



PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908 • (360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112

Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcca.wa.gov

To: Members, Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
From: Lori Anderson, Communications & Training Officer
Date: June 19, 2014
Re: Strategic Plan Update - Personal Financial Affairs Review/Online Access – June 26, 2014 Work Session

AGENDA

The Commission will review the recommendations and stakeholder comments received to date regarding the strategic plan action items related to the personal financial affairs statement (F-1).

2013-15 STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal: Increase the effectiveness of educational and compliance efforts.

- 3.6 Review F-1 requirements to consider changes to laws and rules concerning: reporting thresholds (\$2,000 and \$10,000 thresholds); type and manner of reporting investments (stock values & mutual funds, short term vs. long-term holds, highest value vs. snapshot in time); and the nature and extent of reporting business ownership interests.
- 3.7 Evaluate the feasibility of using a short form for certain local F-1 filers.

Goal: Adapt the Commission's methods of receiving and distributing data to the changing technological environment in which we and our customers operate.

- 5.5 Evaluate, through a pro-active stakeholder process, whether the Commission should begin posting on-line some or all information from candidate and annual F-1 forms and, if limited information from F-1s is to be posted, how to accomplish that in a technologically feasible manner and within available resources.

Progress

Stakeholder and public comment has been received through:

- a **work group** consisting of local government representatives,
- a **stakeholder meeting**,
- a public **survey** with a follow-up question regarding objections to online posting that was directed to F-1 filers who received notice of the survey,
- individuals participating in **commission meetings**, and
- a letter from the Washington Public Ports Association, copy attached, received in response to the invitation to participate in the June 26 meeting.

Staff provided progress reports at the April and May 2014 Commission meeting, which are attached for your reference.

BACKGROUND

Relevant History

- 1972 Initiative 276 approved by voters
Enacts F-1 requirement for *every elected official* (except President, Vice President and precinct committeemen) and *candidates*.
- 1975 Legislature extends F-1 requirement to *every person appointed to fill a vacancy in an elective office*.
- 1976 Legislature passed Referendum Bill 36, which extends F-1 requirement to *executive state officers, professional staff of the governor and legislature, and certain boards and commissions members*. Referendum Bill 36 approved by voters.
- 1982 Legislature suspends requirement for candidates and elected officials in jurisdictions with less than 1,000 registered voters.

Authority

F-1 and F-1 Supplement forms annotated with authorizing statutes and rules are attached.

These policy statements, excerpted from Initiative 276, are the basis for the F-1 requirement:

- (2) That the people have the right to expect from their elected representatives at all levels of government the utmost of integrity, honesty, and fairness in their dealings.
- (3) That the people shall be assured that the private financial dealings of their public officials, and of candidates for those offices, present no conflict of interest between the public trust and private interest.
- (4) That our representative form of government is founded on a belief that those entrusted with the offices of government have nothing to fear from full public disclosure of their financial and business holdings, provided those officials deal honestly and fairly with the people.
- (5) That public confidence in government at all levels is essential and must be promoted by all possible means.
- (6) That public confidence in government at all levels can best be sustained by assuring the people of the impartiality and honesty of the officials in all public transactions and decisions.
- (10) That the public's right to know of the financing of political campaigns and lobbying and the financial affairs of elected officials and candidates far outweighs any right that these matters remain secret and private.

Codified at RCW 42.17A.001.

F-1 Filers

The Commission enforces the F-1 filing requirement for:

- Elected officials and candidates –
 - state and county office,
 - justices and judges,
 - local offices if the jurisdiction has at least 1,000 registered voters
 - local offices in jurisdictions with less than 1,000 registered voters upon receiving a petition for disclosure signed by 15% of the registered voters – there are currently 3 petitions in effect;
- Select state agency directors;
- Members of select state boards and commissions;
- Professional staff of the legislature and governor;
- Higher education presidents, regents, and trustees (includes state 4- and 2-year universities and colleges as well as state technical colleges).

The Commission also receives F-1s filed by individuals outside of the PDC's jurisdiction.

DISCUSSION

Work Group Recommendations, Survey Results, and Staff Recommendations:

The work group recommendations, a summary of the comments received at the stakeholder meeting, survey results (including comments) are summarized on the following pages. Staff recommendations are also included – the [LEG] and [PDC] notations indicate whether the recommendation could be implemented by the Commission or if the change would require a legislative amendment. For ease of reference, the information offered is organized by these topics:

- **F-1 dollar ranges/reporting codes**
- **Investments**
- **Feasibility of a short form for certain filers**
- **Online access to F-1 content**

The work group reviewed how **business ownership interests** are disclosed for possible changes, as directed by the strategic plan. In connection with that review, they also considered options from other states that allow volunteer activities, such as serving as a non-profit organization's board member, to be disclosed differently from business interests. In the end, the work group recommended no changes be made to the disclosure requirements for business ownership and outside interests (F-1, Section 5 and F-1 Supplement).



F-1 DOLLAR RANGES/REPORTING CODES

Work Group Recommendations	Survey Results														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust dollar amounts for inflation. Restructure the dollar ranges to provide more high-end, detailed ranges. For example, Codes A and B could be combined and more ranges added at the top, such as \$100,000 - \$249,999, \$250,000 - \$999,999, and \$1 Million or more. <p>Stakeholder meeting participants generally agreed with these work group recommendations.</p>	<p>Q5 Dollar amounts are currently reported using letter codes A through E, with each letter representing a defined dollar range (e.g., Code A = \$0 to \$3,999, Code B = \$4,000 to \$19,999, etc. to Code E = \$100,000 or more). These dollar codes should be: (Select ALL that apply)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>Answered: 498 Skipped: 22</small></p> <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px;"> <caption>Survey Results Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response Category</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Left as they are (no changes)</td> <td>49.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjusted for inflation</td> <td>16.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Restructured so that ranges provide...</td> <td>11.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Restructured to add more ranges above...</td> <td>28.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not used - it would be better for actual...</td> <td>11.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (please specify)</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The written comments offer suggestions as to how to restructure the dollar ranges. These additional recommendations were included in the written comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> require exact dollar amounts, eliminate the dollar codes and the requirement to disclose amounts/values, change access to F-1 content so that it is used only for audit purposes and released only upon court order, and make financial reporting voluntary. 	Response Category	Percentage	Left as they are (no changes)	49.8%	Adjusted for inflation	16.9%	Restructured so that ranges provide...	11.4%	Restructured to add more ranges above...	28.3%	Not used - it would be better for actual...	11.6%	Other (please specify)	4.4%
Response Category	Percentage														
Left as they are (no changes)	49.8%														
Adjusted for inflation	16.9%														
Restructured so that ranges provide...	11.4%														
Restructured to add more ranges above...	28.3%														
Not used - it would be better for actual...	11.6%														
Other (please specify)	4.4%														
Staff Recommendations															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust dollar amounts for inflation. [PDC] RCW 42.17A.125(2) authorizes the Commission to make inflationary adjustments at least once every five years. The F-1 dollar thresholds and codes were last adjusted in 2008. Restructure the dollar ranges. [LEG] Stakeholders commented that the current “\$100,000 and up” range was not informative given the current real estate values. In 2012, the Office of Financial Management reported the median home price in Washington to be \$234,200. More dollar ranges at the top would allow for a more meaningful year-to-year comparison of a filer’s reports. Staff recommends the following dollar ranges: 															

F-1 DOLLAR RANGES/REPORTING CODES

Staff Recommendations – continued:	
<u>Current:</u>	<u>Proposed Change:</u>
A \$0 - \$3,999	A \$0 - \$29,999
B \$4,000 - \$19,999	B \$30,000 - \$59,999
C \$20,000 - \$39,999	C \$60,000 - \$99,999
D \$40,000 - \$99,999	D \$100,000 - \$199,999
E \$100,000 and up	E \$200,000 - \$299,999
	F \$300,000 - \$499,999
	G \$500,000 - \$749,999
	H \$750,000 - \$1 Million
	I Over \$1 Million

DISCLOSING INVESTMENTS


Work Group Recommendations	Survey Results																								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise the disclosure threshold from \$2,000 to a higher amount • Change the disclosure requirement to be a year-end value instead of the highest value during the reporting period. 	<p>Q6 Do you think the \$2,000 disclosure threshold for stocks, bonds, and other investments is:</p> <p>Answered: 496 Skipped: 24</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Q6 Survey Results</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Color</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Too low</td> <td>Orange</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Just right</td> <td>Yellow</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No opinion</td> <td>Teal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Too high</td> <td>Blue</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <hr/> <p>Q7 Currently, investments owned during any part of the reporting period must be disclosed, regardless of the length of time owned. Should this requirement be changed so that investments are disclosed only if owned:</p> <p>Answered: 487 Skipped: 33</p>  <table border="1"> <caption>Q7 Survey Results</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Color</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Don't change it</td> <td>Green</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For at least 3 consecutive months during the reporting period</td> <td>Light Blue</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For at least 6 consecutive months during the reporting period</td> <td>Yellow</td> </tr> <tr> <td>When the report is filed</td> <td>Purple</td> </tr> <tr> <td>At the end of the prior year</td> <td>Blue</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (please specify)</td> <td>Red</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Additional recommendations received in the survey comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require disclosure only when the investment is impacted by the official's actions and • require disclosure of all investment transactions. 	Response	Color	Too low	Orange	Just right	Yellow	No opinion	Teal	Too high	Blue	Response	Color	Don't change it	Green	For at least 3 consecutive months during the reporting period	Light Blue	For at least 6 consecutive months during the reporting period	Yellow	When the report is filed	Purple	At the end of the prior year	Blue	Other (please specify)	Red
Response	Color																								
Too low	Orange																								
Just right	Yellow																								
No opinion	Teal																								
Too high	Blue																								
Response	Color																								
Don't change it	Green																								
For at least 3 consecutive months during the reporting period	Light Blue																								
For at least 6 consecutive months during the reporting period	Yellow																								
When the report is filed	Purple																								
At the end of the prior year	Blue																								
Other (please specify)	Red																								

DISCLOSING INVESTMENTS

Staff Recommendations

- Raise the disclosure threshold from \$2,000 to a higher amount. **[LEG]** (The draft language proposing inflationary adjustments increases \$2,000 to \$2,400.) Alternative thresholds that the Commission might consider:
 - \$5,000 – aligns with the threshold for determining whether campaigns will disclose contributions and expenditures.
 - \$10,000 – the F-1 disclosure threshold for real estate and the F-1 supplement threshold for disclosure of government and business customers.
 - \$20,000 – the F-1 disclosure threshold for disclosing bank accounts.
- Change the disclosure requirement so that current holdings with asset value and income amounts are disclosed and, separately, transactions made during the reporting period are disclosed. This method would be similar to how real estate is disclosed. **[LEG]** A common complaint from filers is that the requirement to disclose all investments owned during a reporting period gives an inflated picture for those filers who make frequent trades. Stakeholder comments revealed that some filers report an asset's value at the time of filing or the end of the last calendar year instead of the asset's highest value during the reporting period. Disclosing each investment, its value, and, if applicable, the number of shares, held at the end of the calendar year for annual filers or at the time of filing for candidates and newly appointed officials plus disclosing a list of investments (name and, if applicable, number of shares with no value) that were acquired or divested during the reporting period would be less burdensome for the filer yet still provide adequate information for the public.
- Change how mutual funds are reported. **[LEG]** Currently, each mutual fund must be itemized by fund name when the value of the shares held is \$2,000 or more. Staff recommends that the disclosure requirement be changed to allow the filer who has invested in multiple funds within a mutual fund family to disclose by family of mutual funds rather than each mutual fund.

FEASIBILITY OF SHORT FORM FOR CERTAIN FILERS

Work Group Recommendations	Survey Results										
<p>The work group rejected the idea of a separate short form for certain filers, but recommended alternatives as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise the threshold voter count that determines which local officials file F-1s. • Add a jurisdiction’s annual budget or annual expenditures as a second filing trigger so that officials serving in very small local jurisdictions will be required to file only if their position exercises significant fiscal authority. (Example: File an F-1 if there are XXX or more registered voters in the jurisdiction OR the jurisdiction’s annual expenditures total \$XXX or more.) • Exempt domestic violence victims from disclosing an address or other real property location information when a protective order has been issued. 	<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Q4 Should the elected officials’ F1 filing trigger be changed from 1,000 or more registered voters to:</p> <p>Answered: 483 Skipped: 37</p>  <table border="1" style="display: none;"> <caption>Survey Results for Q4</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Count (Estimated)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Don't change it</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,500 or more registered voters</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5,000 or more registered voters</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (please specify)</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div> <p>The written comments suggested various voter counts and expenditure amounts that should trigger the filing requirement as well as these additional recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require all elected officials to file regardless of a jurisdiction’s voter count, • use the office’s salary as the filing trigger, • require candidates and officials in jurisdictions with less than 1,000 voters to file an abbreviated F-1, • eliminate the filing requirement for local officials, and • impose the filing requirement on appointed municipal officers such as planning commissioners. 	Response	Count (Estimated)	Don't change it	250	2,500 or more registered voters	150	5,000 or more registered voters	80	Other (please specify)	30
Response	Count (Estimated)										
Don't change it	250										
2,500 or more registered voters	150										
5,000 or more registered voters	80										
Other (please specify)	30										
Staff Recommendations											
<p>Staff recommends no changes.</p> <p>Staff originally proposed this topic for the Commission’s review after hearing 1) frequent complaints that the F-1 requirement hinders candidate recruitment and 2) reports of occasions where no candidates declared to run in smaller, rural special purpose districts. Work group participants confirmed that the F-1 requirement had deterred potential candidates who did not want the exposure or found completing the F-1 too difficult.</p>											

FEASIBILITY OF SHORT FORM FOR CERTAIN FILERS

Staff Recommendations - continued

The recommendation to raise the voter count and add another trigger is attractive, but would be difficult to implement. Staff was unable to find centralized budget information for the 205 jurisdictions that would be affected by raising the voter count trigger to 2,500. Annual expenditure totals were available for some jurisdictions from the state auditor, but 2012 is the most recent accounting. The superintendent of public instruction has more current data for school districts, but it is based on an academic year, not the calendar year.

Raising the F-1 voter count trigger would also unnecessarily complicate the candidate filing process. The F-1 filing requirement applies to candidates in political subdivisions with 1,000 or more registered voters. RCW 42.17A.135. The Candidate Registration (C-1) applies to candidates who run for office in a *political subdivision of the state that encompasses a whole county or that contains 5,000 or more registered voters as of the most recent general election*. RCW 42.17A.200 (emphasis added). Four counties currently have less than 5,000 voters, with Garfield County having the fewest at 1,560. Raising the voter count trigger without adding the “whole county” qualifier would mean that candidates for county office in at least Garfield County and possibly the other three, depending on the new threshold, would file campaign reports and not the F-1.

The Commission currently has the ability to modify the requirement to disclose a home address or real property information upon receiving an application that includes evidence showing the filer or an immediate family member has received a threat or been issued a no contact order.

The Commission also has the authority to change what information all filers must provide about their residence or any other reportable real estate. RCW 42.17A.710 provides that filers must report “*a list, including legal or other sufficient descriptions as prescribed by the Commission, of all real estate . . .*” By rule, the Commission currently requires “*for the purpose of reporting real estate . . . the filer shall list the street address of each parcel, the assessor’s parcel number, . . . or the complete legal description.*” WAC 390-24-200. This rule could be changed to eliminate the filing of a street address for a filer’s personal residence.

Professional staff of the legislature and governor:

The Commission received considerable comment regarding whether professional staff should be required to file the F-1. Those comments were primarily responding to whether F-1s should be available online. They are referenced here as the Commission may wish to consider the feasibility of a short form for professional staff.


