

Under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, the Democratic and Republican nominees are each entitled to a grant of $20 million increased by a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). In order to receive public funding, the Gore-Lieberman campaign agreed to abide by the overall spending limit and other legal requirements, including a post-campaign audit. Additionally, as major party nominees, they agreed to limit campaign spending to the amount of the public funding grant and not to accept private contributions for their campaign. They also agreed not to spend more than $50,000 in the aggregate of their own personal funds. The campaign may, however, accept contributions designated for its general election legal and compliance (GELAC) fund. This fund is a special account maintained exclusively to pay for legal and accounting expenses related to complying with the campaign finance law. Compliance expenses do not count against the expenditure limit. Contributions to the GELAC fund are, however, subject to the limits and prohibitions of the federal campaign finance laws.

The Democratic National Committee may spend an additional $13,680,292 for coordinated expenditures on behalf of the Gore-Lieberman campaign. These funds are subject to the limits, prohibitions and disclosure requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act.❖

Public Funding for Buchanan-Foster

On September 14, 2000, the Federal Election Commission approved public funding for the general election campaign of Reform Party Presidential candidate Patrick J. Buchanan and his running mate Ezola Foster. The U.S. Treasury Department made the payment of $12,613,452 in federal funds shortly thereafter. Mr. Buchanan was eligible to receive the funds as the candidate of a minor party. To qualify as a minor party, a party's Presidential candidate must have received at least 5 percent of the popular vote in the prior Presidential general election.

As minor party candidates, Mr. Buchanan and Ms. Foster are entitled to partial public funding, based on the amount certified to each major party candidate ($67.56 million). The portion that Mr. Buchanan received is based on the ratio of the Reform Party's popular vote in the preceding Presidential election to the average popular vote of the two major party candidates in that election. In this case, Ross

Perot, the Reform Party candidate in 1996, received 8.4 percent of the popular vote.

In order to receive funding in a given election, the minor party's nominees must provide evidence showing that they have qualified to appear on the ballot as the candidate of that party in at least 10 states.

Pre-election minor party funding has only occurred once before, in 1996, when Mr. Perot received $29,055,400 based on his vote from the 1992 general election.

Under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, Presidential candidates who accept public funding must agree to a $67.56 million spending limit for the general election and a $50,000 limit on their use of personal funds to support their campaign. Minor party candidates may accept contributions up to an amount equaling the difference between the federal funds they receive and the spending limit. These candidates may also accept contributions to their general election legal and accounting fund (GELAC fund). This fund is a special account maintained exclusively to pay for legal and accounting expenses related to complying with the campaign finance law. Compliance expenses do not count toward the expenditure limit, but they are subject to the contribution limits and prohibitions of the Federal Election Campaign Act (the FECA).

The Reform Party may spend an additional $13,680,292 for coordinated expenditures on behalf of the Buchanan-Foster campaign. These funds are also subject to the limits, prohibitions and disclosure requirements of the FECA. For more information on the Reform Party's eligibility for public funding, see the January 2000 Record, p. 16.❖

Matching Funds for 2000 Presidential Candidates: August Certification

Candidate	Certification August 2000	Cumulative Certifications
Gary L. Bauer (R) [1]	$33, 183.11	$4,825,060.93
Bill Bradley (D) [2]	$0.00	$12,462,047.69
Patrick J. Buchanan (Reform) [3]	$102,246.67	$4,124,418.51
Al Gore (D) [4]	$0.00	$15,456,083.75
John Hagelin (Natural Law) [5]	$184,175.06	$573,670.06
Alan L. Keyes (R) [6]	$243,984.07	$4,021,004.91
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (D) [7]	$50,968.49	$1,285,116.95
John S. McCain (R) [8]	$0.00	$14,475,333.10
Ralph Nader (G) [9]	$385,522.92	$664,150.95
Dan Quayle(R) [10]	$0.00	$2,102,525.00

[1] *Gary L. Bauer publicly withdrew from the race on February 4, 2000.*

[2] *Bill Bradley publicly withdrew from the race on March 9, 2000.*

[3] *Patrick J. Buchanan became ineligible for matching funds on August 11, 2000.*

[4] *Al Gore became ineligible for matching funds on August 16, 2000.*

[5] *John Hagelin became ineligible for matching funds on August 31, 2000.*

[6] *Alan L. Keyes became ineligible for matching funds on April 20, 2000.*

[7] *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., became ineligible for matching funds on August 16, 2000.*

[8] *John S. McCain publicly withdrew from the race on March 9, 2000.*

[9] *Ralph Nader became ineligible for matching funds on August 12, 2000.*

[10] *Dan Quayle publicly withdrew from the race on September 27, 1999 .*

August Matching Fund Payments

On August 31, 2000, the Commission certified $1,000,080.32 in matching funds to six Presidential candidates. The U.S. Treasury Department made the payments the first day of September.

