

TO: News Media

September 1976

FROM:

SUBJECT: Campaign Contribution Summaries for the 1976 Legislative Races

Rather than being clear-cut facts, all campaign contribution summary analyses are extremely subjective and open to a wide range of correct, but differing, interpretations. These summaries of campaign contributions for legislative candidates represent only one such viewpoint.

An attempt is made in this series of compilations to provide the public with some rough generalities about the type of money being received by individual candidates for the Legislature. Researchers are limited by their ability to recognize names and addresses and identify those names with specific vested interest groups. It is hoped that any inaccuracies will be the result of incomplete recognition rather than misinterpretation.

Criteria for placing a contribution in a "business" category rather than "individual persons" included: 1) the contributor was shown as a business or political committee representing business; 2) the person making the contribution was a member of the board of directors or an officer or major stockholder in a business or a lobbyist representing business; 3) an attorney, physician, or other professional was categorized "business" if the address was determined to be the business address rather than the home, the assumption being that the contribution was coming from the business rather than personal checking account.

"Union" designation was given to all recognizable contributions from a union, employee organization or the lobbyists for all such organizations. It also includes personal non-reimbursed contributions (as designated on lobbyist reports) from such lobbyists. These personal contributions were attributed to unions in general, however, rather than the specific organization employing the lobbyist.

The other area of subjective interpretation involves the question of when a campaign for election actually begins. For the purpose of these reports, any contribution reported by an individual after January 1 following his last election for office is considered a contribution towards the next election. This may appear to inflate actual financial activity for this 1976 election when such fund-raising was to pay for past campaign debts. Therefore original deficits that existed in January are shown in the summaries as a separate line item and outstanding loans are reduced as paid. The time schedule chosen by an incumbent or future candidate for raising funds may have little connection with actual election dates. Without picking up this financial activity within a reasonably-short time following an election, there would be gaps in the public's available picture of the total flow of contributions for some office holders. This method is only one of many possible ways of analysing how an election is financed.

Given the pressures of timing, work load, and human fatigue in compiling these summaries for all legislative races, they are submitted to you with humility and sincere apologies for those embarrassing errors which I am sure have been inadvertently included.

As of All Reports Filed with the P.D.C. Through 8/19/76:

P.U.L.S.E. has given to 46 legislative candidates	\$ 17,166.24
United for Washington has given to 44 candidates	21,000.00
Winmar (Safeco Subsidiary) has given to 25 candidates	3,235.00
Vernon Lindskog & partners has given to 19 candidates	3,400.00

6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502
October 13, 1978

As a citizen lobbyist in Olympia I am acutely aware of the importance to good candidates to have strong grass roots financial backing. Small individual contributions are the most significant kind a candidate can receive and are the hardest to accumulate. My study of the 1976 election showed that only 17% of all contributions given to legislative candidates in the 1976 election campaigns came from individual contributors giving less than \$50 each.

The high cost of running a successful campaign is also familiar to me. Too few citizens are aware of how expensive and difficult it is for a candidate to get his or her message before the public. In the 1976 general election there were 1,584,590 votes cast. Had each of those voters contributed only \$1.43 to an election "general fund", the primary and general election for all legislative candidates could have been funded at the 1976 level of \$2,265,276!

Because I am supportive of your campaign efforts, it is with great regret that my husband and I have had to conclude that his support of my lobbying efforts cannot extend to giving contributions to all of the candidates to whom we would very much like to contribute. This is just one of the realities of being an independent citizen lobbyist. I do wish you the best of luck and hope to see you in Olympia in January.

Sincerely,

Jolene Unsoeld



6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502

Dear

In an attempt to provide the public with summary information contained in the lobbyist and lobbyist employer reports, I have undertaken a study of these reports for 1975 and the first half of 1976. Some reports are unclear or contain incomplete information. In the interest of presenting an accurate summary of your financial activities associated with lobbying in Washington state, I am seeking your assistance in making the records as complete and accurate as possible. Please review the items checked below and provide me with a clarification or file an amended form with the Public Disclosure Commission:

