

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Board of Elections and Ethics

441 4th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BOARD OF ELECTIONS AND ETHICS

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

One Judiciary Square, Room 280 North

Wednesday, August 2, 2017

10:53 a.m. to 11:28 a.m.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.

1100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., #810, Washington D.C. 20036

Washington: (202) 898-1108 / Baltimore: (410) 752-3376

Toll Free: (888) 445-3376

PRESENT:

Board of Elections and Ethics:

MICHAEL BENNETT, Board Chairman

DIONNA LEWIS, Board Member

Executive Director:

ALICE MILLER

General Counsel:

KENNETH J. MCGHIE, ESQ.

WILLIAM SANFORD, ESQ.

Executive Director, OFC:

CECILY COLLIER-MONTGOMERY

C O N T E N T S

AGENDA	PAGE
Adoption of Agenda	5
Adoption of Minutes	
Regular Board Meeting	
Friday June 30, 2017	5
Board Matters	5
Public Matters	5
Executive Director's Report	8
General Counsel's Report	24
Campaign Finance Report	25
Public Questions Regarding Reports	31
Adjournment	32

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Good morning. We are going
3 to call the meeting to order. Let me introduce the
4 persons that are here. We've got a pretty condensed
5 agenda today. This is the August meeting. To my far
6 right is Mr. Montgomery from the Office of Campaign and
7 Finance. To her left, Michael Gill, Board member. To
8 his left, Ken McGhie, General Counsel, Board of
9 Elections. I'm Michael Bennett, the Chair. To my left,
10 Ms. Dionna Lewis, Board member, and to her left is Alice
11 Miller, Executive Director of the Board of Elections.

12 The first item is the adoption of the agenda.
13 Can I get a motion from one of the Board members?

14 MS. LEWIS: I'd like to adopt to make a motion
15 -- I'd like to move to adopt today's agenda.

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

17 MR. GILL: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All in favor, ayes?

19 (Chorus of ayes.)

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Unanimous. The next
21 item on the agenda, adoption of the minutes from the
22 previous meeting. The July meeting was held on June

1 30th, based on holiday schedules. So those minutes are
2 effectively for the July Board Meeting. So can I get a
3 motion to adopt the minutes from the July Board Meeting?

4 MS. LEWIS: I move to adopt the July 2017 Board
5 Meeting minutes.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Mr. Gill?

7 MR. GILL: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All in favor?

9 (Chorus of ayes.)

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Unanimous. Now adopted.

11 Any Board matters? Ms. Lewis?

12 MS. LEWIS: No.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Mr. Gill?

14 MR. GILL: No.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: None from me. Public
16 matters? Anyone in the public have any matters to
17 discuss?

18 Mr. Sindram?

19 MR. SINDRAM: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Board
20 members.

21 MS. LEWIS: Hello.

22 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Do you have anything for us,

1 Mr. Sindram?

2 MR. SINDRAM: I do.

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

4 MR. SINDRAM: Thank you. I had written to
5 Campaign Finance --

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Mr. Sindram, can you
7 identify yourself for the record?

8 MR. SINDRAM: Yes, certainly. Michael Sindram,
9 disabled veteran. Served our country more than most.
10 Once again, good morning, Mr. Chair, Board members. Can
11 you hear me?

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, sir.

13 MR. SINDRAM: Great. On July 9th of last year
14 I wrote to the Office of Campaign Finance, Cecily
15 Collier-Montgomery, Director. I am still eagerly
16 anxiously awaiting a written response. And I will get
17 another copy of that letter to you all.

18 I was going through some timely news articles.
19 And I'm looking at the express of May 2nd this year.
20 Campaign audits, there is an election reform. The recent
21 and relevant part, and I quote, "Problems with Todd's
22 back-to-back campaigns have focused attention on the

1 District's Office of Campaign Finance and whether the
2 long, troubled agency is helping or hindering the
3 District Government's quest to shed its reputation for
4 corrupt politics. Many councilmembers say that in Todd's
5 case, the office went too far, letting the candidate
6 delay responses to important questions for almost a year.