With these latest certifications, the FEC has now declared ten candidates eligible to receive a total of $59,989,411.85 in federal matching funds for the 2000 election. The above chart lists the most recent certifications and cumulative certifications (and payments) for each candidate. ❖

Election Administration

Revised National Mail Voter Registration

On August 8, 2000, the Commission approved changes to the state information in the national voter registration form for Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Louisiana and Michigan. The Commission also approved a procedural change that allows the Office of Election Administration (the OEA) to make such changes more rapidly in the future. Instead of requesting a formal Commission vote approving the update of state information, the OEA will make the changes and notify the Commission of them. The OEA will, however, continue to submit for a formal Commission vote any changes to the form that are not specific to a given state.✦

Back Issues of the Record Available on the Internet

This issue of the *Record* and all other issues of the *Record* starting with January 1996 are available through the Internet as PDF files. Visit the FEC's World Wide Web site at http://www.fec.gov and click on "What's New" for this issue. Click "Campaign Finance Law Resources" to see back issues. Future *Record* issues will be posted on the web as well. You will need Adobe® Acrobat® Reader software to view the publication. The FEC's web site has a link that will take you to Adobe's web site, where you can download the latest version of the software for free.

Outreach

FEC Roundtables

The Commission will host another roundtable session on December 6, 2000. See the table for more details.

FEC roundtables, limited to 12 participants per session, focus on a range of subjects. All roundtables are conducted at the FEC's headquarters in Washington, DC.

The registration fee is $25, and participants will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. Please call the FEC before registering or sending money to be sure that openings remain in the session. Prepayment is required. The registration form is available at the FEC's Web site—http://www.fec.gov/pdf/rndtabl.pdf—and from Faxline, the FEC's automated fax system (202/501-3413, request document 590). For more information, call 800/424-9530 (press 1) or 202/694-1100.✦

Public Appearances

October 5, 2000
Embassy of the Republic of Singapore
Washington, D.C.
Penelope Bonsall

October 6, 2000
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA
Kate Miller

October 6-7, 2000
National Association of State Election Directors
Leesburg, VA
Brian Hancock

October 18, 2000
American University
Washington, D.C.
Chairman Wold

October 24, 2000
IMF
Washington, D.C.
Bill Kimberling

Roundtable Schedule

Date	Subject	Intended Audience
December 6 9:30 - 11 a.m.	**New FEC Alternative Dispute Resolution Program** • Explanation and Q/A about new program for settling complaints and audit referrals • How program works • Benefits for regulated community	• Lawyers and Consultants to PACs, Campaigns and Political Parties

Statistics

Midyear PAC Count Shows Slight Decrease from December 1999

The FEC's semiannual PAC count reveals that the number of PACs has decreased slightly since the last count was taken in January 2000. The table at right shows the midyear and year-end PAC figures since 1995. To see a complete listing of PAC statistics dating back to 1975, visit the FEC's Web site (http://www.fec.gov) or request a copy of the agency's August 22, 2000, press release (call 800/424-9530 and press 3 for the Public Records Office or press 2 for the Press Office).❖

	Corporate	Labor	Trade/ Member/ Health	Coop-erative	Corp. w/o Capital Stock	Non-connected[1]	Total
Jul. '95	1,670	334	804	43	129	1,002	3,982
Dec. '95	1,674	334	815	44	129	1,020	4,016
Jul. '96	1,645	332	829	43	126	1,058	4,033
Dec. '96	1,642	332	838	41	123	1,103	4,079
Jul. '97[2]	1,602	332	826	41	118	953	3,875
Dec. '97	1,597	332	825	42	117	931	3,844
Jul. '98	1,565	325	820	43	112	897	3,762
Dec. '98	1,567	321	821	39	115	935	3,798
Jul. '99	1,540	318	826	38	115	941	3,778
Dec. '99	1,548	318	844	38	115	972	3,835
Jul. '00	1,523	316	812	39	114	902	3,706