In addition to objecting to their information being online, professional staff raised two additional concerns: (1) professional staff are state employees, not elected officials who seek to become public figures and (2) nonpartisan professional staff are independent of influence. During the

stakeholder meeting, it was pointed out that nonpartisan staff conduct studies, draft bills, etc. and they influence policy even though their work product is relied upon to be independent.

Nonpartisan staff from the House of Representatives also expressed concern that some legislative staff who are not “professional staff” under WAC 390-24-160 receive food and beverage from sources other than their employer that would be subject to disclosure if the recipients had an F-1 filing requirement. The House staff request that the Commission reconsider its definition of professional staff and that professional staff F-1s not be posted online until the Commission’s definition aligns with the purpose and intent behind the disclosure laws.

ONLINE ACCESS TO F-1 CONTENT

Survey Results



The additional remarks collected in the survey encourage and discourage the Commission to make the F-1s available online. Specific objections noted in the written comments echo those received in the last two months: personal safety concerns if contact information or family members names are available, identify theft and related security concerns, and protecting business clients.

An alternative recommendation is made that an individual's filing status be posted with an easy method to request copies of filed reports.

During the June 26 work session, individuals who have expertise in the areas of identity theft, cyber liability, and maintaining personal safety will brief the Commission on "best practices." There may also be additional comment offered by stakeholders.

If the Commission proceeds with making F-1s available online, these questions should be addressed:

Whose F-1 should be online?

- All F-1 filers
- All F-1 filers within the PDC's jurisdiction
- Equal treatment for candidates and elected officials?
- Determined by office:
 - Only statewide officials, legislators (Supreme Court included)
 - Statewide officials & legislators plus

- Judges & judicial candidates
- State agency directors
- Professional staff of the legislature and governor
- Higher education presidents, regents, and trustees
- State board & commission members
- Local elected officials and candidates
 - County
 - City/Town
 - Remaining local offices (includes school directors, fire commissioners, port commissioners, utility (water, sewer, PUD) commissioners, park commissioners, municipal corporation officers, and civil service board members)

How much of the F-1 should be online?

- Entire F-1, including supplement
- All, except:
 - Name of spouse, dependents
 - Residential address information
 - Names of banks/financial institutions
 - Physical signature
 - Dollar codes
- Only filer's name, office held/sought, contact information, and confirmation that F-1 is on file
- Name, office, contact information, plus:
 - Income, sources and amounts by dollar code
 - Business interests
 - Real estate, without residential address
 - Bank accounts/assets/investments
 - Creditors
 - F-1 Supplement lobbying section
 - F-1 Supplement food/beverage section
 - Spouse's name
 - Names of dependents

How should F-1 information be accessible online?

- Images of reports on website (complete or redacted images of filed reports)
- A searchable database
- Icon with a link to online public records request form when an F-1 showing F-1 is on file online public records request form

Mocked up webpage images are attached to provide a sense of how these options might be carried out.

- An amendment that would make it unlawful for F-1 information to be used for any unlawful purpose
- Amendments to address issues raised by professional staff

Having these questions answered will enable the staff to project cost, implementation time and other information that the Commission may need to finalize its decision.

Attachments: June 18, 2014 letter from the Washington Public Ports Association
April and May 2014 Progress Reports
Annotated F-1 and F-1 Supplement forms
Examples of potential website changes



June 18, 2014

Lori Anderson
Public Disclosure Commission
711 Capitol Way, #206
PO Box 40908
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Ms. Anderson,

This letter presents the concerns of Washington State's elected Port commissioners with the Public Disclosure Commission's proposal to place F-1 forms (personal financial affairs statement) online. This issue was discussed at our Board of Trustees meeting last month, and the commissioners present directed us to inform the PDC that they do not support the proposal to place the current F-1 Personal Financial Affairs Statements online.

Washington State has 75 port districts, each with a set of 3 or 5 elected commissioners. While most people are familiar with our large ports, such as the ports of Seattle and Tacoma, few people realize that the majority of our port districts reside in small, rural communities without large populations. In these small communities port commissioners are essentially civic volunteers who receive little or no salary for their community service. Many of these commissioners believe that placing their current F-1 information online will influence their decisions to run for re-election. It will also influence efforts to recruit qualified new commissioners to run for office.

In addition, our commissioners are also very concerned about the type of information detailed on the F-1 disclosure form. These documents contain highly personal information such as spouses' and children's names, and information on bank accounts and insurance policies. Port commissioners believe that this information could easily be


used improperly, especially when there is no way to know who is accessing this information, or when they are accessing it.

It is clear from the survey that the PDC performed that these concerns are shared by a wide range of the elected officials and staff who are subject to filing F-1 forms. We urge the PDC to take these concerns seriously by setting this proposal down and re-thinking its approach to this issue. While there is clearly a benefit in requiring public officials to disclose potential conflicts of interest, there are undoubtedly less intrusive and less potentially damaging ways of accomplishing this goal.

Sincerely,



Tom Albro, Port of Seattle Commissioner
WPPA President



Eric D. Johnson
WPPA Executive Director

c: WPPA Executive Committee



PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908 • (360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112

Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcc.wa.gov

To: Members, Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
From: Lori Anderson, Communications & Training Officer
Date: August 17, 2014
Re: Strategic Plan Update - Personal Financial Affairs Review/Online Access

AGENDA

At the April meeting, staff will update the Commission on the progress made towards completing the strategic plan action items related to the personal financial affairs statement (F-1).

BACKGROUND

The F-1 is completed and filed annually by

- elected officials – state and county office holders, justices and judges, and local office holders from jurisdictions with 1,000 or more registered voters,
- select state agency directors,
- members of select state boards and commissions,
- professional staff of the legislature and governor,
- public university and college presidents, regents, and trustees,
- community college district and campus presidents and trustees, and
- state technical college trustees.

This list represents about 5,600 annual filers. There are approximately 600 additional F-1s filed by candidates in even-numbered years and 1,600 filed by candidates in odd-numbered years.

The strategic plan contains three F-1 related action items:

- 3.6 Review F-1 requirements to consider changes to laws and rules concerning: reporting thresholds (\$2,000 and \$10,000 thresholds); type and manner of reporting investments (stock values & mutual funds, short term vs. long-term holds, highest value vs. snapshot in time); and the nature and extent of reporting business ownership interests.
- 3.7 Evaluate the feasibility of using a short form for certain local F-1 filers.
- 5.5 Evaluate, through a pro-active stakeholder process, whether the Commission should begin posting on-line some or all information from candidate and annual F-1 forms and, if limited information from F-1s is to be posted, how to accomplish that in a technologically feasible manner and within available resources.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Stakeholder and public comment has been collected through:



1. A seven-member **work group**. An invitation to participate was extended to all associations serving local elected officials. The work group consisted of F-1 filers or representatives from county government, cities, and fire, water/sewer, and public utility districts. Meetings were held in January, February, and March during which the subjects identified in strategic plan action items 3.6 and 3.7 were reviewed. The work group's recommendations are offered below.
2. An April 1 **stakeholder meeting** where staff received comments regarding online access to F-1 content. The 14 attendees also reviewed the work group's recommendations. The stakeholder meeting was advertised by direct email to individuals on the PDC's stakeholder list and named in the strategic plan action item. The meeting was also advertised on the PDC's website and Facebook page.
3. An **online survey** launched March 21. The survey was open for 3-1/2 weeks and received 520 responses: 361 F-1 filers, 131 non filers, and 28 who didn't answer the "are you a current filer?" question. It was advertised in the reminders sent to F-1 filers and on the PDC's website and Facebook page. It was also linked to the *Seattle Times* Politics Northwest blog on April 7. The *Seattle Times* blog post was reprinted by other papers around the state. The survey was an attempt to create an open opportunity for public comment, allow all F-1 filers to offer their opinion regarding online access and the recommendations of the work group, and for staff to learn why some F-1 filers are reluctant to file electronically.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Commission's consideration, each subject is set out in a separate table on the following pages with distilled discussion points and the resulting recommendations from the work group, stakeholder meeting, and survey responses. In-depth analysis of the survey will be provided at the Commission meeting. The [LEG] and [PDC] notations indicate whether the recommendation could be implemented by the Commission or if the change would require a legislative amendment.

Evaluate the feasibility of using a short form for certain local filers											
Discussion points	Recommendations										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The F-1 is a resource for voters, a resource for determining whether an official may have a conflict of interest, and an opportunity for officials to review their investments each year so as to be sensitive to subjects that could pose conflicts. • All filers should disclose the same information. • Completing the F-1 can be intimidating for some individuals. • The F-1 requirement sometimes makes recruiting new candidates difficult, especially in smaller jurisdictions. Knowing that F-1s are public records deters some people from running for office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise the threshold voter count that determines who files an F-1. [LEG] • Add a jurisdiction’s annual budget or annual expenditures as a second filing trigger so that officials serving in very small districts will be required to file only if their position exercises significant fiscal authority. (Example: File an F-1 if there are XXX or more registered voters in the jurisdiction OR the jurisdiction’s annual expenditures total \$XXX or more.) [LEG] • Exempt domestic violence victims from disclosing an address or other real property location information when a protective order has been issued. [PDC] 										
Survey Results	Staff Notes										
<p>Q4 Should the elected officials’ F1 filing trigger be changed from 1,000 or more registered voters to:</p> <p>Answered: 483 Skipped: 37</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Survey Results Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Count (Estimated)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Don't change it</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5,000 or more registered voters</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2,500 or more registered voters</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (please specify)</td> <td>53</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Count (Estimated)	Don't change it	250	5,000 or more registered voters	100	2,500 or more registered voters	80	Other (please specify)	53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising the voter count threshold from 1,000 to 2,500 would have eliminated the officials’ 2014 F-1 requirement in 154 jurisdictions. • Raising the threshold to 5,000 would have eliminated the filing requirement for 353 jurisdictions in 2014. • RCW 42.17A.135 authorizes the Commission to enforce the reporting requirements in a small political subdivision upon receipt of a petition containing valid signatures from 15% of the jurisdiction’s registered voters.
Response	Count (Estimated)										
Don't change it	250										
5,000 or more registered voters	100										
2,500 or more registered voters	80										
Other (please specify)	53										

Adjusting F-1 dollar amounts															
Discussion points	Recommendations														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The F-1 dollar amounts were last adjusted in 2008. The \$2,000 threshold for reporting investments is too low. Code E (\$1,000,000 or more) is outdated and uninformative, considering current real estate values and other economic conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust dollar amounts for inflation. [PDC] Restructure the dollar ranges to provide more high-end, detailed ranges. For example, Codes A and B could be combined and more ranges added at the top, such as \$100,000 - \$249,999, \$250,000 - \$999,999, and \$1 Million or more. [LEG] <p>Stakeholder meeting participants generally agreed with these work group recommendations.</p>														
Survey Results	Staff Notes														
<p>Q5 Dollar amounts are currently reported using letter codes A through E, with each letter representing a defined dollar range (e.g., Code A = \$0 to \$3,999, Code B = \$4,000 to \$19,999, etc. to Code E = \$100,000 or more). These dollar codes should be: (Select ALL that apply)</p> <p>Answered: 498 Skipped: 22</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Survey Results Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Response Option</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Left as they are (no changes)</td> <td>49.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjusted for inflation</td> <td>16.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Restructured so that ranges provide...</td> <td>11.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Restructured to add more ranges above...</td> <td>28.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not used - it would be better for actual...</td> <td>11.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (please specify)</td> <td>4.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response Option	Percentage	Left as they are (no changes)	49.8%	Adjusted for inflation	16.9%	Restructured so that ranges provide...	11.4%	Restructured to add more ranges above...	28.3%	Not used - it would be better for actual...	11.6%	Other (please specify)	4.4%	<p>See the next section for discussion and recommendations regarding the \$2,000 threshold for disclosing investments.</p>
Response Option	Percentage														
Left as they are (no changes)	49.8%														
Adjusted for inflation	16.9%														
Restructured so that ranges provide...	11.4%														
Restructured to add more ranges above...	28.3%														
Not used - it would be better for actual...	11.6%														
Other (please specify)	4.4%														

Disclosing Investments	
Discussion points	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$2,000 is a low threshold. The threshold would still be too low after an inflationary adjustment. • It can be difficult to determine what the highest value of some investments was during the reporting period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise the disclosure threshold from \$2,000 to a higher amount. [LEG] (The Commission has authority to make inflationary adjustments, but not to change the underlying amount.) • Change the disclosure requirement to be a year-end value instead of the highest value during the reporting period. [LEG]
Survey Results	Staff Notes
<p>Q6 Do you think the \$2,000 disclosure threshold for stocks, bonds, and other investments is:</p> <p>Answered: 496 Skipped: 24</p>  <p>A pie chart showing the distribution of responses to Q6. The largest segment is 'Too low' (orange), followed by 'Just right' (yellow), 'No opinion' (teal), and 'Too high' (small blue slice).</p> <hr/> <p>Q7 Currently, investments owned during any part of the reporting period must be disclosed, regardless of the length of time owned. Should this requirement be changed so that investments are disclosed only if owned:</p> <p>Answered: 487 Skipped: 33</p>  <p>A pie chart showing the distribution of responses to Q7. The largest segment is 'Don't change it' (green), followed by 'At the end of the prior year' (blue), 'When the report is filed' (purple), 'For at least 3 consecutive months during the reporting period' (yellow), 'For at least 6 consecutive months during the reporting period' (light blue), and 'Other (please specify)' (small red slice).</p>	<p>The work group considered and rejected disclosure alternatives used by other states, including reporting only investments that are relevant to the filer's position, allowing for a copy of a federal tax return to be filed instead of the F-1, and disclosing only investments that produce a certain percentage of the household income.</p>

Disclosing business and outside interests	
Discussion points	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disclosure of business and outside interests is a critical section of the F-1 given the conflict of interest aspect of the F-1. • The current requirements are satisfactory. 	No changes are recommended.
Survey Results	Staff Notes
No corresponding question in the survey.	Exempting certain relationships, such as volunteer board positions with non-profit groups, social, fraternal and like organizations was considered and rejected since those groups may receive grants or other funding from state, county, cities, or some local government jurisdictions.


Online access to F-1 content
Comments received from work group members and stakeholder meeting participants
<p>FOR online access -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PDC has a duty to make F-1s public. • There is no legal basis to justify not putting F-1s online. • Most of the F-1 content is public information and available through other means. <p>AGAINST online access –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The F-1 requirement already deters some people from running for office. Having the F-1 content online will likely deter even more people. • Online access could result in filers being harassed by individuals who find their home address or other property identifiers online. • Filers may be concerned about easy access to their children’s names. • F-1 Supplements disclosing businesses should not be online. Putting customers’ names online is a disadvantage for business owners and it is an invasion of the customer’s privacy. <p>OTHER comments –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The F-1 debt section should be included in those that are posted online [at the time of the stakeholder meeting, compensation, real estate without a residential address, and business ownership/outside affiliations – were the top three choices of survey responders who agreed that only some sections should be online].

- The filer's home e-mail address should not be online.
- Newspapers represented by Allied Daily Newspapers are considering putting the F-1s online if the Commission does not. They would most likely make quarterly blanket requests for all newly filed F-1s.
- Change the form to make it more obvious that dependents do not need to be named unless there is something to report for them.
- Assessed value does not reflect the true valuation of real property.