7 The underpinning of financial disclosure is
8 that the public knows what's going on, said D.C. Council
9 Chairman, Phil Mendelson. There is a disservice if the
10 Office of Campaign Finance has identified missing
11 documents and the public doesn't know for a year if that
12 were true."

13 And the question I pose to you all is this, has
14 anything changed from that point until now?

15 And I want to submit this for the record as
16 well, a hard copy. And then additionally, in the
17 Express, on June 16th, it indicates, "Reports finds
18 favoritism to top donor to Bowzer."

19 And I quote, "A report released Wednesday by
20 D.C. Council Committee found that the City Administrator
21 Rashad Young tried to appease a top campaign donor to
22 Mayor Muriel Bowzer by urging city attorneys to quickly

1 settle contract disputes between the District and the
2 donor's company." It clearly seems that the culture of
3 corruption is alive and well. Sad but true.

4 Any questions, I'd be delighted to field them
5 at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any questions from any
7 members?

8 MS. LEWIS: Not from me.

9 MR. GILL: None from me. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Great.

11 MR. SINDRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Sindram. The
13 next items is the Executive Director's report. Alice
14 Miller.

15 MS. MILLER: Thank you. Good morning. I'm
16 going to begin by just giving you all an update on the
17 procurement. As you know, I've been reporting on the
18 status of the acquisition of our new voter registration
19 system that the council authorized funding for.

20 By way of an update, the procurement has been
21 assigned a contracting officer within the Office of
22 Contract and Procurement Information Technology

1 Commodities Group. The contracting officer has provided
2 the Board with a draft project timeline that estimates
3 that at the time, the award for the contract to be
4 selected by -- to have a vendor selected would be
5 sometime between the end of the calendar year and the
6 beginning of next year. That projection is assuming that
7 all pieces of the puzzle are tightly fit together, such
8 as the proposal being timely solicited. According to the
9 draft plan, which currently has a date of August 8th, and
10 the vendors are then selected by OCP for responses which
11 are then received and assisted demonstrations are
12 presented before the Panel that is put in place by both
13 the Board and MCP. So I guess the idea is that it's a
14 moving target. There are a lot of moving pieces. It's
15 nonetheless moving, but it's moving slowly.

16 Also, I want to talk a little bit about our
17 Electronic Registration Information Center. We have an
18 ERIC mailing that's underway. As a member of ERIC, we
19 are required to upload voter DMV records to ERIC every 60
20 days and establish and adhere to a regular schedule for
21 requesting ERIC data within a minimum -- with a minimum
22 of one request every calendar year. When we receive the

1 cross-state and instant reports, we must initiate contact
2 with at least 95 percent of the voters from the cross
3 state the instant reports for purposes of obtaining
4 current address information within 90 days of receiving
5 the reports.

6 Keep in mind that there are 21 jurisdictions
7 that participate with the ERIC membership. So that's the
8 cross-state information I'm talking about. The in-state
9 would be the instate reports that we receive from in-
10 state jurisdiction; in-state information where voters may
11 have voted but not necessarily updated their information
12 with us, but ERIC can identify that through the
13 information that they have.

14 Having said that, last month, the Board
15 requested and received on July 12th, information from
16 ERIC. From the cross-state report, the report identified
17 matches in the District voters to the voter and/or DMV
18 records and other ERIC-member jurisdictions of 57,106
19 records that matched our record.

20 An in-state report identified matches of
21 District voters to DC DMV records that we've been
22 intending to update that. That is 17,000 records.

1 Duplicate records in the report show the duplicate
2 records of 132 records and we also identified deceased
3 records of 654 records. So what we will now do with that
4 is by October, send to 95 percent of these voters request
5 for information to update their information with us. So
6 it's just an ongoing process to make sure we maintain our
7 voter registry and keep the records updated while we
8 contact these voters through the 21 jurisdictions that we
9 work with to make sure our records are maintained and
10 their records are maintained. Therefore, all the records
11 are maintained in the District of Columbia.

