



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

DEC 23 2011

William Brett McKenzie

Little Compton, RI 02837

RE: MUR 6436

Dear Mr. McKenzie:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint received on November 29, 2010. On December 13, 2011, based upon the information provided in the complaint, and information provided by the respondent, the Commission determined that there was no reason to believe the respondents violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. Therefore, the Commission decided to close its file in this matter on December 13, 2011.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). A copy of the dispositive General Counsel's Report is enclosed for your information. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g (a)(8).

Sincerely,

Anthony Herman
General Counsel

BY: Jeff S. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination and
Legal Administration

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

12044310611

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION

2011 OCT -3 PM 12: 26

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

In the Matter of)
MUR 6436)
LITTLE COMPTON TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION)
JOHN LOUGHLIN)
FRIENDS OF JOHN LOUGHLIN AND MIA)
CAETANO JOHNSON, AS TREASURER)

DISMISSAL AND
CASE CLOSURE UNDER
THE ENFORCEMENT
PRIORITY SYSTEM

CELA

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Under the Enforcement Priority System ("EPS"), the Commission uses formal scoring criteria to allocate its resources and decide which cases to pursue. These criteria include, but are not limited to, an assessment of (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, both with respect to the type of activity and the amount in violation, (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the electoral process, (3) the legal complexity of issues raised in the case, (4) recent trends in potential violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("Act"), and (5) development of the law with respect to certain subject matters. It is the Commission's policy that pursuing low-rated matters, compared to other higher-rated matters on the Enforcement docket, warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss certain cases, or in certain cases where there are no facts to support the allegations, to make no reason to believe findings.

24
25
26
27

For the reasons set forth below, this Office recommends that the Commission dismiss the allegations as to respondent Little Compton Taxpayers Association ("Little Compton") and make no reason to believe findings as to John Loughlin and Friends of John Loughlin and Mia Caetano Johnson, in her official capacity as treasurer ("the Committee").

28
29

In this matter, complainant William Brett McKenzie stated that Little Compton disseminated a mailer dated October 27, 2010 that, among other items, endorsed John Loughlin

12044310612

1 for Congress from Rhode Island's First Congressional District.¹ According to the complainant,
2 Little Compton is not registered with the Commission as a political action committee and he
3 claims that its "endorsement of candidates is beyond their mandate as a community tax policy
4 organization." Furthermore, the complainant asserts that the Committee failed to report the costs
5 of this "contribution."

6 Attached to the complaint is what appears to be the mailer in question, which is in color
7 and printed on glossy paper, and consists of two double-sided pages, most of which contain text,
8 some of which is in color, while a fourth half-page solicits donations. Most of the first page is
9 taken up with a sample ballot, with candidates favored by Little Compton indicated as such, and
10 a side column of text supporting and opposing various candidates. The sample ballot lists
11 candidates for fourteen offices, only one of which is federal, while the others are state or local.
12 Other pages of the mailer discuss state and local tax issues and schools, and the last page
13 includes a membership form. In addition, the complainant attaches a photograph of what he
14 describes as a "campaign expenditure of a similar organization, indicating that it is RI [sic]
15 practice to consider such activities as reportable campaign expenditure filings," although there is
16 no indication that this filing is related to Little Compton. Thus, it appears that the complainant is
17 alleging that Little Compton should have registered with the Commission and that the
18 Committee should have reported Little Compton's mailer as a contribution or, alternatively, that
19 Little Compton should have filed an independent expenditure report with the Commission
20 disclosing the cost of the mailer.

21 Both Little Compton and the Committee filed responses. According to Little Compton, it
22 is not a registered political committee because it is incorporated with the State of Rhode Island as

¹ Mr. Loughlin was defeated in the general election.

12044310613

1 a non-profit corporation and, according to the terms of its constitution, is a non-partisan
2 organization that does not align itself with political candidates, either directly or indirectly.
3 Little Compton states that its mailer, which was sent to every "mailbox in Little Compton,"
4 endorsed Republicans, Democrats, and members of third parties who shared its views on low
5 taxes and small government. In its response, the Committee denies any coordination with Little
6 Compton and states that it made no expenditures in connection with the mailer, and asks that the
7 case be dismissed. Neither the complaint nor the responses provide information as to the
8 expenses involved in the production and dissemination of the mailer.