Comments regarding professional staff members –

- Legislators choose to become public figures. Professional staff, especially nonpartisan staff, have not made that choice. What purpose would be served by online access to F-1s filed by professional staff? Nonpartisan staff should be exempt from the F-1 filing requirement, since they are independent of any influence.
- Nonpartisan staff conduct studies, draft bills, etc. and they influence policy even though their work product is relied upon to be independent.
- Legislative staff who are not professional staff as defined by the Commission's rule, WAC 390-24-160, (legislative assistants, aides, etc.) are at least as likely, if not more likely, than non-partisan staff to receive complimentary food and beverage, travel, or the like, and yet they are not required to file an F-1.

Survey Results



Staff notes

Occasionally, F-1s are received that include account numbers or other sensitive information that is not required. At times the staff has returned F-1s with instructions to refile without the sensitive information or redacted the information when it was noticed. There is no current process in place to carefully review F-1s for such content. Additional resources would be needed to perform that type of review.

Separate from this review, the staff recently received a suggestion to enhance the online searchable campaign finance database with an indicator that an F-1 is available. The suggestion was made by someone who requested the F-1 of a new candidate who had not yet filed.

Staff anticipates that having F-1s online may reduce the staff time it currently takes to process the approximately 1,200 – 1,500 requests for copies of F-1 reports typically received each year.

Staff also anticipates that having F-1s online may increase the number of requests for reporting modifications that require both staff and Commission time to review and process.

NEXT STEPS

At this stage, the staff is seeking direction from the Commission regarding:

- Whether stakeholder outreach has provided sufficient information for the Commission to move forward and, if not, what additional outreach would be helpful.
- What other information the Commission wants, if any, to inform its decisions regarding the three strategic plan action items. For example, for items 3.6 (reporting requirements) and 3.7 (short form), does the Commission wish to review:
 - the research of other states' practices that was provided to the work group,
 - more information about who would not be filing F-1s if the threshold voter count was raised, and/or
 - more information about the annual expenditure levels of those jurisdictions whose officials would not be filing F-1s in the event the Commission wants to consider adding an additional filing trigger?


For item 3.5 (online access), does the Commission need additional information about the estimated staff time/cost of putting all reports online versus posting select sections?

If the Commission believes it has the information it needs to make decisions regarding any of the issues associated with items 3.5-3.7, staff will prepare next steps based on those decisions. For those issues requiring further information, once staff is able to produce the additional resources, they will be scheduled for consideration at a future meeting.

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Should the public have online access to F1 reports?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, the entire F1 should be online	31.4%	161
The F1 without dollar amounts/codes should be online	7.4%	38
Only some sections should be online	17.3%	89
None of the F1 should be online	43.9%	225
<i>answered question</i>		513
<i>skipped question</i>		7



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014


If you selected "Only some sections should be online" above - (Please select all that apply). If not, please click the "NEXT" button below to proceed.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Compensation	67.6%	73
Real estate, including residential address	15.7%	17
Real estate without residential address	55.6%	60
Bank accounts/investments	28.7%	31
Creditors	31.5%	34
Business and other affiliations	69.4%	75
Signature	32.4%	35
answered question		108
skipped question		412



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014


Have you, or anyone on your behalf, ever requested a copy of someone's F1?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	14.8%	76
No	85.2%	438
<i>answered question</i>		514
<i>skipped question</i>		6



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Should the elected officials' F1 filing trigger be changed from 1,000 or more registered voters to:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
2,500 or more registered voters	10.8%	52
5,000 or more registered voters	18.2%	88
Don't change it	64.8%	313
Other (please specify)	6.2%	30
<i>answered question</i>		483
<i>skipped question</i>		37



Responses to: Other (please specify)


**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

- > eliminate it
- > 50,000 or more registered voters
- > Don't have opinion
- > No Opinion
- > Shouldn't matter the number of voters
- > 20,000
- > Not sure
- > not sure
- > 10,000
- > should include appointed municipal officials, like planning commissioners
- > Mine is less than 1000 registered voters, but still you want it??? also, your password retrival doesn't work
- > Only required by paid elected officials. As a School Board Director...makes little sense!
- > It is my opinion that F1 filing should not be required for locally elected offices regardless of the number of registered voters.
- > No thoughts either way.
- > zero - everyone should apply
- > All persons, no exceptions. Level playing field.
- > budget of entity they serve- some electeds serve small districts for nominal compensation- \$500,000.00 or more
- > agency budget over \$500,000
- > I'm not informed enough to comment
- > any number of registered voters
- > No opinion
- > Need F1-A (a "short form" version, for offices with voters < 1000)
- > Offices with a salary within 10% of a State Representative.
- > ALL
- > 1500 (maximum size of precinct)
- > 15,000
- > Do a simplified F1 for jurisdictions with under 5,000 voters, not requiring listing of all accounts, and only listing properties within the jurisdiction.
- > I'm not sure what the trigger is for.
- > It should be ALL elected officials. The "trigger" should be "1".
- > all elected officials regardless of how many registered voters

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Dollar amounts are currently reported using letter codes A through E, with each letter representing a defined dollar range (e.g., Code A = \$0 to \$3,999, Code B = \$4,000 to \$19,999, etc. to Code E = \$100,000 or more). These dollar codes should be: (Select ALL that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Left as they are (no changes)	49.8%	248
Adjusted for inflation	16.9%	84
Restructured so that ranges provide more details (narrower ranges)	11.4%	57
Restructured to add more ranges above \$100,000	28.3%	141
Not used – it would be better for actual dollar amounts to be used	11.6%	58
Other (please specify)	4.4%	22
answered question		498
skipped question		22



**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**


Responses to: Other (please specify)

- > Voluntary, as financial reporting should be altogether.
- > Consider modification of real estate categories.
- > Should be removed entirely. Is overly intrusive and an invasion of privacy.
- > Property value ranges should be increased above \$100,000 since the assessments depend a lot on where you live.
- > Exact amounts
- > At the very least, disclosures should provide MUCH more detail for ranges over \$100k. Should have ranges into the \$5 million, \$10 million or \$20 million or more range. Otherwise, rich people get more privacy than those of modest means.
- > Leave ranges below \$100,000 the same but include more ranges above \$100,000, say up to 100,000,000 and above as
- > Many F-1 reports do not report the individual mutual funds held, or the individual stocks held. This should be enforced. Just knowing you have "Fidelity" with "E" is not much information on whether you are invested in oil, timber, or real estate interests.
- > restructured so that the ranges provide broader ranges
- > The lower codes could be widened (for inflation). For example, lowest should be up to \$5k, then up to \$10K, then up to \$25K, etc.
- > No thoughts - would need to understand the rationale for existing structure.
- > two ranges: 0-100,000 and 100,000 or more
- > Ranges below \$100,000 could be expanded adding fewer ranges below and more above \$100k
- > Not sure; no opinion
- > not used, it's not anybody's business.
- > Not used is first choice but if ranges are kept they must be increased to give more details
- > No value added, the property, asset or income data is sufficient to show any conflicts.
- > More detail is needed, as are ranges above \$100,000. Keeping ranges, however, is good. It greatly simplifies filing and allows for F1A to be filed with little additional effort in subsequent years when the changes are still within the range. If PDC requires specific dollar amount, then every official has to refile completely every year.
- > The Washington Constitution protects people's private affairs so bank information should be protected from any disclosure.
- > As professional staff, I would likely leave my job if I was legally required to disclose specific dollar amounts and details regarding my personal finances.
- > Fewer < \$100k categories and more >\$100k categories
- > move all ranges up significantly and be kept confidential for audit purposes only unless court rules for disclosure (citizen action to request disclosure with cause)

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Do you think the \$2,000 disclosure threshold for stocks, bonds, and other investments is:


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Too high	3.8%	19
Too low	42.9%	213
Just right	23.8%	118
No opinion	29.4%	146
answered question		496
skipped question		24



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Currently, investments owned during any part of the reporting period must be disclosed, regardless of the length of time owned. Should this requirement be changed so that investments are disclosed only if owned:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
At the end of the prior year	11.7%	57
When the report is filed	15.0%	73
For at least 3 consecutive months during the reporting period	5.3%	26
For at least 6 consecutive months during the reporting period	9.9%	48
Don't change it	56.1%	273
Other (please specify)	2.1%	10
answered question		487
skipped question		33



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014


Responses to: Other (please specify)

- > Voluntary.
- > Should only disclose in period following session for investments if held company testified on bill worked on.
- > It undermines the purpose of the reporting if investments can be liquidated prior to filing of the report
- > Don't change it. It is tempting from a filer perspective to say don't make me file for every little stock I buy or
- > Again, how is the current information used? I can't recommend improvement without that understanding.
- > At any time from one year before filing period for office opens
- > Full Disclosure of any investment that is given to or purchased by a candidate or public official, as well as, any investment that is sold or transferred to another party.
- > Phrase as 6 months, or at the end of the reporting year.
- > No opinion.
- > What does statute authorize? If it's not in statute then don't require it.

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

Are you currently an F1 filer?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes - (Please answer the following questions)	73.4%	361
No - (Please click "Next:" at the bottom of this section)	26.6%	131
answered question		492
skipped question		28



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

F1 FILERS ONLY – I filed because I am running for or hold a:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Statewide or legislative office	7.9%	29
Judicial office	6.8%	25
County office	11.5%	42
Local office in a jurisdiction with 5,000 or more registered voters	31.1%	114
Local office in a jurisdiction with less than 5,000 registered voters	17.8%	65
University president or regent/college president or trustee appointment	3.3%	12
Professional staff of the governor or legislature	17.5%	64
Other (please specify)	4.1%	15
answered question		366
skipped question		154



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014


Responses to: Other (please specify)

- > Forest Practices Board Member
- > school board member
- > Former filer; no longer in public office
- > School Board Director
- > School board director
- > Local office - unsure of the number of registered voters
- > Appointed board member
- > Our agency is concerned about perception; I believe our F1 should only be reviewed internally as we do not fit any of the categories listed above
- > Appointed by Gov to a state Commission.
- > Governor appointed commission member
- > appointed member of a board
- > Governor Appointee - Salmon Recovery Funding Board
- > Work for the WS Investment Board
- > community college board
- > appointed

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014

F1 FILERS ONLY – Would online access to your F1 cause you to seek a reporting modification that you don't currently have?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	25.4%	89
No	74.6%	262
answered question		351
skipped question		169



Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014

F1 FILERS ONLY – Would online access to your F1 report cause you to leave office or not run for re-election?


Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	7.6%	27
No	57.8%	204
Maybe	34.6%	122
<i>answered question</i>		353
<i>skipped question</i>		167



**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014**

F1 FILERS ONLY – If you do not file the F1 electronically, tell us why:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Too intimidating	7.0%	9
Attempted to e-file, but had problems	48.1%	62
Have e-filed, but did not like it	8.5%	11
Do not have easy access to the Internet	0.8%	1
Other (please specify)	35.7%	46
answered question		129
skipped question		391



**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses to: Other (please specify)

- > sometimes do, sometimes don't, whatever seems more efficient at the moment
- > don't want info available to hackers
- > Concerned about technology issues, including process, efficiency, access, and security. Rumors are that the system is not up to current acceptable professional standards.
- > N/A
- > I would if I had the link.
- > Optional, and my finances are my own business.
- > Does not accommodate number of investments--have filed electronically, but generally have to mail or fax additional material. Also, re: online access to the F-1, I would not mind having everything listed online except for the amounts of investments, bank accounts, value of property, etc. The actual investment types, companies, properties, etc. to me is the most important to have transparency regarding.
- > Would like to be able to easily access my old F-1 for ease of reviewing and updating
- > Prefer to submit information in person.
- > I have used both
- > Such a personal, private document should be safeguarded as much as possible. Therefore, I hesitate to file electronically knowing how information is able to be hacked and compromised.
- > was advised that e-filing has too many difficulties
- > the internet is untrustworthy
- > Clearer requirements. I like the e-file.
- > prefer US mail
- > More convenient to file on paper.
- > Had technical trouble. Also, am concerned about data security issues.
- > Mail hard copy; too much computer hacking....
- > Surprisingly easy
- > I file electronically and think it's great.
- > I e-file and like it. Simple and straightforward.
- > Paper filing makes it slightly more cumbersome for the general public to access my spouse's financial information. She does not hold office and has not consented to F1 filing requirements; it is ironic that PDC in Washington State treats spouses as chattel property.
- > Site doesn't let me retrieve password, fix it please 4/15 is almost here
- > Concerned about IT security (data breach) and malicious use of personal/private information.
- > Filling it out on paper works fine for me.
- > Don't want to make it easy for people to read my personal information.
- > preference

QUESTION #12

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses to: Other (please specify) - Continued

- > Had problems the first time, would be extra work to go back and do it now. Easier to modify document I have in file in my computer.
- > I prefer to prepare the report by hand
- > form said that signature was required - I know you have it on file!
- > I do file electronically.
- > PDC website won't accept my password
- > Need to have verification that e-filing reached office as I'm having difficulty
- > easier to print out and do reporting with hard copies of financial info
- > None of the above.
- > I prefer the paper option.
- > Prefer to handwrite it out
- > I did not see the option of providing the shortened form when there have been no changes since last year.
- > judges have litigants harrassing them. I have one mentally ill but internet savvy litigant from 1994 threatening to kill me, and another
- > identify compromise
- > I do file electronically, but your system blows
- > personal choice
- > did not know about it and is it available for ammendments??
- > My F1 is complex and prefer to prepare offline
- > prefer doing it by hand
- > prefer not to submit personal data with internet

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
 Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
 April 16, 2014**

Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

	Response Count
	154
<i>answered question</i>	154
<i>skipped question</i>	366

Responses

- > The f1 supplement is confusing and time consuming to put together, for filers and for non profit organizations alike.
- > I have a day job where I work with some possibly dangerous and mentally ill people. I therefore don't like the idea of my home address posted online. I shouldn't have to sacrifice safety in order to serve the public.
- > The School Board Director position in Toutle lake district #130 is a volunteer, unpaid position. I don't see what my family's income has anything to do with Public Disclosure involving the School District. If someone is interested in how much I make, it is available thru my employer.
- > Do not believe executive branch staff or legislative staff should be subject to this requirement. Should be appointed and elected "officials" with significant responsibilities ("significant" could be defined by PDC rule).
- > Thank you for all the great service & help the team at the PDC provides
- > None
- > As you make your decision, please keep in mind that not all F-1 filers are elected officials. If you decide to make F-1s available online, I hope you will consider keeping staff F-1s off the internet.
- > A distinction should be made between filers who have chosen to stand for public office (allow for more personal scrutiny) vs. those of us who are career professionals.
- > Not sure why, but half the time it won't accept information and have to keep reentering the information. Sometimes I have to come back to enter new information.
- > Simply what I just stated with the previous comment, that I would be fine with naming investments, property, etc., online, but not including online the dollar value (even the range).
- > If you want staff F1's to be made public, then make it anonymous. The public can know that staff are making certain investments, but not every detail about us. We do not seek the public light, yet we file these reports, but don't make them public in an individually identifiable way. I have nothing to hide, but I'd just like my privacy.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > This process may be drifting away from the original intent and now becoming an obstacle for some wishing to run for office.
- > Thanks for keeping Washington safe from corruption!
- > I have serious concerns about the level of detail that would be available, like names of entities that I owe debt and the amount. This reporting and potential publication also this impacts my spouse as well, since we are one household, and it is ownerous to have this personal information that impacts him, as well as myself, be searchable online. I do not know of other circumstances where I am required to report all this information to one entity. I am concerned about the security of the information that I report already. Making the report public via the internet only heightens my concern, namely with the detail of information that is required to be reported. I am a public employee, a professional staff, not an elected official. This would not make the distinction between elected officials and a subset of public employees - the ones required to fill out the PDF form. Professional staff should not have their information disclosed online.
- > I am concerned about certain information on the form facilitating fraud or theft. While that is of some concern in a paper only system, there are groups that spend a great deal of energy mining the internet for identity related information. The concern is much greater when it searchable via the internet.