12 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: So this is focused on people
13 who have moved from the jurisdiction?

14 MS. MILLER: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Also, deaths?

16 MS. MILLER: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: And what was the other -- I
18 thought there was --

19 MS. MILLER: In-state and cross-state death
20 records.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Is there a third category?

22 MS. MILLER: And duplicate.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: And duplicate. Okay. Now,
2 is there a way for us to -- I had a second question. Is
3 there a way for us to go back, once we at least have that
4 level of purge, i.e., have identified deaths and
5 jurisdiction moves and all that, and duplicates, is there
6 a way to go back and match -- I know you were saying we
7 should, go back and match that up with the voting records
8 in the past?

9 So for instance, if we say that we find there
10 is 100 people that actually were deceased on the rolls,
11 could we take those 100 names, assuming we have death
12 dates, and assuming those death dates were before the
13 past election and match up to see if they voted --

14 MS. MILLER: Before we had information on their
15 death?

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes.

17 MS. MILLER: We can do that.

18 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Unless it's just something
19 that we can do --

20 MS. MILLER: Yes. We would have access to that
21 information.

22 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. So the database is --

1 the system is capable of generating a match?

2 MS. MILLER: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That's one of the things
4 that as we move forward with the new system, being able
5 to do retroactive matches is probably something we want
6 to focus on. I'm just listening to that and I'm just
7 thinking that's something that we want to be able to do
8 quickly.

9 MS. MILLER: I think it would be a lot better
10 with the new system because with that, it would be a lot
11 cleaner with the new system and the process would be a
12 lot easier with the new system.

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yeah.

14 MS. MILLER: We can do it with the current
15 system, I just think it will be a lot more reliable.

16 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: As we look at the new
17 system, I think we ought to be probably thinking about
18 how do we take the capabilities or the data that we're
19 going to get out of ERIC and allow our system to be able
20 to utilize that data to do things faster and quicker or
21 maybe even more than it can do right now. I would
22 imagine now that we'd have to do a fair amount of work by

1 hand to do that match, but a new system, if we thought
2 about it -- if we think about it with the contractor, it
3 was the capability to do some matching that we don't
4 necessarily have now to do some automatic database
5 queries.

6 Does that make sense, what I'm saying?

7 MS. LEWIS: Yes.

8 MS. MILLER: There are a lot of -- there's a
9 lot of delving into the system that we're dealing with
10 going into and getting the queries and matching stuff
11 back and forth that we're dealing with our vendor right
12 now, and the staff as we try to match the data, going
13 back and forth with the new system. The thought is going
14 to be a lot easier.

15 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes. Because my guess is
16 we're going to probably, in the future, we're going to
17 get a lot more inquiries that having the ability to do
18 these database matches and having the software and the
19 program as part of the new system would probably be
20 helpful to us.

21 MS. MILLER: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: So as we switch back to the

1 new system, as we go we go through that and start looking
2 at operational requirements, we really ought to think
3 through some of those things too and I think
4 particularly, as we look at some of the lawsuit we have
5 and we have to produce certain things, we ought to be
6 thinking about what can we get the system to do. All the
7 data is there, and so with the new system, it's really
8 just a matter of programming to allow for certain
9 inquiries and it shouldn't drive costs dramatically
10 because all these programs, for the most part, they do
11 all these database matching and this stuff is all off the
12 shelf. So it's a matter of plugging it into a new
13 system. Anyway, just a thought to consider.

14 MS. MILLER: So what we will do, pursuant to
15 the ERIC By-laws, we're required to initiate contact with
16 at least 95 percent of these individuals, both from the
17 cross-state and in-state reports to solicit update the
18 office by October 10th and then report back to ERIC by
19 October 24th of what we have and that keeps the database
20 updated as well as the information ERIC updated so that
21 all the jurisdictions have the accurate information here.