1. Reports for _____ do not show compensation for lobbying.
2. Each quarterly report by a lobbyist shall contain an itemized listing of each such expenditure in the nature of a contribution of money or of tangible or intangible personal property to any legislator, or for or on behalf of any legislator. All contributions made to, or for the benefit of, any legislator shall be identified by date, amount, and the name of the legislator receiving, or to be benefited by each such contribution. (RCW 42.17.170 (2)(c)) Your reports for _____ do not properly provide this information. Incorporation of the weekly reports by reference on the quarterly report does not sufficiently satisfy the reporting requirements and, in my opinion, frustrates the purpose of the act.
3. The sum of your weekly reports do not equal the totals shown on your quarterly report for _____.
4. Your L-3 report for 1975 apparently fails to include the amount of compensation or salary paid to the lobbyist or lobbyists.
5. The total expenditures made by you in 1975 in connection with lobbyist _____ on your L-3 report is less than reported by this lobbyist.
6. The L-3 report for 1975 does not list all contributions made to a _____ candidate for state office, to a political committee supporting or opposing a candidate for state office, or to a political committee supporting or opposing a state-wide ballot proposition. Such contributions shall be identified by the name and address of the recipient and the aggregate amount contributed to each such recipient. Also required to be listed is the name of each state elected official, successful candidate for state office or members of his immediate family to whom the lobbyist employer made expenditures, directly or indirectly, either through a lobbyist or otherwise, the amount of such expenditures and the purpose for such expenditures if such expenditure is made for the purpose of influencing, honoring, or benefiting such elected official, successful candidate or member of his immediate family, as an elected official or candidate (RCW 42.17.180 (2)(4)).

I am looking forward to a speedy response from you concerning this apparent oversight. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Jolene Unsoeld



6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502

Dear

In monitoring the financial activities of your campaign committee, I have found what appears to be unclear or incomplete information. In the interest of presenting an accurate summary of your financial activities associated with elections, I am seeking your assistance in making the records as complete and accurate as possible. Please review the items checked below and provide me with a clarification or file an amended form with the Public Disclosure Commission:

- _____ 1. Insufficient identification of contributor/contributors --RCW 42.17.060(2) and 42.17.090(1)(b)

- _____ 2. Insufficient identification of recipient or person to whom an expenditure was made in the aggregate amount of \$25 or more, and the date, and purpose of each such expenditure -- RCW 42.17.090(1)(f)

- _____ 3. Aggregate value of all contributions received from each person during the preceding twelve-month period not shown or incorrectly shown -- RCW 42.17.090(1)(b)

- _____ 4. Computation of Total Contributions or Total Expenditures incorrectly reported --

- _____ 5. Contribution reported received by _____ not reported by you.

- _____ 6. Contribution reported given by _____ not reported received by you.

- _____ 7. Incomplete incorporation of C-3 reports by reference on Schedule A

- _____ 8. Reporting deadlines missed or late

- _____ 9. Inadequate handling of previous campaign surplus or debt

I am looking forward to a speedy response from you concerning this apparent oversight. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Jolene Unsoeld



TO:

FROM: Jolene Unsoeld
6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502

SUBJECT: Reconciliation of Lobbyist L-2 Reports and Employer's L-3 Report, Etc.

Since the passage of Initiative 276 I have tried to improve reporting procedures and to summarize information provided by the law. In an attempt to provide the public with summaries of financial activities associated with lobbying in Washington state, I have been examining the lobbyist and lobbyist employer reports. I am seeking your assistance in identifying reporting difficulties and in making the records as complete and accurate as possible. Please review the items checked below. I would appreciate your comments, clarifications, or suggestions.

1. The L-3 report requires listing "all contributions made to a candidate for state office, to a political committee supporting or opposing a candidate for state office, or to a political committee supporting or opposing a state-wide ballot proposition." This includes contributions made through the lobbyists and those made through direct contact by the employer.

2. The L-3 report requires listing "the name of each state elected official, successful candidate for state office or members of his immediate family to whom the lobbyist employer made expenditures, directly or indirectly, either through a lobbyist or otherwise, the amount of such expenditures and the purpose for such expenditures". "Expenditure" includes a payment, contribution, subscription, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

3.

6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502
February 18, 1977

Dear

Attached are copies of actual portions of the manuscript I am preparing for volume II of Who Gave? Who Got? How Much?

Is it accurate? Or have I perpetrated some major goof?

Now is the time to find the errors -- before any of this material is released to the public.

I know what a horrendous work load you have. I also know that I cannot move thousands of figures around from one page to another through several operations without making mistakes. Each of you is the best one to sense an inconsistency in my summary and analysis of your campaign contribution figures. Therefore I must seek your assistance in checking the reasonableness of the numbers I have used.

Already some of you have found major errors in the first material I distributed to you. Most of the discrepancies involved a failure to consistently follow the proper set of dotted lines across the page. Thank you very much for your cooperation with this effort. I am most anxious that this work accurately reflect the flow of campaign contributions in the 1976 election. Only with your cooperation can I achieve that goal.