While everything on the forms should be available to PDC staff (and most readily available to the public) I would suggest the following:

- a) Signature is redacted but a statement is added for public view that the document was signed.
- b) Residential address redacted but the street and block could still be included (i.e., 21XX of Main St)
- c) Names of any children under the age of 18 should be redacted (it would show up as Child A, age 15)

It seems like these changes are a good balance between disclosure and concerns from (at least this) filer. As a filer I would love to have the names of financial institutions redacted as well but felt that would serious impair the discloure aspect. Things like names of children, exact address of primary residences, and redacting an actual signature seem like reasonable trades.

- > on line system outstanding. thank you
- > There a number of people who choose not to run for office because of all that is required to be reported on an F1. If they are readily available to anyone online, I believe that number will increase!
- > F1s for professional staff should only be available as a public records request. Personal address and phone # information should not be made available at all
- > I think professional staff should not be required to report.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > As professional staff, I am required to report for both myself and my spouse. While online public accessibility to F1s may be appropriate for elected officials, for staff (and our spouses!) this seems like too much. Our salaries are already public, along with every reimbursement we claim. It's hard enough to find good staff to work in the legislature already - this would be one more disincentive.

- > The current PDC process makes a serious mistake by lumping professional staff in with elected officials. This survey does the same thing, and it makes the results less than useful. I think, and I believe I'm in the majority, that candidates and elected officials should have one set of reporting and transparency rules to comply with, and staff -- who are essentially just employees working for a living -- should have another, one that provides a maximum of privacy. My salary is already online, along with my name. I accept that. I work for the taxpayers, and they have a right to know that basic fact. But that's all. My F1 contains identifying information about my family and my personal life that no one needs to know. I'm not asking the public to trust me to make laws. I'm not asking the public to vote for me, as opposed to someone else. If I were, OK, gather my detailed information and make it available. Otherwise, no. This is especially important in today's highly fractured, emotional and dysfunctional political climate. There are significant numbers of people who just flat out hate government and government workers. I face risk every day simply by entering my office building. The public has nothing to gain by knowing my address, or where I do my banking, or how much money I owe on my car, and the people who would be seriously interested in knowing this private information are the very ones who should not have it. So to sum up, my recommendation would be to devise a new process that does not lump employees in with elected officials. It's never made sense to me, and putting my private information online makes even less sense. I strongly object, and the fact that someone decided this survey makes sense causes me to feel a sense of relief about my retirement being only a couple of years away.

- > The entire process is an invasion of privacy and if it must exist should be entirely retooled to require only disclosure that one generally has investments in an area where one is pursuing policy.

- > The prospect of posting staff F1s online holds serious privacy concerns for me - particularly in the age of data mining of electronic information. As staff, I have ZERO influence and my information should be kept out of the online environment and should be shared only if requested through a public disclosure form.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > As nonpartisan professional staff, I am make significant personal sacrifices in the name of public service. I work hundreds of hours of overtime. I am not a member of associations or organizations that I would otherwise be a part of in order to maintain my nonpartisan credibility. However, posting all of my financial information online is excessive and unnecessary. It asks to much of me and my family. Now my spouse's financial information would be accessible via an internet search? This might make sense for an elected official, but for a staffer who is has no stake in the outcome of legislation, this is asking too much. Perhaps part of the problem is classifying all of us as the same type of filers. If the trend is going to be toward more and more disclosure, then I think the PDC should consider reclassifying filers.
- > Staff should not be subject to filing requirements.
- > Employees of the state (i.e. staff) should be treated differently if this will be online. Employees are career state workers and not politicians. As such, even if the forms of those seeking office go online, career employees should be given more privacy and discretion.

- > Unlike those who seek elective office, professional staff of the legislature have not made a deliberate decision to put themselves and their families in the spotlight. Legislative staff do not vote on legislation. Our salaries are already public record. Public disclosure of personal financial information should be confined to those who seek or hold elected office.

- > Wish we could update our email addresses for log-in. This is an email address from about 10 years ago....I have to search every year for my log in information to fill out the F1. It takes an effort on my part to locate the information to be able to log in.

- > Tried to file F-1A online and could not get in. Password would not take and I was not able to reset.
- > No, Thank you for surveying.
- > Transparency is good.
- > I have struggled with exiling in the past; even spending a half day on the phone with the PDC staff but finally with the aid of a new computer was successful. Now again I have a confirmation and a message saying you have no record for the same report. I am beginning to think I should have stayed with paper.
- > I think financial information should not be online. It can always be requested. I think it is good to have a record of who has requested information. There is an accountability inherent in the current system.
Thank you.

- > no
- > Investments should be limited to actual interests in businesses - not stocks/bonds/mutual funds/bank accounts

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > No.
- > having previously had to file an F-1, they are not that onerous. If someone wants the public's trust they need to be transparent about their personal affairs and these should be posted like any other PDC report/form.
- > I have been an elected official 15 years. I access F-1 reports and Campaign Financial Reports one to several times during every local election. I am dismayed at the number of reports that are not filed on time or are incomplete.

It is common knowledge that the Washington State PDC does not have the man power to enforce compliance. This is most unfortunate since we are a State that "stresses open government and transparency."

Perhaps we need to go back to the drawing board -- starting with the State Legislature.
- > The more information the better. I did not know about the F1 reports but now that I do I would like to see them.
- > Need to better publicize this survey. I only heard about it through the paper. Every Wa st voter should be invited to participate
- > Takes too long to procecute disclosure violations.
- > None
- > voters need all the info that can be disclosed
- > I disclose business customer information on the F-1 so I prefer a person who wishes my information be required to request it versus easy accessibility to it online-mainly due to potential use of customer info. I would probably seek a modification of filing to eliminate or reduce customer names accessibility.
I did file electronically this year and last. First year was a bit cumbersome but this year it was great to just have to make changes.
- > Washington State is lagging behind in regards to Public Disclosure and our politicians. Please do what's right and evolve accordingly with the rest of the country - this is rather embarrassing.
- > We want to see where every penny comes from and goes out.
- > Since presently anyone can request as many F-1' as they want and get them via email, I don't see why they can't just be posted on-line. Perhaps deleting minor children.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > Just Do It! :-)
- > When the public reports the failure of a candidate to report ownership of property or business, the PDC should look into it without further sworn statements from the member of the public. YOU should check out tips instead of letting information languish.

- > Full disclosure is asking a lot of folks who decide to run for office, but that is the price they pay for choosing to try to become elected officials. If they don't want to make public a pretty specific list of their assets and liabilities, they shouldn't run for office. How else can we voters know if there might be conflict of interest unless we know that about our elected officials. Thanks for the opportunity to take this survey.
- > Certain information such as real estate and business holdings is important for the public interest. However, personal/family information and creditors should remain private. I would recommend that for information such as compensation from work outside public office, only those individuals making more than \$200,000/year be required to disclose the range and source. The public is typically concerned about the influence of wealthier individuals who hold office, not a middle-class wage earner.

- > I am currently having trouble accessing the system to electronically file my F1 form. The system does not recognize my password nor does it recognize my email address, even though Chip has sent email to me. ???

- > For small jurisdictions easy, on-line access to F1 filings becomes very personal. It should broad in scope so that quality candidates are not hindered to run.

- > As an elected official, I would appreciate not having to make public all my personal family information. I don't mind disclosing ranges and don't mind it as it is, but more public information would not be appreciated.

- > Biggest concern is being a judge and having my address out there to be accessed by anyone.
- > Why is F1 required for nonpaid position?
- > I strongly object to online access to F1 filings because legitimate inquiries are already getting access but online access would only increase ease and frequencies of inquiries made for the purpose of harassment and other illegitimate reasons. Public office holders already have enough safety concerns by virtue of holding office, why make it tougher to serve? Why increase the invasion of dependents' privacy by putting dependents' employment info on the web? I could go on and on. Please don't do it.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

> With the growing numbers of self appointed watchdogs that are not held accountable for their inaccurate or borderline slanderous comments towards elected officials; access to financial records with personal information and addresses of properties owned/partially owned, purchased etc. by office holders or candidates for office, is none of their business and does not serve any honest law abiding citizen any further insight into the candidate or the elected ability to serve their community. They, self appointed watchdogs of taxpayer monies, use this information to challenge/distorte electeds integrity, personal growth and to harrass neighbors and electeds.

These transparency policies are slowly eroding the civic fabric of our communities, to where citizens who really want to serve their communities will not run for elected office, because their detractors, watchdogs, are not required to be truthful and accountable for their statements!

- > Filing an F1 is a necessary responsibility of an elected official!
- > Easier access to information about public officials helps bring accountability to government.
- > Should be some way to update your username as email addresses change.
- > I am not interested in anyone other than PDC knowing my financial status. There should be some privacy when seeking/holding public office.

- > Increase the dollar categories real soon. Over or under a 100K, is what we have now. I would recommend every level in 200K increments. Than at 1,000,000 go to 500K levels.

- > I do not believe the F1 information should be made publicly available online to prevent casual inquiry that has no legitimate relation to the purpose of these forms. By making an individual submit a request for the F1 forms, there is a threshold established for intent and purpose in obtaining this information.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

> The e-filing system, while better than paper, needs some improvement. The interface is not as user friendly or intuitive as it could be. It looks and "feels" like 1990's technology. I understand the PDC is not well funded, but a sleeker and more modern online filing system may reduce errors, the need for amendments, etc. Overall, though, it is great to have an e-filing option.

I would prefer F-1 not be posted online. However, I think the public/media should be able to confirm whether a required filer has filed the F-1 and whether the F-1 was filed on time. Then, if the person wants to request a copy they can do so.

> More intrusion will discourage good candidates

> No.

> With concerns for personal safety and the theft of personal information a serious issue the more personal information you require me to make public and easily accessible means I will seriously consider not running for public office in the future. My family's personal safety is not worth the risk.

> I currently serve in a small town & dont even accept the stipened. If I do not accept any campaign contributions, or other compensation I dont see why the rest of my information should be online when I work very hard to keep personal information off the internet.

> I believe that access to personal information could present a problem for the filer especially in today's environment.

> For elected officials - I think that there should be a clear record of who is seeking our F-1's and we should be notified when somebody requests the form (we should get a copy of the info request - it would be easy to send an e-mail). I think it is only fair for us to know who knows this personal info. We do not check our rights when we run for office.

> My concerns are only for personal security. Especially from web/online spam, fraud and cyber crimes. If a person needs the information it is available via public request on hard copy.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > I would like to be able to see who is contributing to State and County Elected Officials because I see legislation that seems to be response to special interests that would only be there because of heavy contributions. But, I see the Public Disclosure requirements as being a significant barrier to getting the best qualified candidates to participate in the smaller County and City governments. Many excellent people I know have said they are not going to get involved with City government because they do not intend to expose their personal financial business to the world for litte of no personal gain.
It is a thankless job in many ways, and to also have to expose your financial status to the public so that you can be attacked by members of the public with an axe to grind is not very appealing.
Increasing the number of registered voters that would trigger a PDC Filing requirement would be a good thing.

- > When I filed my F-1 when I was appointed to the unexpired portion of an elective office two years ago, I requested many F-1s to guide my decision on how to comply. I found that even most of the members of the PDC, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State had concealed their individual stock and mutual fund holdings behind blanket "Fidelity" or "Vanguard" entries with "E". The PDC Executive Director filed correctly, fully disclosing individual holdings within each account. This is deceptive, and makes it impossible to know where officials' financial interest lies, one of the purpose of disclosure.

Oh: I ALSO hid my holdings behind a blanket account "E" entry, figuring that if I drew a complaint, I could demand that the AG and PDC members ALSO comply.

- > Fix the password retrieval function!!!
- > Internet access is too easy and subject to abuse. If someone is looking at your financial information, you should be notified, and told who is requesting it. Public disclosure should work both ways to avoid abuse.

- > As a spouse of someone who works in the legislature and as someone who also works around the legislature on behalf of my company, I am very opposed to making this information available online. My private information should not be readily available for those who disagree with stances my organization take in the legislature. I do not want my mortgage information readily available, etc. F1's online will punish those people who's information is only put in because of where their spouse has chosen to work. Please do not put my personal financial information online for those who disagree with me to use against me. If they want to access it, it is available at the PDC.

- > As stated previously...if your elected position does not have a salary or income attached to it, there should be no reason to disclose personal financial information on an F1 statement

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

- > I am very concerned about the electronic availability of F-1 information on the internet. The F-1 report requires employees and elected officials to report personal and private information that doesn't appear to have any nexus to potential conflict of interest issues (e.g, why does the public need to know where I have a checking account or mortgage?). This information, if accessed by a malicious party, could be misused and result in identify theft, fraud, and/or other serious complications for the reporter. If made available over the web, the information could be mass harvested to target public officials (fraud schemes, etc.).
- > The online system seems very convenient.
- > I do not think that it is necessary or appropriate to have the F-1 forms online because people can already make specific requests for copies of our F-1 forms. I understand that filing a F-1 is part of the process for being a public employee, however, I think that it is important for those of us who must disclose some of our most personal information that the requests for our information are documented, rather than anybody being able to check online without any paper trail of our information being accessed. I understand that a request produces the same result as the information being available online, but out of courtesy for public employees, I think it is best to maintain the current system that requires individuals to submit a formal request to access our most personal information.
- > As a staff person, my personal financial information should not be subject to electronic disclosure. It's different for an elected official, but a staff person should not have their info disclosed electronically. It's too easy for hackers and others to use the information for bad purposes.
- > My shoes do not fit everyone, but persons whose answers do not change from year to year, should be allowed to check "No Changes since last report"
- > It is my opinion that F1 filing should not be required for locally elected offices regardless of the number of registered voters.