22 I want to also just bring you up-to-date on

1 where we are with our E-petition signature. We will be
2 implementing E-sign. I've been reporting on that as
3 well. That is the E-sign gathering petition gathering
4 process where we nominate petitions as an option for
5 candidates for the 2018 election year. It will be the
6 first time that this process will be available as a means
7 for candidates to gather petitions. Hopefully it will
8 add to the validity of a petitioner's signature process
9 for circulators.

10 You know we've been working with Denver.
11 Again, we thought it was going to be a quick, short,
12 easy-to-do, as did they. It has been a year process. We
13 started this in February. When we started, they said oh,
14 we can do this in a moth, it'll be easy. It's the first
15 time they have worked with the jurisdiction to do it as
16 well, even though they've had it in place for about a
17 year or two. It's a learning process and we're glad we
18 started it as soon as we did. We are now to the point
19 where we can begin our testing and begin testing on our
20 process with them, I think it is next week in August. So
21 Denver will be testing with us to make sure we have what
22 we need next week with our petitions. And then once we

1 have the testing in place, the Denver officials will be
2 here to start the training in September for our staff
3 once the staff is trained on to actually use the mobile
4 app, to use the E-sign. We will then start training the
5 circulators who may be interested in doing it for the
6 candidates for our next year election. So we are
7 anticipating to begin training weekly, starting October
8 through the circulation period starting in January. I
9 think it's once a week we're going to start doing it.
10 Every other week once -- thank you.

11 MS. LEWIS: Oh, good.

12 MS. MILLER: You're sure you don't want to do
13 it once a week?

14 MS. LEWIS: No. I'd rather it be every other
15 week.

16 MS. MILLER: Twice a month.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Very good.

18 MS. MILLER: Starting in October, through the
19 petition period.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

21 MS. MILLER: We are in the process of
22 purchasing 100 mobile iPads for the circulators to rent.

1 We'll have some criteria that they'll have to provide in
2 order to rent them. The app will be available for anyone
3 to put on their own devices if they want to do that. So
4 that will be an option. Also, the basic process for
5 anyone who wants to just circulate normal petitions the
6 old-fashioned way will also be available.

7 So that's it. Can you just report really
8 quickly, just for the record, of our request from the
9 presence for the Fraud Committee and City Council and
10 their direction?

11 MS. MILLER: Yes. We actually did not receive
12 the letter from the President's Commission on Integrity
13 what is it, the President's Advisory Commission on
14 Integrity ourselves. That letter actually went to the
15 secretary, Lauren Vaughn, back in June. It wasn't until
16 last Thursday, which was on July 27th that I actually got
17 the letter myself. The letter was dated June 28th.

18 The City Council, during the interim,
19 introduced emergency legislation that directed the Board
20 not to provide the Commission with any data at all.
21 During the interim of that, I think there were a number
22 of advocacy groups that went to federal court. And Ken

1 can report on that the requested TRO that there not be
2 any information that was released from the jurisdictions
3 to the Commission that were -- that released public
4 information on the Social Security numbers, voter
5 records, criminal information or anything tied to voter
6 records.

7 The court has since issued an order that says
8 that the jurisdictions may release information that is
9 public information to the commission that they want. We
10 have since gotten a couple of letters from some civil
11 rights organizations that have requested us not to do it,
12 but the Council's law in place directs us not to release
13 any information at all. I have not released anything to
14 this point whatsoever.

15 My understanding is that the Commission itself
16 had requested jurisdiction not to do anything until the
17 court ruling. They were then going to send a subsequent
18 letter, but we have not yet received anything from them.
19 So whether or not they sent a subsequent letter to Lauren
20 Vaughn, I don't know. I haven't received anything from
21 them and they have not communicated with the Board
22 directly or anything.

