

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM  
DISMISSAL REPORT

MUR: 7504

Respondents: Elissa Slotkin for Congress  
and Janica Kyriacopoulos, as Treasurer  
("the Committee")<sup>1</sup>

Complaint Receipt Date: September 26, 2018

Response Date: November 26, 2018

EPS Rating:

Alleged Statutory  
Regulatory Violations:

52 U.S.C. §§ 30104(c)(1), 30120(a);  
11 C.F.R. §§ 109.10(b), 110.11(a)

The Complaint alleges that the Committee placed signs without the required disclaimer statements indicating who paid for the signs.<sup>2</sup> Respondents assert the Committee did not create or authorize the signs, and state that volunteers created and paid for the signs independently and without authorization from the Committee.<sup>3</sup> Respondents further state that the Committee contacted the volunteers immediately after receiving the Complaint and learning the signs lacked disclaimers, offered to reimburse the costs of the signs, and printed and applied disclaimer stickers to the signs.<sup>4</sup>

Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and

<sup>1</sup> Elissa Slotkin won the November 6, 2018, general election for Michigan's 8th Congressional District.

<sup>2</sup> Compl. at 1 (September 26, 2018). The Complaint describes the signs as large and in the same style as Slotkin's yard signs, using the same logo as Slotkin's yard signs and website, but lacking any disclaimer. *Id.* The Complaint attaches copies of photos of the signs. *Id.* at 2-7.

<sup>3</sup> Resp. at 1 (November 26, 2018). Respondents state that the volunteers paid \$180 for the three signs.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 2. Respondents state that the Committee would report the reimbursement on its 2018 Post-General Report. *Id.* That report discloses a \$180 disbursement to Lee Anzicek for "Reimbursement." See Elissa Slotkin for Congress 2018 Second Amended Post-General Report at 1512, filed January 8, 2019, available at <http://docquery.fec.gov/pdf/233/201901089143770233/201901089143770233.pdf>. Respondents also state that the \$51.26 cost of the disclaimer stickers was reported on the Committee's 2018 Pre-General Report. Resp. at 2. The available information confirms this. See Elissa Slotkin for Congress 2018 Amended Pre-General Report at 753, filed January 8, 2019, available at <http://docquery.fec.gov/pdf/274/201811209133802274/201811209133802274.pdf>.

1604444464518

assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both 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 complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low priority for Commission action after application of these pre-established criteria. Given that low rating, the Respondents' explanation and action to remedy the non-compliant signs, and the modest amount at issue,<sup>5</sup> we recommend that the Commission dismiss the Complaint consistent with the Commission's prosecutorial discretion to determine the proper ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources.<sup>6</sup> We also recommend that the Commission close the file as to all Respondents and send the appropriate letters.

Lisa J. Stevenson  
Acting General Counsel

April 2, 2019  
Date

BY: Charles Kitcher  
Charles Kitcher  
Acting Associate General Counsel

Jeff S. Jordan  
Jeff S. Jordan  
Assistant General Counsel

Donald E. Campbell  
Donald E. Campbell  
Attorney

<sup>5</sup> The Response indicates the cost of the volunteers' signs, together with the disclaimer stickers provided by the Committee, totaled \$231.26, which falls below the threshold for filing independent expenditures. *Id.* See 52 U.S.C. § 30104(c)(1), *see also* 11 C.F.R. § 109.10(b)

<sup>6</sup> *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985).