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014

Responses - Contiued

- > The whole F-1 process does make me feel like I have to share more about my personal financial affairs than I would normally do - I don't walk down the street or even talk to good friends about which stocks I have or how much I have invested in them - that feels like it is my business. But I "get it" that the public needs to be assured that I am not taking advantage of my elected position to personally profit. Having to provide the data so that it "was there" *IF* someone accused me of doing something inappropriate is a reminder and deterrent to all filers that they need to watch their p's and q's, and provides a path to research real issues. Making it all available on line scares me, though, because there are people who have nothing better to do than "mine" the data and potentially target me with marketing offers, or potentially find out data that makes identity theft more feasible. Yes, the full reports are available now by request, but putting them all on line would make it easier for someone to use computing tools to search for data or vulnerabilities more readily than could be done today. I also feel some protection now that if someone makes a request for my F1, the PDC knows who made the request in case there was a pattern of problems that came out of F1 report data being used. Once you go online with it, PDC will no longer know who asked for the data, so I feel more exposed. Bottom line, if you go online, data needs to be "sanitized" somehow to give me some reasonable expectation that my personal privacy will not be compromised, or it *WILL* cause me to forego public office. As a small city council member, I already give up a lot of personal privacy for a few hundred bucks a month - expose me to unwanted marketing efforts or identity theft, and it is not worth it.
- > Allow judges to not list addresses or descriptions for personal security reasons for all residence(s)
- > I understand these reports being reviewed by knowledgeable people to protect all of us in the state from inappropriate behavior (and hope they really are reviewed); and when people are elected they have an obligation to provide this information. I don't believe that as an employee my financial affairs are the business of the public (I was not elected) although my details should be reviewed by knowledgeable authority within my agency for internal control purposes.
- > Thanks for asking
- > The problem with the F-1 is that we only fill it out once a year. We forget how to fill it out because we use it so infrequently. I think you need a training video on the website.
- > Would like to be able to pull up my previous years' report and just make minor changes where needed. Guess my file copies are in storage & I am not able to use them this year.
- > I do understand the purpose for Public Disclosure, but I do not understand the utility of the data as collected by the F1 Survey. I almost think that a copy of my Federal tax returns would provide more useful information.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

- > Keep it as is. Finally over the years it has become easy to do. I like how we see the past report and then can edit and add. One thing is the email used for the 1st online filing can not be changed (or so I was told by a number of the staff - so I get an email to the existing one, but have to use an email I had ages ago to access my account. That should be allowed to be changed...now when I receive the confirmation, I also see it went to my old account. With the craziness of hackers, it does not make me feel comfortable. SO change it and let filers know they can.
- > Nope.
- > small districts lose very good potential candidates because of disclosure rules. These small districts do not pay much and some not at all yet the disclosure requirements are overly invasive of personal finances.
- > Discourages qualified people from seeking office due to the disclosure of confidential information, example: an attorney having to disclose his clients.
- > I don't believe the PDC is adequately funded by the Washington State Legislature and until it is, the agency should keep changes and work burden to a minimum.
- > It is very important to the integrity of the election process that candidates provide a lot of detail as to their personal financial holdings as well as campaign contributions. This information should be required to be kept current through that person's elected office career, not just at the point that he/she files as a candidate. It is equally important that this information be kept up to date and made available to everyone via the PDC web site.
- > PDC is severely understaffed. Seriuos complaints take too long to investigate and resolve.
- > All government information should be available to any citizen on the Internet. The more availability with the least hassle only makes government better and accountable which is missing especially in city government.
- > I think staff should be treated somewhat differently than electeds. Personally identifying details -- that could be used for identity theft or stalking -- should not be electronically available.
- > A few years ago I requested an opinion from the PDC on whether stock options held but not exercised must be reported. The written answer was No, because they are often not liquid assets, nor transferable, and don't have a determinable market value. I find that policy to be a loophole for inviting the withholding of financial interests from the public. Stock options are vested value that the public should know about to evaluate the financial interests of candidates. I propose that stock options of any kind, including promise of options in the future (for example, in the case of certain conditions sustaining, such as an IPO) should be explicitly added to the list of mandated disclosures, even if their cash value is zero or indeterminate.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > I can't find a copy of the F-1 I filed last year; it would be great if I could look it up on line.
It also seems I wrote down the wrong email address or password last year so now that I have an evening to fill out the form I can't access the old one. It would be nice if there was a way to have that info accessible online during off hours.
- > Nope. More openness is better, these folks are doing the People's business
- > I filed F-1s for 35 years as a county and statewide official.
- > I filed 3 times and I personally think my own money should be filed not my husbands. Mainly because he had nothing to do with my running
- > Let's keep it transparent.
- > For small, local offices, it is very intimidating having that kind of info about me so easily available. I know from experience, many people won't run for office because of this. All info is available for investigations, but this amount of public access for no reason makes me uncomfortable.
- > All information that is disclosed in response to a public records request to the PDC should be posted on-line. This will save a lot of staff time because there will be no need to respond to such requests, other than to point people to the website.
- > It is important for the public, including the candidate's opponents, to be able to find out and understand the candidate's or officeholder's financial entanglements innocent or otherwise.
- > Congratulations to the PDC for working to make campaign finances more transparent!
- > Please, as an FOI, send a copy of this completed survey to donaldadenning@msn.com
- > More transparency is better. It's kind of like the Bellevue School District Superintendent Amalia Cudeiro who owned an education consulting company with her husband. How many more conflicts of interests do we need in public office?
- > Although I understand the desire for F-1 filers to retain their privacy, good government requires transparency.
- > You need easy FTP download access to bulk, raw PDC data. Look at what the FEC does.
- > Don't put it online - - - too much fraud risk in light of Seattle Archdiocese data breach.
- > Keep it simple. Financial reporting should only focus on potential conflicts of interest...other items do not matter.
- > All of this information should be online for the public to see, without making a formal request.
- > Public info is laudable. These forms should be simpler and more general to capture essence but not all the painful detail that does not disclose any additional meaningful information
- > If people really want that information, they have access to it by request.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > There are safety concerns about telling the public what properties I own. There are often threats against public officials, I don't need criminals knowing where I might be or where my family might be. Some things should remain private. No one should know who my creditors are. My honesty, integrity, and work ethic should tell enough without disclosing other info. As it is, it can be requested and produced, putting it online is unwarranted and unwelcome.
- > Please encourage people other than F1 filers to complete your questionnaire. Financial information about elected officials is vital for trust and accountability, including allowing the public and media to decide if conflicts exist. I would strongly encourage PDC to use narrower ranges and ranges over \$100,000 for income. However, reporting of actual income would then trigger every official having to file a completely revised F1A, instead of being able to check that there were no significant changes from prior year. Rep. Gerry Pollet
- > Posting these documents online may save the agency some money in terms of public records requests, but seeing as they contain information about us that is sensitive regarding our financial life, it should be kept behind at least that one layer of protection and not just available for anyone.
- > Financial Information needs to be protected by the government from data mining companies. The government has not done a good enough job of protecting personal information about individuals from the abuse by commercial and other sources. People in other countries would very much like to steal American identities, and with the bank and investment information on the forms the PDC is inviting the criminals to prey on filers. Please do not make it easier for the criminals and people overseas to access the information.

I would urge the commission to re-asses the F1 based on the legal standard of strict scrutiny for all the requirements on the form and the mechanisms by which the information is released. Can the government prove that each item of information requested furthers a compelling state interest and that those rules and policies are narrowly tailored to do that? Is it in line with current US and WA Constitutional legal interpretations? I would ask that the PDC seek out constitutional scholars on the issue and do a public hearing to inform the commissioners and the public, then consider redrafting the F1, removing some of the information requirements.

- > On the whole, the PDC is doing a difficult job well. Hold their feet to the fire!
- > Given rampant identity theft and the unsafe world we live in, I do not support posting the F-1 online. I don't live an extravagant lifestyle, but someone could read my F-1 online and easily decide I was a financial target. I think you should notify candidates when a request of their F-1 is made.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > I can no longwr access the forms on line to print out.I had no trouble for 13 years but now someone has "improved" the system to where it no longer works.
- > The F-1 is one of the most overlooked reports filed. Every effort should be make to make them more visible and available.
- > The PDC provides a wonderful and informative service in a democracy..... Keep up the good work. Please don't water down the existing process and system. If anything please strengthen the disclosure system in Washington and let Washington lead us into the sunshine on public service.
- > no
- > Online access is not necessary - for those who actually have a reason to inquire, they can simply request the information from the PDC.

- > Good work and Good Luck
- > see my last comment.
- > I would like to be able to print for my records a copy of my F-1 report.
- > I am in a volunteer position and have no desire for the public to have unfiltered access to my personal data.
- > I believe having the F! on line will change its purpose to one of being a weapon used against elected officials. I also work very hard to keepmy personal information off of the internet and do not want the government making it availble for all uses both good and bad. I also do not want to be targeted by marketers as a revenue source due to my service to my community.

- > Identity Theft concerns the more info online/available makes theft of more likely
- > In the age of international travel it could be life threatening when traveling in 3rd world countries to allow access to ones financial situation to the public (especially to those members of the public even in this country whom pursue burglaries, kidnappings, etc)
- > Frankly, I don't mind providing the information, although I think the form is a bit clunky and difficult to use. Making the F-1 viewable by the general public has more downsides then value. I have been harassed by naysayers and having this information online just increases the likelihood of this happening more frequently.

- > I think that the PDC is a joke of an organization and it should not be required for positions where there is no compensation. No compensation, no conflict of interest.

- > Nope
- > I hope e filling has filters so some one could not steal my Identity.

**Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014**

Responses - Contiued

- > I would put it online but do not see the need. Most who would take the time to browse one's financials are not interested in a study. They are seeking evidence!
- > Please protect our privacy. If folks want to get salaries, etc, they can order it. It doesn't help to have this information on the web for family members etc to see when they are not part of our constituency. Thank you for listening.
- > Privacy of citizen legislators should be balanced with need to disclose. Rules should be put in place to limit who can access and for what cause, absent a court order, to limit potential for snooping and harassment (and other illicit purposes).
- > It appears to me the F-1 is not appropriate for WS Investment board staff (at mid levels). If the goal is to monitor personal investments to watch for inappropriate trading (which is appropriate), then a confidential system that reports investment activity should be developed and monitored by an internal compliance group. A restricted list should be developed such that approval for new investments is granted based on potential conflicts with restricted list companies. Staff would need to report all investment activity to the compliance department, which can be done automatically by approved brokers. This is the type of system that is used in most investment organizations, not this unwieldy, unmonitored and self reported system.
- > Have a form, on the internet, that can be updated each year.
- > Thank you for taking this survey! \$100,000 shows voters so little any more about how much a person actually owns in stocks or their home. This will be a big change and a welcome one for transparency.
- > Thank you for all the work that the PDC does to ensure transparency in our state! It is appreciated!
- > Posting online details about where a person has their bank accounts, their mortgage, their car loan, and their IRA is nothing but a recipe for harassment and identity theft.
- > F1 filers should not have to list their home address. Listing the city of residence and \$value is sufficient. Public officials/judicial officials have security concerns that should be respected by not requiring the F1 filing of home addresses.
- > It's a pain in the ass to fill it out and then have to send you a physical copy. If i scan one i signed and fax it to you, that should be enough. or let us fill it out online for f1a or f1
- > I am a regular candidate for state legislature; unfortunately, I haven't won yet but I'll keep on trying. Regarding financial disclosure; I'm from Florida, down there it's called 'form 6' down there they ask everything and get very pointed with financial questions. While it's important to have public information I do worry about job related problems for legislative candidates...Asset disclosure yes but employment disclosure no...

Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1) Survey Results
April 16, 2014

Responses - Contiued

- > The information listed in the F1 is highly personal such as specific banks used and accounts held. This information is available readily to requesters but should not be on the open internet for potential fraudsters to access.
- > Results of this survey will never be statistically valid. Why don't you consider an approach that won't target just the online crowd.



PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908 • (360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112
Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcc.wa.gov

To: Members, Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
From: Lori Anderson, Communications & Training Officer
Date: May 15, 2014
Re: Strategic Plan Update - Personal Financial Affairs Review/Online Access

AGENDA

Following the April 2014 progress report, the Commission asked staff to solicit more stakeholder comment regarding potential online access to Personal Financial Affairs Statements. The additional comments received since the April meeting will be summarized for the Commission at the May 2014 meeting.


BACKGROUND

The strategic plan contains three F-1 related action items:

- 3.6 Review F-1 requirements to consider changes to laws and rules concerning: reporting thresholds (\$2,000 and \$10,000 thresholds); type and manner of reporting investments (stock values & mutual funds, short term vs. long-term holds, highest value vs. snapshot in time); and the nature and extent of reporting business ownership interests.
- 3.7 Evaluate the feasibility of using a short form for certain local F-1 filers.
- 5.5 Evaluate, through a pro-active stakeholder process, whether the Commission should begin posting on-line some or all information from candidate and annual F-1 forms and, if limited information from F-1s is to be posted, how to accomplish that in a technologically feasible manner and within available resources.

During the April 2014 meeting, the Commission reviewed recommendations related to action items 3.6 and 3.7 as well as public comment received through a stakeholder meeting and a survey that covered the recommendations and whether the contents of the F-1 reports should be available online.

The Commission expressed concern that so many of the 361 F-1 filers responding to the survey indicated that online access to F-1s would or may be a reason for them to leave office. Staff was asked to gather additional comment on this topic in an effort to learn, more specifically, what kinds of concerns filers have that might cause them to leave office or choose not to run again if the Commission moved to post F-1 reports online.



The Commission also generally agreed with the recommendations for proposed changes to disclosure requirements related to dollar value codes and investments, but was interested in seeing more detailed proposals and staff recommendations before making any decisions.

ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE

Following the April Commission meeting, staff sent an email to all F-1 filers who had been invited to participate in the original survey asking for additional comment if they had responded that online access to F-1 reports would or may be a reason for them to leave office. Staff received 115 additional responses.

Some individuals cited general privacy concerns without identifying specific objections. Of those filers providing follow-up comments about their objections to posting F-1s online, the specific objections voiced since the April meeting include the following:

- home address, phone number and/or email address (50),
- security of information/identify theft (32),
- spouse and/or children's names (30),
- dollar values (5), and
- protecting business clients (4).

Copies of the emails received are attached. The emails are grouped by objection, to the extent possible. If an individual listed multiple objections, each objection is included in the counts listed here, but only one copy of the email is attached. One response suggests that the Commission develop an automated process for obtaining the F-1s that does not include having them posted online. A few responses encourage the Commission to post the F-1s. Professional staff from the House of Representatives express concerns with the Commission's definition of "professional staff" in addition to explaining their objections.

In addition to the emails, staff received a few telephone calls from individuals who were reluctant to send responses knowing that the emails are public records.

NEXT STEPS

Staff proposes scheduling a work session during the June Commission meeting in order to allow the Commission to consider options that staff will craft based on the recommendations and Commission guidance received to date concerning all aspects of the F-1 review, particularly the dollar codes, investments, and online posting issues. A work session would allow more informal and in-depth discussions and would also give stakeholders another opportunity to participate in the deliberative process.

Attachments: Email responses from F-1 filers

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

PERSONAL CONTACT INFORMATION

From: [Baum, Beth](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:33:17 AM

Hi Lori,

I am uncomfortable with my personal contact information (home address, phone number, email address, etc) or information about my family (spouse's name) being made available online. If this information were redacted from the form I currently submit, I would be much more comfortable with the form being available electronically.

Thanks,
Beth Baum

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:41 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Richard Bloom](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 8:39:23 PM

Uncontrolled access to data in the F-1 reports would place the elected officials like myself and their families at risk from predatory individuals looking for "targets" for home invasion and the like.

As an elected official serving my community for \$350/month I have serious concerns as to making that information easily available on line.

I would ask if the same information would be available online for Commission members as well.

I live in a very safe community but that does not keep me safe from internet predators.

I feel that such a move by the PDC does not serve the public good but rather places community minded individuals and their families at greater risk.

Richard Bloom
City Councilmember
West Richland, WA

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
To:
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:24 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520

From: [Buel, Richard D](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: ["Richard Bloom";](#)
Subject: F-1 reports
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 8:10:21 AM

Hi Lori,

I was forwarded a document by one of my fellow West Richland City Councilmembers (Richard Bloom), who had responded to your organization's question about posting F-1 documents online. I must have missed the email asking for input, as I did not send in any reply. However, I must echo Councilmember Bloom's sentiments about posting F-1 information online. I am not in favor of posting these complete documents on the Internet.

Respectfully,

Rich Buel, West Richland City Council

From: [Greg Castellaw](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 2:22:11 PM

Lori,

Thanks so much for the opportunity to respond to issues I have with providing on line access of F-1 filing information. I have very strong feelings concerning posting my personal information on line. For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone would think this would be considered “appropriate balance”.

Please let me be clear the posting of my F-1 information on line would definitely require me to resign my school board position. Easy access to public servant **personal information** on line clearly steps over the line concerning **personal privacy and security**. It is already difficult to find qualified and willing candidates for unpaid school director positions. Subjecting school board members to this level of exposure will further erode the pool of quality candidates, especially those that are **not single issue** candidates (true public servants). We, as school directors, would not dream of subjecting the privacy of our students and staff to the same level of exposure as appears to be under consideration for school board members (& other elected officials) by the PDC and the State of Washington.