1 MR. GILL: So you haven't received a direct
2 request, so there's no need to send a direct reply.

3 MS. MILLER: Right.

4 MR. GILL: The Council has already asked the
5 legislation --

6 MS. MILLER: Right.

7 MR. GILL: -- and then directed us --

8 MS. MILLER: Not to respond.

9 MR. GILL: Right. I'm thinking in terms of
10 normally I would say well, we'll somehow let people know
11 so we're not just hiding but if they can't find anything
12 or if they can't figure out where we're at.

13 MS. MILLER: I haven't received any --

14 MR. GILL: Figure out what they need.

15 MS. MILLER: I have not gotten a direct request
16 from them at any point. And it's the letter that I did
17 receive came from Lauren Vaughn, and it was over a month
18 late from when she received it from the Commission
19 herself.

20 MR. GILL: But we would, by no means, blame it
21 on the postal service?

22 MS. MILLER: No.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, like I said, the
2 letter was not directed to us.

3 MS. MILLER: No.

4 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I think two important things
5 to note from Alice's comments, for the record, is one,
6 there is legislation that says that we are not supposed
7 to divide anything. And so under the circumstances,
8 since they said don't respond to the court cases that
9 were up, a response to them is probably inappropriate
10 anyway.

11 It may be appropriate to respond if we get a
12 follow-up letter.

13 MS. MILLER: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: And the response would be we
15 don't have the authority, based on the legislation. But
16 I think further, it should be noted that there is only a
17 couple of bits of information that they asked for if it
18 wasn't public information anyway. And we would certainly
19 be able to get it through any other means or anybody else
20 in the public relative to the voter registration and all
21 that.

22 For the record, I just wanted to make sure it

1 was clear what the circumstances were that you were in
2 with regard to that Commission. But I think it's also
3 important to note that that is an Advisory Commission
4 that has absolutely no authority at all to ask for
5 anything from anybody, certainly not to demand anything.

6 Ken, do you want to comment on any of the court
7 cases that you were following?

8 MR. MCGHIE: No. I will also add that there
9 was a decision that the case with the Presidential
10 Commission and they were requesting a TRO and the court
11 denied the TRO and said that the information -- they may
12 request the information, but they cannot demand the
13 information from Commission. Like Alice said, a letter
14 to all the election officials saying that he shouldn't
15 comply in a case. There is a law out that says that we
16 can't.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Any other comments on
18 that?

19 MS. MILLER: It's also my understanding that
20 even with that law in place, it's an emergency
21 legislation. So the emergency will obviously expire at
22 some point. I think that before the emergency expired

1 with -- it's a catch 22 because with the emergency in all
2 of our laws, they have to go to Congress to be signed.

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That would be interesting.
4 My point, I guess, where we're sort of getting at but in
5 a roundabout way, Michael's point it's the Advisory
6 Commission that we don't have to comply with if we don't
7 feel the need.

8 MS. MILLER: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: So I think to the extent
10 that the public information is available, if they were to
11 get that public information on their own and then come
12 back with a need of something beyond that, then we can do
13 that.

14 MS. MILLER: Think about a FOIA. I think there
15 may be some amendment to the legislation that requests if
16 it's a FOIA or if it's FOIA information.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yeah. You have to comply
18 with FOIA, but you also direct people. FOIA is
19 burdensome and I think we can direct them to where it's
20 publicly available and they have a desire to comply.

21 All right. Does that conclude your report?

22 MS. MILLER: That's it.

1 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: So Mr. McGhie.

2 MR. MCGHIE: Okay. I just have a litigation
3 status update and that is just the same three pieces of
4 litigation that we had last month, One Fair Wage, that is
5 the one involving Initiative 77. We had originally,
6 initially, stated that in the proposals, they did not
7 collect enough signatures for us to move forward and they
8 filed a complaint in Superior Court. But in the interim,
9 we've been working with the proposals to see whether they
10 have some additional signatures. So we requested a -- we
11 had a joint motion to request a continuance on us
12 answering it and we are continuing to work out the
13 details, and we had a quick grant of that motion. So now
14 we have until October 9th to file our motion.