9 It appears that the costs associated with the mailer could be viewed either as an
10 independent expenditure or an expenditure that could trigger political committee status for Little
11 Compton. An independent expenditure is an expenditure for a communication that expressly
12 advocates the election or defeat of a federal candidate, but is not coordinated with a candidate or
13 political party. 2 U.S.C. § 431(17); 11 C.F.R. § 100.16(a). Individuals, partnerships, and other
14 entities, except for political action committees or party committees, must report independent
15 expenditures exceeding \$250 per calendar year. 11 C.F.R. § 109.10(b). When such an
16 independent expenditure is made on behalf of clearly-identified non-Federal candidates, as well
17 as clearly-identified federal candidates, the expenditure shall be apportioned to determine the
18 benefit expected to be derived by the federal candidates, such as comparing the time or space
19 devoted to the federal candidate to the time or space devoted to all candidates. 11 C.F.R.
20 § 106.1(a)(1).

21 Any club, association, or other group of persons which receives contributions or makes
22 expenditures exceeding \$1,000 per calendar year must register with the Commission as a
23 political committee and file periodic reports of receipts and disbursements. See 2 U.S.C.

12044310614

1 §§ 431(4), 433, 434. However, the Supreme Court has stated that only organizations whose
2 "major purpose" is campaign activity can potentially qualify as political committees under the
3 Act. *See, e.g., Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 79 (1976); *FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life*,
4 479 U.S. 238, 262 (1986).

5 Although neither the complaint nor the responses have provided information relating to
6 the cost of the mailer, we have estimated the potential costs using publically available
7 information. Based on our research, we believe that the total costs associated with the mailer
8 may have been approximately \$3,600. Given that the federal candidate was only mentioned on
9 one page of the four page mailer and was the only federal candidate listed among many state and
10 local candidates, it is unlikely that the federal portion of the mailer could have exceeded \$1,000.
11 *See* 11 C.F.R. § 106.1(a)(1). However, the federal portion of the cost of the mailer could have
12 exceeded \$250 thereby triggering the threshold for reporting independent expenditures.²

13 Although it is possible that Little Compton may have triggered the threshold for reporting
14 independent expenditures, we note that the potential costs at issue are relatively low given the
15 small federal portion of the mailer. Therefore, we believe that further Enforcement action is
16 unwarranted. Accordingly, under EPS, the Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 6436 as
17 a low-rated matter and therefore, in furtherance of the Commission's priorities as discussed
18 above, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its
19 prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the allegations as to the Little Compton Taxpayers
20 Association. *See Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). We also recommend that the
21 Commission find no reason to believe that John Loughlin, and Friends of John Loughlin and Mia

² After reviewing the public record, we discovered that the complainant in this matter filed a complaint with the Rhode Island State Board of Elections against Little Compton, and one of Little Compton's officials, concerning the mailer at issue here, *see* <http://sos.ri.gov/documents/publicinfo/omdocs/minutes/132/2011/22538.pdf>. However, no information as to the cost of the mailer was disclosed.

1 Caetano Johnson, in her official capacity as treasurer, violated the Federal Election Campaign
2 Act of 1971, as amended, close the file, and send the appropriate letters.


3 **RECOMMENDATIONS**


- 4 1. Dismiss the allegations as to the Little Compton Taxpayers Association.
5
6 2. Find no reason to believe that John Loughlin, and Friends of John Loughlin and Mia
7 Caetano Johnson, in her official capacity as treasurer violated the Federal Election
8 Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.
9
10 3. Close the file and send the appropriate letters.

11
12
13 Anthony Herman
14 General Counsel

15
16
17 10/3/11
18 Date

19 BY:

20 
21 Gregory R. Baker
22 Special Counsel
23 Complaints Examination
24 & Legal Administration

25 
26 Jeff S. Jordan
27 Supervisory Attorney
28 Complaints Examination
29 & Legal Administration

30
31 
32 Ruth Heilizer
33 Attorney
34
35
36
37

12044310616