

-----

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION Washington, DC 20463

## **MEMORANDUM**

TO:	The Commission
FROM:	Commission Secretary's Office
DATE:	July 23, 2013
SUBJECT:	Comments on Draft AO 2013-07 (Winslow II)

Attached is a timely submitted comment from Tim Gill. This matter is on the July 25, 2013 Open Meeting Agenda.

Attachment

· ``\	Comment on Draft AO 2013-0	7 (Winslow II)	
	Tim Gill		
The	to:		
-	AO		
	07/23/2013 11:36 AM		
	Cc:		
	Scott Miller, Kirk Fordham, To	ed Trimpa	
	Hide Details	•	
	From: Tim Gill <tim< th=""><th>&gt;</th><th></th></tim<>	>	
	To: AO@fec.gov,		
	Cc: Scott Miller <millersc< th=""><th>&gt;, Kirk Fordham <kfordham< th=""><th>&gt;, Ted</th></kfordham<></th></millersc<>	>, Kirk Fordham <kfordham< th=""><th>&gt;, Ted</th></kfordham<>	>, Ted
	Trimpa <ted@< th=""><th>&gt;</th><th>,</th></ted@<>	>	,

Thanks for the clarification on the effect of FEC rules in a post-DOMA section 3 world.

Your document uses the phrase "married ender state law". In the case you're considering, the souple were married in MA and reside in MA.

Does this also apply to couple married in a state where same sex marriage is allowed but residing in a state where it is not?

I know one couple where one member lives in New York (where same sex marriage is allowed) and the other in Colorado (where it is not). So presumably one wants the ruling to apply regardless of the state of residence of either party to avoid defining a collection of complex exceptions.

I am unsure what specific wording changes to recommend to clarify this. Thanks!

ť