15 Also, in the interim, we have a scheduled
16 administrative challenge on the initiative scheduled for
17 the 10th. So we have an administrative challenge on the
18 table at 10:00. The other two matters are still the
19 same, Petition for Enforcement Matters, where it is still
20 pending in court. Superior Court told us that our
21 records were incomplete and so we are still in the
22 process of getting together a complete record to forward

1 to the Superior Court. And that would conclude my
2 litigation status update.

3 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Any questions, Ms.
4 Lewis, Mr. Gill?

5 Okay. Next on the agenda, Office of Campaign
6 Finance. Ms. Montgomery?

7 MS. COLLIER-MONTGOMERY: Yes. Good morning.
8 During the month of July, on July the 10th in 2017, I
9 presented testimony before the Community on judiciary and
10 public safety of the Council of the District of Columbia
11 on several proposals to amend the Campaign Finance Act.
12 The proposals, for the most part, will tighten up the
13 reporting requirements of the Act by increasing the
14 certification requirements of the treasurers of
15 committees; in particular, the Independent Expenditure
16 Committee as well as the Political Action Committee.
17 One provision will increase the bundling
18 reporting requirement from \$10,000 to \$15,000. One
19 proposal will prohibit anyone other than a national
20 person from making contributions to political committees
21 as well as to the citizen and service programs. One
22 proposal will deem as ineligible to do business with the

1 government, in particular, with respect to contracts
2 exceeding \$100,000. Anyone who has made a contribution
3 to a covered recipient, specifically, a candidate for
4 elected office.

5 The other proposal will prohibit anyone who is
6 doing business with the government or seeking to do
7 business with the government in excess of \$250,000 from
8 making contribution to candidates for elected office.
9 That particular provision is the one that would be the
10 most burdensome for the Office of Campaign Finance
11 because it would require us to enforce those provisions.
12 And so therefore, there would have to be a shared
13 database available to us, which would identify who those
14 particular business are or individuals who are attempting
15 to do business or who are engaged in business with the
16 District Government.

17 Basically, those are just some of the
18 highlights of those particular pieces of legislation.
19 Also, during the month of the July, there were three
20 reporting dates. The first was the July 1, 2017 reports
21 of received expenditures which was due by our constituent
22 service program on July 3, 2017. We have 10 required

1 filers. We had nine timely filers. We also had all nine
2 of those filers electronically file. One of our
3 reporting -- with one of the reporting entities with the
4 constituent service programs, the treasurer is
5 accountable as well as the public official who organized
6 that constituent service program. So that accounts for
7 the filing with respect to that program.

8 Also, July 1, 2017 was the filing deadline for
9 filing reports of receipts and expenditures by our state
10 representative statehood funds. We have three required
11 filers, all three timely filed, and also electronically
12 filed their reports with us.

13 With the July 31st filing deadline, which is
14 for the reports of receipts and expenditures by our
15 Independent Expenditure Committee, as well as our
16 Principal Campaign Committee and Political Action
17 Committee, that filing deadline was this past Monday. So
18 at this date, we are pulling together the numbers of
19 required filers as well as the numbers of committees who
20 timely filed or did not file. So I will probably present
21 those stats at the next Board meeting.

22 Also, during the month of July, we had one new

1 candidate committee who registered with the agency to
2 participate in the 2018 election cycle, and that is Shaka
3 Nicole Reed, City Council Ward 1. Basically the
4 candidate committee registered on July 21, 2017, but they
5 withdrew on July 24, 2017.