[1] *Nonconnected PACs must use their own funds to pay fundraising and administrative expenses, while the other categories of PACs have corporate or labor "connected organizations" that are permitted to pay those expenses for their PACs. On the other hand, nonconnected PACs may solicit contributions from the general public, while solicitations by corporate and labor PACs are restricted.*

[2] *During the first six months of 1997, 227 PACs were administratively terminated because of inactivity.*

Compliance

(continued from page 2)

Nonfilers

The campaign committees of the candidates listed at right failed to file required campaign finance disclosure reports. The list is based on recent FEC news releases. The FEC is required by law to publicize the names of nonfiling campaign committees. 2 U.S.C. §438(a)(7). The agency handles nonfiler cases through its Administrative Fines Program.❖

Candidate	Office Sought	Report Not Filed
Abair, Peter J.	House MA/01	Pre-Primary
Buchanan, Patrick J.	Presidential	August Monthly
Carroll, Jennifer S.	House FL/03	Pre-Primary
Clarke, Una S.	House NY/11	Pre-Primary
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	House FL/21	Pre-Primary
Detro, Mark	House OK/02	Pre-Primary
Dodd, Douglas J.	House FL/02	Pre-Primary
Ducey, Susan G.	House OK/04	Pre-Primary
Fee, John	House NY/30	Pre-Primary
Harris, Kevin Bruce	House AZ/06	Pre-Primary
Lafalce, John J.	House NY/29	Pre-Primary
Meeks, Gregory W.	House NY/06	Pre-Primary
Sessman, Ray	Senate FL	Pre-Primary
Troutt, Eric D.	House OK/02	Pre-Primary

FECFile Help on Web

The manual for the Commission's FECFile 3 electronic filing software is now available on the FEC's web site. You can download a PDF version of the manual at http://www.fec.gov/pdf/fecfile3.pdf.

Index

The first number in each citation refers to the "number" (month) of the 2000 *Record* issue in which the article appeared. The second number, following the colon, indicates the page number in that issue. For example, "3:4" means that the article is in the March issue on page 4.

Advisory Opinions

Alternative disposition of 2000-09, 10:5
Reconsideration of 2000-08, 10:5
1999-24: Web site sponsored by LLC featuring information on candidates, 1:17
1999-29: Fundraising exemption from state limits for direct mailing by Presidential committee, 1:19
1999-30: Application of allocation ratio in state with single house legislature, 1:20
1999-31: Application of one-third rule to prizes and premiums used in connection with payroll deduction, 1:21
1999-32: Indian tribe's utility authority treated as separate from the tribe, 3:4
1999-33: Delayed transmittal of payroll deductions, 3:5
1999-34: Use of campaign funds to finance charity event, 2:2
1999-35: Soliciting for SSF through electronic deduction system, 2:4
1999-36: Fundraising via electronic checks and Internet fund transfers, 3:5
1999-37: PAC distribution of express advocacy communications through Web site and e-mail, 4:1
1999-39: Disaffiliation of SSFs after corporate restructuring, 4:5
1999-40: Solicitation of members of rural electric cooperatives, 5:6
2000-1: Paid leave of absence for attorney seeking federal office, 4:5
2000-2: Campaign rental of candidate-owned office, 5:7
2000-3: PAC's payment for corporate communication, 5:8
2000-4: Automatic Deductions for credit union PAC, 5:8
2000-5: Application of $25,000 limit to contributions by Indian tribe, 7:8
2000-6: Use of federal convention funds to develop voter data base and balloting system, 7:9
2000-7: Use of corporate web sites to provide PAC information and solicit contributions, 7:9
2000-10: "Permission to solicit form" placed on trade association Web page, 8:8
2000-11: Misplaced payroll-deducted contributions, 8:9
2000-12: Using campaign funds to pay convention expenses of former presidential candidates, 9:5
2000-13: Internet video coverage of Republican and Democratic national conventions, 8:9
2000-14: Status of New York State Committee of the Working Families Party as state committee, 9:6
2000-15: Payroll deduction by trade association's affiliated member, 9:7
2000-16: Political ads on Internet for academic study, 10:2
2000-17: Establishment of separate segregated fund by subsidiary of foreign corporation, 9:7
2000-18: Closing date for Nader 2000 matching funds, 10:3
2000-19: Retroactively reallocating ballot composition ratio, 10:4
2000-21: New York Conservative Party as State Committee, 10:5