As an unpaid elected official, I have the following specific concerns:

1. **Addresses:** I am often required to take a position protecting our students that may be unpopular with certain individuals or discipline an employee for questionable behavior. I feel that the risk I might subject my family as part of the duties of my uncompensated position would become too high of a price to pay. Posting on line where my family lives, and where my spouse and I work would not be a safe practice.
2. **Children/Spouse:** Once again my concerns with listing names of my family, even though rare, might once again place my family at risk. Not only do I have a responsibility to protect the students of our school district, I also must protect my family, first and foremost.
3. **Income/Real Estate/Investments/Transactions/Etc.:** I fully understand and support the need for the PDC to be able to monitor monetary appropriateness, but this does not include splashing my private information on line. Those that are inclined to prey on, scam, or swindle others would be provided with an easy to follow road map of my personal finances and the locations of those holdings. As on line security of financial information becomes more difficult to maintain, it appears that the State of Washington may be interested in ensuring that my

personal information becomes less secure. Of the concerns I have voiced, I think this concern is my greatest. Privacy should not be compromised in this manner in the line of public service to others without compensation.

4. **Business Clients:** On line posting of my business clients that have paid my firm over \$10,000 is also a concern that I have. The potential adverse impact to my business and the families that are supported by those that are my employees would not be acceptable. I am sure that I have clients that would not be pleased to know that an easy “google” of them would reveal their business transactions that have occurred. The potential loss of business that I sense would be a deal breaker for my public service.

As mentioned above, a decision by the PDC/State of Washington to post my F-1 information on line (any of the above information) will require me to immediately resign my unpaid position as school director. I hope that you do not decide to proceed with this poorly thought out proposal. Even though some might think that easy access to personal information of others should not be a concern, those same individuals would most likely be furious to have their personal information posted on line. There still are crazies and those with criminal tendencies out there looking for an easy way to pray on others. Please take a moment to consider what is an appropriate balance. Posting personal information on line that is required by the F-1 reporting is not an appropriate balance. It only compromises one’s privacy and security.

Even though I have enjoyed my public service and feel that I have been a very effective and dedicated school director for a number of years, **this service will come to an immediate close if you decide on posting of my personal information on line.**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to express my concerns,
Greg

Greg Castellaw
Director Clarkston School District
Home Phone: 509-758-6745
gcastellaw@ckarchitects.com

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:30 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

From: [Jeff Cook](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 2:48:44 PM

I prefer that my public disclosure information not be available online. Last year in my second year of being in public office my wife and I were subject to unfortunate harassment incidents from one citizen to the point that we had to appear in court multiple times to obtain a restraining order against this individual and respond to other issues that were eventually dismissed by a judge. In all I had to go to court 12 times in front of 8 different judges because of this individual. I think that having my personal information readily available to individuals like this could cause my family problems. I'm not holding public office for the small monetary compensation that I receive but consider it as community volunteering. I ran in 2011 partly because no one else did. I think that having personal information readily available might discourage citizens from running for public office. We need more good candidates not less.

Jeff Cook
Council Member
Ward 3
Aberdeen, WA

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:20 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what

From: [Cutler, Pete](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 2:24:47 AM

Lori -

I did not indicate that I would have concerns about making the F-1 content public. HOWEVER I was thinking of the financial summary information. For safety reasons I would strongly prefer that home addresses, home/cell phone numbers, and family member names not be made public. If somebody has a legitimate need for that kind of information they should be required to contact the public employer or the PDC.

Thanks for asking, Pete Cutler [Senate staff]

From: Lori Anderson [lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:42 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results <<http://www.pdc.wa.gov/home/accountability/pdf/F1.Survey.2014.pdf>> are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s). I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.

Thank you,

From: [Davidson, Pam \(OFM\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:55:22 AM

Lori, I would not want my home address posted on-line. My daughter is grown now, but I used to list her, and would not want my children's names published either. Thanks for asking.

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:42 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax
Follow the PDC on [Facebook!](#)

From: [Gene Egan](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:55:39 AM

Hi Lori,

Thanks for requesting our input. I would definitely leave office if any portion of my F1 report were made public.

Regarding the disclosure of my address, I have had citizens come to my house uninvited to discuss their concerns with the Town. I even had a disgruntled citizen call me at 5 am on a Sunday morning to complain. I make myself available to the Town and our citizens, but I should be able to enjoy private time also. Publishing our contact information would compromise this private time.

Regarding my financial information, it is simply nobodies business what my personal income or assets are. There is no financial reward for being a council member for the Town of Skykomish. It is quite the opposite. For example, when I attend meetings outside of Town, those expenses are picked up by me, not the Town.

We want to encourage good people to serve the Town, but some won't even consider volunteering for a council position if their contact and financial information is made public. As for me, as was unaware of this requirement, and would not have run for this position had I known of the reporting requirement.

Once again, thanks for asking for our input.

Gene Egan
Skykomish Town Council

From: [Dan and Ann Fagerlie](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: [Junk released by User action] Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:13 PM

I object to it being online as it is the PDC's business to make sure that we are not taking contributions or \$ from someone we should not, but if it is online then everyone in the world can see it. My son is a border patrol agent on the AZ-Mexican border. His and his co-workers fear is to be taken hostage or captive by cartel or other illegal influences. it would only take a second to search online to then see what we were capable of paying ransom or to even use to target relatives or my daughter or others whom travel to central america or mexico. This information could be used to actually target individuals who's family may have resources through hard work. I also had a friend whom was a lead detective in Spokane. She said inmates major way to make funds while in jail or prison was to sell information they knew or discovered, to outside people whom used that information to target places for burglary, etc. I can see many possible uses non-lawabiding citizens could use the information for. If it is going to be listed I would seriously have to weigh the decision on whether the safety of my family and home, or my service to the public is more important. Which would you choose??

----- Original Message -----

From: [Lori Anderson](#)

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:29 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Ruth Gordon](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:05:42 AM

Hi, Lori – I don't recall this survey – but would just say, that although in this day anyone who wants to find you can find you, the information provided on an F-1 provides a golden key to anyone who wishes to harass, intimidate, blackmail or physically harm a filer or the filer's family. And it would be a treasure trove for run of the mill identify thieves. I don't think one's home address should be published online, nor the location of one's bank accounts. I do think those making policy decisions for the public good should disclose their financial interests, and it make sense to me to show a value range. I agree with those who stated that the value ranges in their current form provide much more privacy for the rich than those of modest means.

Please do not publish residence information, at a minimum.

When I was appointed to public office no one mentioned that I would have to disclose so much of my (formerly) private information, and then it was too late to weigh my options. It has given me some measure of comfort to know that information is not published online.

How many requests is your office having to respond to?

Thanks for doing this survey and sharing its results – very interesting.

Ruth

Ruth Gordon

Jefferson County Clerk

P.O. Box 1220

1820 Jefferson Street

Port Townsend, WA 98368

Phone: 360-385-9128

FAX: 360-385-5672

rgordon@co.jefferson.wa.us

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]

From: [Paul Greenlee](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 11:51:25 AM

Dear Ms. Anderson,
My wife is a one-on-one and couples mental health counselor. Some of her clients are, frankly, "scary."
She is also under legal obligation to keep her client list confidential, among other things. That information is exempt from subpoena under Washington Law.
We have kept separate last names, and we keep our financial affairs separated.
Her clients are not told who I am, or what I do. I do not "advertise" her profession.
I have great concern for her safety, and for potential violations of "client privacy" and loss of her license, under the existing disclosures.
Having my F-1 online raises the risk substantially.

Further, to think that it's only a small change to go from "by specific request only" to online is incredibly naïve.
Google (actually "Backrub,") was the first "web-bot" or "web-crawler" in 1996.
In the almost two decades since, "data-mining" has exploded exponentially.
Automated (mindless!) data-mining by bots now constitutes a substantial percentage of total web traffic.
Exposing F-1 data to data-mining, substantially increases the risk that the covered officials will be subject to threat, extortion, or other forms of manipulation.
That is exactly opposite to the intent of of our Public Disclosure System.

Please, please, do not make this F-1 data dangerous.

Thank you for your service,

--

Paul Greenlee
Council Member
City of Washougal

On 4/25/14 8:24 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the

From: [Hesselholt, Claire](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 3:32:43 PM

I very strongly do not think residential addresses should be that easily available for anyone, but most particularly for staff. The residential address shows up with the real estate information, as you know.

Clearly the financial information is relevant – and that would include the value and the mortgage on the real estate. But the actual location doesn't need to be that easily available. I would think many people would have issues with this, but as a single woman with an unusual name, I have tried for years to keep my personal address private. I view this as a safety issue. I also think, in this day and age, that providing all this information online for so many people will provide identity thieves fertile ground for years to come.

I would be happy to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Claire Hesselholt

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:42 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this**

From: [Hill, Hollis](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Thursday, May 01, 2014 10:22:30 AM

Dear Ms. Anderson,

I don't believe I would leave office if this information were on line but I would certainly object to mine and my family's personal finances being available for the public to see. I think it is appropriate for elected officials to divulge their campaign financing, of course, but I don't think it is a good idea for us to share information not relevant to our jobs. As a judge who is called upon to send people to prison and at times take away children I am vigilant about personal security by taking many measures to avoid my personal life being in the public eye. I urge the PDC not to put this information on line.

Judge Hollis Hill

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:18 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Diane Houser](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, May 12, 2014 10:29:37 PM

Dear Lori,

I feel strongly enough about this that I would resign my position as a local fire commissioner if F-1 information is made accessible online. The position is not worth the complete loss of personal and financial privacy of my family. Whether founded or unfounded, my family considers it a safety issue as well.

Sincerely,
Neal Houser

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:25:03 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the**

From: [Debrena Jackson Gandy, Speaker & Author](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:18:47 AM

From Debrena:

I didn't mention that I'd leave office if the F-1s were on-line, but I would still like to weigh in. I must have missed the communication suggesting that this might occur.

As a volunteer appointed public servant, the number of hours invested in fulfilling my position, away from my business (self-employed) and family, is done in the name of service and contribution.

Then to have my , personal AND family's information available so easily and readily on-line in a culture where fraud is a full-time pursuit for many is unsettling. To have the names of my children, home address, spouse's information readily available at another's fingertips on-line, enables a level of exposure to my family and my private information that now creates a major deterrent to serving.

Even a registered sexual offender isn't require to disclose this much information on-line.

The F-1s are already available. What has precipitated the conversation about them being available on-line. Why is this so essential?

What is the down-side of leaving things as they are, and thus not taking the risk of alienating ANY Trustees, or creating what could be perceived as a burden of serving?

In this high-tech culture, personal information is already too readily available in my estimation, so as a function of my volunteer service as a Trustee, I am not interested in making my personal AND family information that much more readily available to an unscreened public and in a current environment where there are abuses of information. The "average Joe" can post and share personal information via multiple social media platforms with the touch of a button, someone who might be disgruntled, in

disagreement with a vote, etc.

If such a condition were in place as a consideration BEFORE I took office, I would probably have declined, based on this.

Thanks,
Debrena Jackson Gandy
Trustee, Highline CC

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:40 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax
Follow the PDC on [Facebook!](#)

From: [Mike's iPad](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 12:18:37 AM

I would resign my office for the following reasons.

It would make it easier for the less than stable and vindictive constituents to access my personnel information should they want to create harm to me or my wife.

Anyone that files an F-1 and the F-1 is publicized in the current environment of the radical political opposition creates an atmosphere that would make it prudent to carry protection as well as my wife.

The position is not worth the added risk and my wife having to obtain a CWP and carry a concealed weapon.

James M Dennis Langham

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:22 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular**

From: [Penny McAnally](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 2:49:08 PM

Hello,

I wouldn't want my home address, phone number, etc published online.

Thank you,
Penny

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:35:13 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Doris McConnell](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 11:05:58 AM

Lori,

I would prefer to keep my address and financial information as private as possible. It could only be used against an elected. Particularly in local government, our salaries is accessible and why would anyone want to know our address and more personal information?

Thanks,
Doris McConnell
Shoreline City Councilmember
dmcconnell@shorelinewa.gov

From: Lori Anderson [lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:23 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results <<http://www.pdc.wa.gov/home/accountability/pdf/F1.Survey.2014.pdf>> are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s). I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.

Thank you,

From: [Mary Morgan](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 11:01:50 AM

I did not receive the survey...but must admit that when I found I had to do the F-1 for the last year that I was horrified. I run a one person business in a small community, and tend to keep my financial affairs very private. If my F-1 is made available online, I am not sure if I will feel safe in many ways where I live. I liquidated 2 properties last year, in order to resolve financial issues. Both had been in my ownership for many years, but it makes my report look as if I have money that I don't have. The proceeds of the sales went to settle debt, but there is no way on the form to show that. I seriously thought about resigning from office but realized that you would still force me to file for last year. If the information is going to be published online, I feel it is grossly unfair to those like myself who try hard to keep our personal matters out of public view. In addition, I am a single older woman, 67, and I live alone. This has the possibility of making me a target, especially with the fact that anyone can find out where I live because of public notice requirements. Please do NOT publish this information online. And frankly, if someone does a public request for this information, I feel I should be notified so that I can take appropriate actions to protect myself from harm. By the way, for about 40 hours a month of work on Ellensburg City Council, I am paid \$250/month. Hardly worth giving up all my privacy for that!

Sincerely,

Mary
Ellensburg City Council
Ellensburg, WA

Mary Morgan
509.899.1412
mary@sagelandproperties.com
www.sagelandproperties.com

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:22 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

From: [Dawn Morrell](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 2:39:02 PM

Thank you for asking. In today's world I would not like to have children's names and home addresses on the PDC F1 report. Too many scary people out there and safety is important. I don't care about investments - probably because I don't have many.

Thank you

Rep. Dawn Morrell

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:16 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

<image002.jpg>

From: [Steve Nylund](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 11:16:36 AM

Hello Lori,

I'm new to this whole process so I did not respond to the original survey, but I would like to add a second to this comment—the F-1 should not be required at all for **unpaid** positions where there is little or no opportunity for the person to receive any direct financial gain due to the position:

Only required by paid elected officials. As a School Board Director...makes little sense!

And for any information that needs to be on-line, then I would prefer that personal information, like street addresses and children's names, not be included. It also seems like it would make sense to increase the voter numbers and the dollar ranges.

Thank you and best regards,
Steve Nylund
School Director - Hockinson
19712 NE 174th Street,
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
360-896-4161

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:35 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this**

From: [David Poucher](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 2:26:39 PM

I do not believe my home physical address should be available on line. I do not mind my mailing address being available.

Mayor David Poucher
White Salmon

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:19 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Jesse Salomon](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 7:21:04 PM

While I'm not planning to leave office over this, the idea of publishing my home address leaves me very uncomfortable. In my day job I work with people some of whom have long criminal histories, serious mental health issues etc. I do my best to keep my personal information private to best protect myself and my family. I try to keep our personal address offline. I feel like I shouldn't have to jeopardize our safety so that I can also serve the public as an elected official. Why not use our elected office's business address? While I love serving I still value some semblance of a private life.

Jesse Salomon, Councilmember
City of Shoreline
Jsalomon@Shorelinewa.gov
(206) 396-5807

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:26 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular

From: [Brenda Stonecipher](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 7:22:10 AM

Lori:

Thank you for asking.

I think it's important for the Commission to remember that the purpose of the Open Government Act, as I understand it, is to bring 'sunshine' to the financing of campaigns and lobbying. The collection of candidate and elected officials' personal information is necessary where it helps to 'shed light' on the activities that are deemed essential for the public to know. I hope the Commission asks itself, when considering these changes, whether or not the publication of any personal information would allow users of the information to understand better the candidate's campaign financing or lobbying activities.