6 With our entrance conferences, we held an
7 entrance conference on July 19, 2017. There were two
8 participants, Kent Bowes, candidate for Bowes 2018, and
9 Matt Goldsmith, treasurer for Bowes 2018. In our audit
10 branch during the month of July, the audit branch
11 conducted 22 desk reviews of reports which had been filed
12 with the agency. In terms of ongoing audits, we have,
13 with respect to field audits, one of the many elected
14 officials, Vince Gray 2016 from the 2016 election cycle.
15 With our periodic random audits, we have one which is
16 ongoing with our constituent service program and that was
17 April the 1st of 2017, our filing deadline and that of
18 the Citizen's Outreach Fund. We did not issue any audits
19 during this past reporting cycle. I would ask general
20 counsel to give a report at this time.

21 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

22 MR. SANFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and

1 distinguished Board members. My name is William Sanford,
2 general counsel for the Office of Campaign Finance.
3 During the month of July 2017, the Office of the General
4 Counsel did not receive any referrals from either the
5 reports analysis and audit division or the public
6 information and reports records management division
7 because as the director indicated, the most recent filing
8 date was July 31st and that has not been determined
9 regarding how many reports have not been timely filed.

10 The Office of the General Counsel did issue six
11 ANC or its affiliates to timely file summary financial
12 statements in which no fines were imposed. The Office of
13 the General Counsel did not refer any petitions for
14 enforcement to the Office of the General Counsel for the
15 Board of Elections; however, during the month of July,
16 the Office of the General Counsel collected \$13,000 in
17 fines and those fines were paid by Muriel Bowzer from the
18 2014 campaign and the fine was imposed for receiving
19 excessive contributions during the 2014 campaign.

20 During the month of July 2017, the Office of
21 the General Counsel maintained a total of three open
22 investigations. They included the following: OCF FI

1 2013-013, Lee Calhoun was the respondent that the
2 investigation was internally generated and the infraction
3 was campaign contribution violations. The second
4 investigation is OCF FI 2013-014; internally generated.
5 The respondent was Stanley Straughter. The infraction
6 was campaign contribution violations. And finally, OCF
7 FI 2013-015, internally generated. The respondent is
8 Jeffrey Thompson. Again, it was campaign contribution
9 violation and all three of those investigations are
10 currently pending.

11 During the month of July 2017, there were no
12 show cause proceedings, no request for Interpretive
13 Opinions. And as I indicated earlier, there were no
14 referrals of petition for enforcement to the Office of
15 the General Counsel for the Board of Elections. And that
16 should conclude my report.

17 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Any questions?

18 MS. COLLIER-MONTGOMERY: No. That concludes
19 our report.

20 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Great. Thank you. If I
21 must say -- I want to say for the record, anyway, in
22 observing the hearings that both you, Mr. Sanford and Ms.

1 Montgomery conducted to the primary respondents did an
2 incredible job. I mean, absolutely did great in handling
3 the facts and great presentation and all the issues were
4 very well thought through and I think the public
5 benefited from your work in that area.

6 So thank you.

7 MR. SANFORD: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: So that concludes that
9 report. Are there any public questions regarding the
10 reports from the Board of Elections, General Counsel, or
11 the Office of Campaign Finance?

12 MR. SINDRAM: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Yes, sir?

14 MR. SINDRAM: Yes. I just wanted to reiterate
15 my request, albeit it for an untimely reply from Ms.
16 Montgomery's letter of July 9th of last year. I
17 resubmitted it. So you all will have a copy, and
18 hopefully by next meeting I'll get a reply.

19 CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. SINDRAM: Thank you.

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: All right. The meeting is
adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:28 a.m., the Regular Board
Meeting was adjourned.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION

I, GERVEL A. WATTS, the officer before whom the foregoing meeting was taken, do hereby certify that the testimony that appears in the foregoing pages was recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that said proceedings is a true record of the proceedings; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this meeting was held.

GERVEL A. WATTS

Notary Public in and for the
District of Columbia

My Commission expires: February 14, 2019

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue N.W., #810, Washington, D.C. 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.
1100 Connecticut Avenue N.W., #810, Washington, D.C. 20036
Washington: 202-898-1108 • Baltimore: 410-752-3376
Toll Free: 888-445-3376