Compliance

Administrative Fines Program, 5:1,7:1, 10:1
Alternative Dispute Resolution Program, 7:2, 8:10
MUR 3774: Failure to allocate expenses between federal and nonfederal accounts for get-out-the-vote drive conducted by third party, 3:3
MUR 4322 and 4650: Violations by candidate, campaign committees, treasurer and relative, 2:1
MUR 4648: Failure to disclose purpose of expenditures and other violations, 3:4

Court Cases

_____ v. FEC
– Akins, 8:12
– Arlen Specter '96, 8:14
– Becker, 8:13
– Christine Beaumont, et al., 3:9
– Patrick J. Buchanan, et. al., 9:8
– DNC, 4:6
– DSCC, 1:2
– Fulani, Lenora B., 7:7
– Hooker, John Jay, 6:9, 7:8
– Unified Independent Party, Committee for, 7:8
– Virginia Society for Human Life, Inc., 3:8
FEC v. _____
– Christian Coalition, 4:7
– Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 7:1, 10:6
– Freedom's Heritage Forum, 6:8
– Friend for Fasi, 3:9, 8:14
– Fund for Conservative Majority (Heckman), 6:8
– National Rifle Association, 6:9
– Salvi for Senate Committee, 6:9
– Toledano, James, 6:9
Other
– Fireman v. USA, 1:13
– Hooker v. All Contributors, 8:15
– Mariani v. USA, 1:3, 7:7
– Reform Party v. Gargan, 5:9, 7:8
– Shrink PAC v. Nixon, 3:7

(continued on back cover)

Campaign Guides Available!

It has been brought to our attention that many committees do not have copies of the *Campaign Guides* – the single most valuable tool available to committees.

For each type of committee, a *Campaign Guide* explains, in clear English, the complex regulations regarding the activity of political committees. It shows readers, for example, how to fill out FEC reports and illustrates how the law applies to practical situations.

We publish four *Campaign Guides*, each for a different type of committee, and are happy to mail your committee as many copies as you need, free of charge. We encourage you to view them on our Web site (go to www.fec.gov, then click on "Campaign Finance Law Resources" and then scroll down to "Publications").

If you would like to place an order for paper copies of the *Campaign Guides*, please call 800-424-9530, or return the form below by mail.

Fold

Order Form

Name:_____

Name of Committee:_____

Address:_____ City:_____

State:_____ Zip Code:_____

Campaign Guide	Number of Copies
For *Congressional Candidates and Committees*:	_____
For *Corporations and Labor Organizations*:	_____
For *Nonconnected Committees*:	_____
For *Political Party Committees*:	_____

Please fold this form into thirds, seal it and drop it in the mail. Fold Over

_____

_____

_____

NO POSTAGE NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST-CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 12976 WASHINGTON, DC

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
INFORMATION DIVISION
999 E STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20277-2976

Index

(continued from page 10)

Regulations
Administrative Fines, 5:1, 7:1
Coordination, 1:14; 4:3
Election Cycle Reporting, 6:1, 8:4
Electronic Filing, 5:1, 8:1
Electronic Freedom of Information Act, 4:1
Express Advocacy, 4:2
Presidential Public Funding, 5:3
Repayments by Federally Financed Presidential Primary Campaign Committees, 4:2
State Waivers, 4:3, 7:5

Reports
Georgia special election, 9:4
October reporting reminder, 9:1
On-line 48-hour notices, 10:1
Reports due in 2000, 1:5
Reports due in July, 6:1
State Filing Waiver, 1:2; 2:5, 4:3, 5:5, 6:3, 7:5
Virginia Convention Reports, 5:5
Web access to Senate candidates' campaign finance reports, 10:1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Printed on recycled paper

Bulk Rate Mail
Postage and Fees Paid
Federal Election Commission
Permit Number G-31