I think the publication of all the F-1 information is an invasion of privacy that transcends what is reasonable for a public office holder. The ready access to an elected official's home address, the names of his/her children and spouse, and the locations of other property owned is unreasonable because it puts both the office holder and his/her family in danger. Rogue citizens who are angered by the official's actions could easily find the information that would enable them to track down the official and -- more importantly -- his/her loved ones. Moreover, this information serves no public purpose. Why would my constituents be entitled to know who my children and spouse are, or where I live? The only legitimate purpose would be to establish that the elected official meets the residency requirements of his/her office -- a task that the PDC does not perform. County election officials, who field these inquiries, have other ways to handle them.

In reviewing the PDC "Privacy Notice" on your website, I note that you "do not knowingly collect any personal information from children," and you caution repeatedly that personal information of children who access the site "may be subject to public access." The reason for these warnings is that you, evidently, believe that publication of a child's personal information is inadvisable. Please take your own advice and protect elected officials' children and families.

As for the investment information, I actually believe it is information that

SHOULD be available and serves a valid public purpose. If I am asked to vote on an action that benefits a business or developer, my constituents have the right to know if I have a financial 'relationship' with the business or developer. If I do, it may impair my ability to make an unbiased vote on the action. While ethical rules may require an elected official to recuse him/herself from a vote where they have a direct financial interest, it is possible to be biased even if there is an indirect financial investment in an unrelated business unit or, in the case of a developer, a different development LLC.

I realize that the internet makes much of an elected official's private life public. It is likely that all the information contained on the F-1 is available somewhere, but it would require a great deal of effort for a person to gather that information, and it might not be a complete set. I do not think the PDC, whose primary mission is to help citizens understand who is financing elections and whether lobbying efforts are exerting influence, should be in the business of publishing personal information just because you have it. Particularly if that information puts a candidate and his/her family at greater risk, while serving no public purpose.

Brenda Stonecipher
Everett City Council

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:22 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea

From: [Charlene Strong](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:55:26 AM

Hi Lori,

I would seriously have to consider the exposure to my family. Being a same-sex couple with children, and the work that I have helped with in this state for marriage equality, I have already felt unfavorable, and at times scary behavior from those opposed to equality.

I am deeply proud that our state operates with such sunshine laws, and I think it is good practice generally, however, when people chose to serve the citizens of this state, the cost to our privacy is great.

I would encourage the PDC to consider the potential vulnerable position that this poses to families, and for privacy and protection of our children.

Thank you for you email,

Charlene

[Charlene Strong](#)

Be a light-a flame-a beacon
206-819-9626

A genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus but a molder of consensus.

Martin Luther King

Confidentiality Notice: This email and all attachments are intended solely for the named person or entity to which it is addressed and contains information that may be privileged, confidential or copyrighted under applicable law. Any review, distribution, dissemination or copying of this email or the information herein by anyone other than the intended recipient, or an agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please disregard.

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:40 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa>

From: [Art Swannack](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:10:32 PM

You would be revealing private specific address, investment and financial data of my self, wife and minor children that is none of the public's business in terms of direct access. You would also be revealing my farm size, debt status and worth that could damage my ability to compete. I understand the PDC department needing it for reference purposes and legal issues. My family's welfare could and likely would be endangered due to extensive details of their address and other links to daily life patterns being available for unstable people to find and use. My family lives on a farm in rural eastern Washington. Sheriff's/EMS protection is not fast (30min to 1hr response time). I don't believe that the citizens' will gain any real insight to any decision I make that warrants this level of access to data but I see real increases in risks to my family, unnecessary separation from the people I represent (their data won't be available to compare to mine when someone attacks my personal character based on flawed judgements of my affairs) and serious risks of identity theft and electronic data security breach-personally, in my business and potentially at the county. My only other alternative is to not fully complete your forms. I don't believe that is what the PDC wants either.

Sincerely,

Art Swannack
From my mobile phone
Whitman county commissioner district 1
400 N. Main
Colfax, WA. 99111
Office (509) 397-5247
Cell (509) 288-1684

All communications may be subject to WA open public records act.

----- Original message -----

From: Lori Anderson
Date:04/25/2014 8:21 PM (GMT-08:00)
To:
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

From: [Art Swannack](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 11:40:26 AM

One additional comment: please make sure any vulnerable elected officials (Sheriffs/Prosecutors/Judges) needs are considered when you decide what to do. They have active criminals that could be after their families or personal data.

Thanks,



Arthur D. Swannack

Whitman County Board of Commissioners

District 1

400 North Main Street
Colfax, Washington 99111

Phone: (509) 397-5240
Email: ArtS@co.whitman.wa.us

Please note: Washington has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from County Employees and Officials regarding County business are public records and are available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communication may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:19 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are

From: [Thompson, Mark](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: [Thompson, Mark;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, May 12, 2014 12:37:08 PM

The following response is my opinion and my opinion only; does not reflect that of my organization or fellow electeds. Sorry for the late response, but have had other pressing matters to attend to.

First off, I truly believe that the intent for public disclosure was intended for Statewide elected, Senators, Representatives, Governor and the like as well as county council members/commissioners, those that make laws/policy that impact businesses etc. Public disclosure should have never really been intended for elected members of Junior Taxing Districts such as school boards, fire districts, hospital districts, library districts and the like, as they don't make public policy or laws that affect the masses or have fiscal impacts other than for their operations; they have to live/operate within the laws established by the legislature, where financial disclosure should be, due to impacts statewide.

So that being said, I think PDC F-1 filing should only be required of state wide elected offices and local county council members/commissioners and not the local junior taxing districts within the state.

In regards to the question at hand regarding online access to F-1 reports and stepping down from my elected position. I am sure the PDC staff are aware of the numerous groups/individuals that are self appointed watch dogs or anarchist types and bloggers that want go harass elected officials and agencies, and PDC staff by filing complaints regarding perceived violations of some rule/law or violate their twisted interpretation of what they think should be right in their world.

The Junior Taxing district that I have been elected to represent has had numerous public records requests for things the requestor believes they are entitled to, to support their personal/group agenda , but we don't have that information that they think/believe we should have. Many times requests are made, many hours of staff time are spent getting the information and it is never picked up!! It is just harassment of the agency. Some of that information is available online, but they don't care, they want to make a

public records request so as to see if we will comply with the PRA timelines, which take valuable and limited staff time!!

So now knowing what is going on out in the public trying to be transparent and open, I don't feel that personal information regarding family members, personal property and financial information regarding with whom I have investments and how much is anyone business and in my junior taxing district jurisdiction does add value to my ability to serve my community. I hire/fire the administrator and approve a 16 million dollar budget 80% of which goes to personnel costs not make laws that have an impact on anyone or would have cause to influence anyone!

Junior Taxing District electeds do not need to give anarchist, self proficating watch dogs easy access to personal information that has not already been provided through the election process and we should not be mandated to provide the personal family information so as to provide information that sets up our family members in the crosshairs of such groups or individuals and their publishing of their innuendo's and contrived rhetoric based on their perceptions of how things should be in "their world."

When the anti-campaigns, anarchists, self appointed watchdogs, bloggers are required to play by the same rules of elected officials, having to tell true and nothing but the truth and have to disclose their information; then there will be true transparency in government.

Do to the experiences suffered by my agency, should the PDC enact the policy of immediate access to local Junior Taxing Districts electeds F-1, I will resign my position to protect my family from being in the crosshairs of anarchist, self proficating appointed watch dogs and bloggers!

I truly love my being an elected official for my district and community I serve, there is no need to paint a target on the backs of families of elected officials of Junior Taxing Districts.

I also strongly believe that should you make F-1 reports readily accessible via the web for Junior Taxing Districts, the pool of interested and dedicated candidates for local elected offices will dwindle to the point that only the anarchist, watchdogs and demeaning bloggers will be those elected to local office and the guiding government principal "of the people and by the

people” will stress and tear at the constitutional fabric of the State and the Union.

I encourage the Commission to not invoke online access to all Junior Taxing District electeds F-1 reports.

Mark L. Thompson, Fire Commissioner
South King Fire and Rescue

Sent from Windows Mail

From: [Lori Anderson](#)

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:28 PM

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission’s survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC’s website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children’s names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State

From: [Urquhart, John](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 11:46:25 AM

I have no objection to the general content of the F-1. However in my job, as with judges, elected prosecutors, and so on, personal and family safety is a huge concern! I don't think anything is accomplished by allowing home addresses, names of children and spouses names *more* easily available accomplishes anything except to reduce our safety.

Sheriff John Urquhart
King County Sheriff's Office
516 Third Ave W-116
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 263-2555

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:19 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Margaret Wiggins](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 7:40:59 AM

Hi Lori,
Maybe if the personal address, phone number etc were redacted it would keep the pests from annoying the electeds. In the 16 years on the job none of the customers have had trouble getting a message to any of us here at the Northshore Utility District by district forward or email link on our website. But at least the pests have to work a little harder to dig the home address and tel number information out of your website.

Thanks,
Margaret Wiggins
NUD
Kenmore, WA

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:40 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Randal Wilhelmsen](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:46:05 AM

My concerns run in the area of personal information being available. I already get phone calls at unreasonable times from people who want to influence me one way or another. The open meeting law provides that opportunity. I should not have to deal with these calls at my home at any time much less than after 9:00 at night. Publishing personal information would make me reconsider running again.

Randal Wilhelmsen
School Director
Peninsula School District 401
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:35 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Wilson, Donna](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 3:57:18 PM

While it would not make me not run for re-election, I do have a concern about easy access to the F-1. Home address is the most important thing that comes to mind. There have been stalkers and rapists and as a single woman living alone it causes me some concern. Having our addresses on-line was greatly discouraged by the US Marshall's task force on judicial safety. Thank you.

Judge Donna Wilson

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:18 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

**ONLINE SECURITY/
IDENTITY THEFT**

From: [Andrea McNamara Doyle](#)
To: [Angel, Sen. Jan;](#)
cc: [Austin, Debbie;](#) [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: F-1 possibly on line - - concerns
Date: Friday, May 09, 2014 11:07:47 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you Senator, for your thoughts about the issue of posting F-1s on-line. They echo the comments we've received from a number of others, and the Commission is carefully considering all viewpoints. I will include your email with the other written comments we've received, which will be provided to the Commission later this month as they continue their deliberations at their next meeting on May 22.

Andrea McNamara Doyle, Executive Director
711 Capital Way, Rm 206 | PO Box 40908, Olympia, WA 98504-0908
(direct) 360.664.2735 | (toll free) 1.877.601.2828
andrea.doyle@pdc.wa.gov



From: Angel, Sen. Jan [mailto:Jan.Angel@leg.wa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 5:44 PM
To: Andrea McNamara Doyle
Cc: Austin, Debbie
Subject: F-1 possibly on line - - concerns

Andrea, thank you for your note. When I first heard about our F-1's possibly being on line it concerns me that this opens us up even more as elected officials to have our identity stolen. Most all our information is on this form - -please take that into serious consideration, as if our F-1 is requested, we at least know who is making the request - -on line we would never know who would have what. I see that as a serious problem. I also feel it could possibly develop into a safety issue for us as well - -wish everyone loved us (smile) but that is not the case. Thank you - -some points and thoughts to ponder. Senator Jan Angel

From: [ANTHONY X CAROLINE](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 6:38:18 PM

Lori

I am against placing the F-1s online. The recent news of security breaches causes me grave concern and puts not only my personal information at risk but that of all my family members. I also object to having to involve my adult children in my F-1 reporting just because they happen to reside in my house. This places their personal information at peril just because their parent is a public servant. This information is confidential and should remain so. If there are issues or concerns expressed by members of the public they should be required to submit a public disclosure request and state the specific reason for this requiring this confidential information.

Causing this information to be readily available to the general public puts me and my family in a very precarious position and I would seriously rethink my public service position. This has the potential for placing myself and my family in danger. What type of financial guarantee would the PDC grant me to ensure that the information released would not be used to damage my credit or that of my family members or would not jeopardize our employment? My family members should not have to be at risk because their parent is a public servant - they did not ask for this.

I request that the PDC reconsider this and not allow the information to be accessed on line.

Caroline Belleci
Councilmember, City of University Place
cell: 253-389-9517

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:24:21 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's

From: [labevis](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 7:13:44 AM

My concern with on-line access is that you may become a target for people looking to steal from you--they have an address, investment, financial information that I don't feel should be available to anyone. The Commission might need to know if you can afford to run for office but others do not. I am a senior citizen and safety is very important to me. There is too much scamming going on and nothing is secure in this day of technology.

Thank you for doing the survey.

----- OriginalMessage -----

From: "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>

To:

Sent: Fri, Apr 25, 2014, 08:24 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content?

If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).

From: [Chris Brong](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 10:32:02 AM

Dear Ms Anderson. If possible please accept my comments for the survey.

I am required to complete a F1 as a current County Commissioner with only 11,000 residents in the County. I had never planned to run for public office but was continually requested after retiring from over 33 yrs with the federal government working in Wash. DC and several western states. I was required to file numerous financial disclosures during that period. A FOIA request approval would be required to disclose this information under specific criteria and normally this is very rare.

Have any of you been a County Commissioner in a small community? We treasure our privacy as such. Should F1's be easily available on line? Absolutely not. It would be fodder for those who would utilize for personal and family attacks, and potential financial identity crimes.

I would definitely NOT run for public office if F1's were easily available on line.

Sincerely,
Christopher Brong
Skamania County Commissioner district 1

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:22 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov><<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>>> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results<<http://www.pdc.wa.gov/home/accountability/pdf/F1.Survey.2014.pdf>> are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just

From: [R X](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 10:58:06 PM

Lori,

If the F-1's were posted online it could have an impact on my willingness to serve because:

- a) 1. it identifies which financial institutions I have accounts, which makes it that much easier to find a way to defraud me.
- b) 2. the value range provides a road map as to which accounts are worth accessing.
- c) 3. the real estate ownership requirement forces me to disclose my home address
- d) 4. while this does not apply to me, I am concerned that the debt disclosure requirement provides information can be used to identify elected leaders who are under financial duress, and therefore could be targets for undue influence by foreign governments

Put them online and the international criminal organizations will soon find them. If a story comes out that an F-1 was used to defraud or otherwise attack an elected official it will have a chilling effect on the willingness of future candidates to serve and it will take years for our democracy to recover. I think the only reason this has not apparently happened in the past is that international criminals prefer online records they can access anonymously.

If the PDC does go ahead with online F-1 access is the PDC willing to indemnify, defend and compensate F-1 filers if it can be proven that the information was used to defraud or hurt them, if not why not?

BTW I think it's fair that if I have to disclose my personal financial information to anyone who wants it that I should be told any time it's accessed and the name of who accessed it.

From: [Clark, Sally](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:14:09 PM

Hi, Lori –

I think I replied that I'm fine with F1 information being accessible on-line. Your email has me thinking a bit more about the question. I still think on-line access is a good idea, but I would want to avoid a level of specificity that might lead to fraud. The specificity of investments, home addresses, kids names – I would be in favor of making it slightly more difficult to get that information.

Thanks for thinking about this.

Sally

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:24 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Cleveland, Sen. Annette](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: [Winters, Vickie;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 4:52:02 PM

Hi Lori –

While I did not respond that I would leave office if F-1 reports were posted online, I do have strong feelings I would like to share with you regarding this issue.

I do not object to most aspects of the F-1 reports being posted on-line. What I do object to is any information listed on these reports that share personal information related to my husband or child. While I am an elected official, they are not. Therefore, I believe their privacy should be maintained and protected.

I also am concerned that posting this information on-line could increase the likelihood of identity theft. I would welcome your thoughts regarding how best to safeguard against this type of possibility.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my perspective. Please feel free to contact me should you have additional questions.