Please give me your criticism by March 1. You may contact me at night, on weekends, or whenever it is convenient for you. My home telephone is 206-866-8815 or you may leave a message for me at Ulcer Gulch. I will check out every question raised by you and provide you with a response.

You may be interested to know that the total campaign contributions given to legislative races in 1976 is in excess of \$2,260,000.

Thank you very much for your helpfulness. I am certainly appreciative of your assistance and regret the additional burden it places on your limited time.

Sincerely,

Jolene Unsoeld

Jolene Unsoeld

P.S. There is one more facet of this project that requires checking. In my research I have cross-indexed contributions both as reported by the candidate and the contributing entity. In some cases these figures do not agree and must be further researched. There are many possible reasons for the discrepancies and I am in no way accusing anyone of mis-reporting. I am only trying to clarify the actual facts. I may have been simply blind in reading the list of contributors and over-looked or failed to recognize a particular contribution. Or the check may have been returned and never so noted by the contributing entity in his reports. Some checks may be misplaced and still uncashed. Any contribution which I could not match between the giver and the receiver is noted below. These will be reported as having been received by you unless you notify me otherwise. If they are in error, please bring them to my attention. Thanks again.

Contributions reported given by the following I cannot find reported by you:

TO: Washington Legislators

6110 Buckthorn N.W.
Olympia, Washington 98502
February 16, 1976

FROM: Jolene Unsoeld

SUBJECT: Volume II, Who Gave? Who Got? How Much?

One of the criticisms of my first publication Who Gave? Who Got? How Much? was that it gave no mention of the amount a legislator had raised in his election campaign from small individual contributions. We all know that to be the hardest kind of money to raise. Therefore, in the summary of the 1976 legislative elections which I am now preparing for publication, I am including that kind of analysis. I wish to emphasize that there are no absolutes in analyzing how elections are financed and that my method is only one of many possibilities. However, I do want you to be familiar with my criteria.

"Small individual contributions" are limited to contributions of less than \$50 from individuals not identifiable with any vested interest group.

All research is limited by an ability to recognize names and addresses and identify those names with specific vested interest groups. It is hoped that inaccuracies will be the result of incomplete recognition rather than misinterpretation.

Criteria for placing a contribution in a "business-related" category include:

- 1) the contributor was shown as a business or political committee representing business;
- 2) the person making the contribution was a member of the board of directors or an officer or major stockholder in a business, or a lobbyist representing business;
- 3) an attorney, physician, or other professional was categorized "business" if the address was determined to be the business address rather than the home, the assumption being that the contribution was coming from the business rather than personal checking account.

A "union" or "labor" designation was given to all recognizable contributions from a union, employee organization or the lobbyists for all such organizations. It also includes personal non-reimbursed contributions (as designated on lobbyist reports) from such lobbyists.

The other area of subjective interpretation involves the question of when a campaign for election actually begins. For the purpose of this summary, any contribution reported by an individual after January 1 following his last election for office is considered a contribution towards the next election. This may appear to inflate actual financial activity for this 1976 election when such fund-raising was used to pay for past campaign debts. Therefore original deficits that existed in January are shown in the summaries as a separate line item and outstanding loans are reduced as paid. The time schedule chosen by an incumbent or future candidate for raising funds may have little connection with actual election dates. Without picking up this financial activity within a reasonably-short time following an election, there would be gaps in the public's available picture of the total flow of contributions for some office holders. Again let me say that this method is only one of many possible ways of analyzing how an election is financed.

In some cases you will find that my figures for "total contributions" and "expenditures" may differ from the candidate's figure. In that case I have made a rough explanation for the differences. For example, I have deleted reimbursements from total contributions because they are not really contributions but rather an adjustment to a previous expenditure. Although my accounting procedures may differ from your own, this does not mean that yours are "wrong". There are simply many different acceptable methods, but I found it necessary to standardize in order to treat all candidates in the same manner.

The category "other" refers to other lobbying entities, other candidate committees, and other organizations.

Pencil notations at the bottom of the page refer to the Boeing Civic Pledge Program contributions not yet observed by me on a C-3 form.

Please examine the enclosed analysis and let me know if you feel that there has been a gross misrepresentation. For example, some of my helpers had trouble getting figures on the correct line sometimes causing a "party" contribution to register on the "union" line! I want to save us all from future embarrassment by having you see all copy before I go public with it. Next week I will distribute to you a summary of the dollar amounts received by you from each of about 50 contributing entities. If you have questions, please call me at home (tel. 866-8815) or leave a message at the Gulch. I want to exert every effort to present your campaign accurately to the public.