Best,

Annette Cleveland
Washington State Senator
49th Legislative District
Vancouver
(360) 786-7696

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:17 PM
Subject: PDC F1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission

From: [Dan and Ann Fagerlie](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: [Junk released by User action] Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:12 PM

another thought Lori, is this information available online could lead to elected officials being targeted for online identity fraud because of their listed resources including investments, banks, etc. My wife and my daughter have been victims of identity fraud and it is not a fun experience. Please do not make it easier to target those with resources.
Dan Fagerlie

----- Original Message -----

From: [Lori Anderson](#)
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:29 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone

From: [Forbes Robert](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:02:28 PM

Lori:

I don't recall whether I said I'd leave office or not if the F-1's were online but here is my two cents worth anyway:

There are two types of political office - the ones with high visibility, large responsibility, and generally decent salaries (federal/state legislature, county council, etc.) and the ones that are unpaid such as school board, city council, etc. I fit into the second category. I ran for school board to help my community and didn't spend any money campaigning as I ran unopposed (probably still wouldn't have spent any campaign money even if I had an opponent...). Yet I still have to fill out an F-1 and potentially may end up with my (general) income and investments online so anyone can access that information at any time. I can see the need to provide transparency for the first type of politician, but for those of us in small towns serving in an unpaid office it seems quite intrusive. I feel if you're making money off the position then you give up a lot of your privacy and putting the F-1 information online is probably valid, but for the folks like me I'd prefer to make it a bit harder for the identity thieves to get at my financial information. If you put the F-1's online, I'm going to have to think hard about whether I want to run for another term. I'm not certain it is worth the exposure.

Bob Forbes
253-912-5446

-----Original Message-----

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Fri, Apr 25, 2014 8:39 pm
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).

From: [Charles Gibson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Thursday, May 01, 2014 1:43:02 PM

Lori,

I would seriously consider leaving my elected position if the F-1 is available online. The opportunity for data mining and pulling together F-1 information with other information available increases the risk of identity theft or fraud.

Thanks for asking.

Charles Gibson

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:39 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: nehenders@comcast.net
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 4:12:21 PM

Hello Ms. Anderson,

I didn't participate in the survey because I unfortunately wasn't aware of it. I looked to see if it was sent out in a previous email, but didn't locate that. I'm sorry if I overlooked this because I would have responded.

I support transparency. There needs to be a system in place as a deterrent to self-aggrandizement due to one's political position. I think that need is currently met with the ability of anyone to make a request to obtain a copy of an F-1. I am concerned that if the F-1 forms were posted online, it would provide anonymity for the one viewing the F-1, increasing the likelihood that the forms may be viewed for nefarious purposes such as identity theft. It is wise to maintain a record of who is requesting the information. I believe the current system does that while providing a means for public disclosure.

I agree with the comments of others to increase the financial categories to be more specific above \$100,000, since this is more meaningful.

I'm not sure that the specific financial institution needs to be reported. It would seem to make identity theft a bit easier.

Thank you for taking a look at my thoughts on this.

Best regards,

Nancy Henderson
Councilmember
Town of Steilacoom

From: "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:24:21 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520

From: [Marcus Hoffman](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#); "undisclosed-
recipients";
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 1:39:02 PM

Dear PDC,

There is enough ID fraud and hackers stealing peoples private information, why are you trying to make it easier by having our personal information online? If concerned WA citizens want this information they can request it from you. No one trying to steal information or break the law would leave you their contact information. I am all for transperance in elections, but please use some common sense about disclosure of sensitive information.

Marcus Hoffman
Commissioner

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:38 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Kedrich Jackson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
cc: [Duke Mitchell](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 4:03:04 PM

Hello Lori,

My business in the tax prep & accounting industry where identity theft is the number one issue the IRS is dealing with today. Further, access to my kids' name is a serious concern of mine in protecting their online identities.

It is VERY POSSIBLE I would step down if this information on my family is easily available online without any safeguards in place.

Regards,

Kedrich Jackson
Trustee - Columbia Basin College

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:42 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the

From: [Jarvis, Veronica \(OFM\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:47:04 AM

Hi Lori,

I recently had my identity stolen so am keenly aware of how too much information online makes it easier for identity thieves. Having a home address, some of my financial information, along with my name and workplace are just more pieces of the puzzle for a thief. It just seems like we're making it easier for them! Some of those items you listed are what the credit bureaus ask you to prove you are you, so making that publicly available, and easily searchable, is really a bad idea.

That would be my reasoning for discouraging making the information available online. I would be happy to let you know further about my issues if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Veronica

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:42 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond,**

From: [Lien, Laurie \(OFM\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: FW: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 1:41:21 PM

After giving this more thought, I would probably retire if it's decided to post F1s of professional staff on-line. I have serious concerns about my (and my spouse's) personal and financial information being available for anyone to search on the Internet just because I work as a nonpartisan staff in the executive branch of state government. Having this information on the Internet would increase the possibility of identity theft and fraud. There is too much identity theft already; let's not make it easier for more of it to happen. If someone really wants to know that information about me, they can already get it via a public records request; at least that leaves a trail of who got it.

Thanks for the opportunity to convey my concerns.

From: Feinstein, Deborah M. (OFM)
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 11:02 AM
To: OFM dl B-ANALYSTS
Subject: FW: PDC F-1 Survey

FYI

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 5:54 PM
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey

The Public Disclosure Commission's strategic plan contains action items related to potential changes to the F1 filing requirements as well as posting F1s received on the PDC's website. Over the last few months, the PDC staff has been gathering information for the commission to consider if and when they take action. A [summary](#) of the stakeholder work so far and the input received was given to the commission when they last met in April. On p. 7 of the linked summary, you will see that we have received comments from professional staff that were shared with the commission. **If you have additional general considerations to share with the commission regarding professional staff, email them to me.**

No decisions have been made yet. The agenda for the May meeting has not been finalized but, at this point in time, I believe that responses to my April 25 email will be reviewed with no action taken. So, if you have objections specific to particular personal information being available online, email them to me. The sooner the better because I am compiling them all and those received by the end of the day Wednesday, May 14, will be sent to the commission members in advance of the meeting.

A significant amount of time will be set aside at a future PDC meeting – perhaps in June – for an in-depth discussion and potential action.

You are also welcome to join the discussion by coming to a PDC meeting. Meetings are on the 4th Thursday of the month, so the next meetings are May 22. and June 26. Agendas are always finalized and posted on the PDC's website the Friday before the meeting.

From: Lori Anderson [lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:41 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Moore, Paula \(OFM\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 11:11:12 AM

Hello Lori,

I wanted to provide a comment regarding posting F1s on the PDC website. I think this raises a question regarding what information in the professional staff F1 should be shared with the public in the age of identity theft and certain cases of domestic violence and the need to protect individual privacy. I am concerned that professional staff addresses are listed and their financial institutions are listed. Perhaps a middle ground approach is needed—which could list the type & range value of the asset or creditor without releasing personal information. I think this consideration is key if the information is posted online. It may also be worth the PDC considering this if the information is released via a public records request given issues with identity theft and/or domestic violence. Thank you for your time.

Paula Moore

Senior Budget Assistant to the Governor
360-280-0586 (c)
360-902-0540 (o)
paula.moore@ofm.wa.gov

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 5:54 PM

Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey

The Public Disclosure Commission's strategic plan contains action items related to potential changes to the F1 filing requirements as well as posting F1s received on the PDC's website. Over the last few months, the PDC staff has been gathering information for the commission to consider if and when they take action. A [summary](#) of the stakeholder work so far and the input received was given to the commission when they last met in April. On p. 7 of the linked summary, you will see that we have received comments from professional staff that were shared with the commission. **If you have additional general considerations to share with the commission regarding professional staff, email them to me.**

No decisions have been made yet. The agenda for the May meeting has not been finalized but, at this point in time, I believe that responses to my April 25 email will be reviewed with no action taken. So, if you have objections specific to particular

From: [C.J. Nickerson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Fwd: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Friday, May 02, 2014 5:48:01 PM

Hi Lori,

I am forwarding this to you. Our information is all out there because C.J. and I wanted to offer his considerable experience, time, and service to the Longview School District as a board member. There should be some way to screen people whose intentions aren't legitimate nor noble from making it difficult for our personal lives.

Thank you,

Sue and C.J. Nickerson

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Ramona Leber" <ramona.leber@cni.net>
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: May 2, 2014 at 9:59:55 AM PDT
To: "C.J. Nickerson" <cjnick7@gmail.com>

Hi Sue:

Go ahead and respond to the survey with your concerns. There is more and more hacking happening. I was part of the KickStarter hack, just because I wanted to support new ventures. What a pain. Your concerns are valid and the PDC want to hear them.

Ramona

From: C.J. Nickerson [<mailto:cjnick7@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 01, 2014 1:01 PM
To: Ramona Leber
Subject: Fwd: PDC F-1 survey

Hi Ramona,

I don't know if it is too late to make a comment on this survey. We feel strongly that the position of school board does not necessitate disclosing such detailed information on our personal, vital information. We realize no monetary reward or advantage from this elected position. We, in fact, are put at some risk in having this information made public. C.J. is simply serving the needs of the community. We just experienced a great inconvenience because personal information and our social security numbers were compromised as a result of trying to volunteer with the Catholic Church in Western Washington. Their whole system was hacked. What would prevent us from being at risk as a result of divulging our personal information in this wide-spread method?

Do you have any advice?

Thanks, Ramona. sue nickerson
Begin forwarded message:

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Date: April 25, 2014 at 8:35:13 PM PDT

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your F1 report

From: [Bob Powell](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 2:02:01 PM

Lori, thanks for your email. While I've been e-filing the F-1 since 2010, your email is the first I've heard about any plan to post the F-1 reports online, or about a survey concerning that.

I object strenuously to the idea of the complete F-1's posted online and indeed that would factor strongly in the tradeoffs involved in deciding whether to continue in this basically volunteer position as an elected water commissioner.

The question that should be asked isn't whether it's public or not. The fundamental problem with the complete F-1's posted online concerns personal privacy and fraud. With all this personal information online, it will instantly become part of hundreds of giant databases that at the very least exploit filers for marketing purposes, but also significantly expose them to high risk of identity theft and account theft.

It would be egregiously awful for the names of family members and the names of financial institutions to be posted online. Everyone so affected would become an immediate target of financial account fishing and fraud.

Seriously, if this complete information was posted, based on my direct experience in the computer security world, I would seriously consider resigning from office before the rule change takes affect, if that was my only option to prevent this information from being posted.

regards,

Bob Powell
Water District 19
Vashon, WA

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:37 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and

From: [Anne Proffitt](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:21:08 PM

Hi Lori,

Thank you for providing the survey results and seeking additional feedback.

As a Trustee for one of the four year public Colleges, I have always filed my PDC/F-1 report because it is required. It has been difficult for me, however, because it is such an invasion of privacy. While I can understand – to a point – the value for elected officials, I fail to see the value for appointed positions such as Trustee or professional staff.

I already take steps to limit online access to personal information, guard against identity theft, fraud and other intrusions into my personal life. Again, I do not agree with the amount of information I am currently required to provide. If the public were to gain online access, I would consider resigning from my Trustee position.

Thank you,
Anne Proffitt

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:40 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional

From: [jim redding](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, May 04, 2014 5:57:48 PM

Lorie,

In this day and age, I am extremely concerned about identity theft and fraud. This seems like one more avenue for personal information to be freely distributed and the only consequence is my identity and personal information is at risk.

There is no "one size fits all" in regards to public disclosure. Conflict of interests must be noted for honesty and confidence in elected officials. I can understand reporting conflicts of interest due to other business interests, however my net worth should not be public nor financial institutions I deal with. A State representative, Governor, etc. representing thousands of voters at the state or federal level needs some level of disclosure versus smaller entities.

Personally, I am a Water district commissioner in a ~4000 voter district, basically volunteering to manage the system with the other commissioners and only receiving compensation for our monthly meeting. Everything else I do is volunteered at no cost to the district.

I had second thoughts about stepping forward initially because of PDF requirements at the level of a local water district commissioner, but if the PDC makes this information available on line I, for one, will be resigning (if it's not already to late)

Best Regards,

Jim Redding
Grays Harbor County Water District No. 2

From: [Rolfes, Sen. Christine](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: FW: PDC F1 Survey
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 9:47:16 AM

Lori -

I missed the original deadline to comment on the proposal to allow public access to F-1 reports, but read about the discussion in the newspaper last week. I'm hoping I can give the members of the Commission some additional feedback.

On April 15, while filing our family's taxes, we learned that a fraudulent tax return had been filed under my social security number. I had not experienced identity theft before, and it was an enlightening experience that I know millions of others have been through. One thing that was of consolation was the knowledge that my personal financial records were not available online through the PDC, as that would have made it even easier for anyone in the world to easily assume my identity, falsify my tax return, or really mess with my investment funds or bank accounts. In fact, I actually had the thought that PDC filers should be notified electronically each time their personal financial statements were accessed by a member of the public, to help prevent identity theft. This, ironically, is the opposite direction that the Commission is heading.

My other concern is that by making our records available to everyone in the world, the state is placing my children at greater risk. While we have never been threatened, it is already of concern to me that everyone knows where we live and where they attend school. This concern would be heightened when organized criminals have access to all my financial records.

I am in complete agreement that the personal financial affairs of elected officials and some public employees should be available to public scrutiny, but support the current policy of not placing these records on the internet. For these reasons, I ask the Commission to please proceed carefully with the decision to make our personal financial statements available online. It is highly likely that their decision will impact the quality and quantity of Washingtonians willing to serve for years to come.

Thank you,
State Senator Christine Rolfes

----- Original Message -----

From : Lori Anderson[<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]

From: [PVandever](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
cc: [Tammie Ownbey](#); [Rachel Johnson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 8:51:23 AM

April 28, 2014

Lori Anderson and Commissioners,

Greetings. As a local judge, I occasionally put people in jail and, otherwise, tend to tick off people on a fairly regular basis. It comes with the territory. One defendant went to prison for fervently threatening to kill me, and I have had problems with the Freemen and other groups trying to intimidate me both in court and by obtaining my home address for a personal visit. I live in a small town, so it is simple to find out where I live should someone want to do something rude and unpleasant. Let's just say I am prepared, and don't plan on leaving office.

On the other hand, publishing my address, family, and financial information online for everyone to access provides a whole new level of opportunity for anyone who truly wants to F%#K with me or my family, play havoc with my finances, or screw with my business or other relationships. I am sure you have some idea of what kind of damage can be done to someone using the internet, social media and other new technologies. Publicly posting private and sensitive information to assist in the process is sheer lunacy.

As a public official I expect to be under the microscope, and I am prepared to disclose sensitive information. However, it would be much better to require that individuals personally request such data. This would leave a trail should the information be used for unlawful purposes. And, the fact that the name of the requester is known would probably reduce the chance of the requesting

individual using the information to hurt or harass.

One more thing. The Commission is now on notice that broadly publishing the private, personal, and financial data of elected officials can lead to physical, economic and emotional harm to the elected officials and their families that is directly related to the information the Commission requires to be posted. I can imagine an injured public official or his family seeking legal redress against the appropriate authorities. Whether it would be successful would be another matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

Judge Philip Van de Veer
Pend Oreille County District Court

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:18 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Common Sense Managing](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 12:12:53 PM

Hello Lori,

Do you seriously have to ask why, for approximately 40 hours/month at a grand fee of \$75/month before taxes, I would not want my personal information available to the entire world?

Have you never heard of identity theft?

Or harassment of public officials?

I live and serve in a small town, so many people know where I live and know they can stop by most anytime to discuss city issues. However, I don't want any of my personal information, that I am forced to provide to you, to be published.

The question I would like you to propose to your PDC is:

Would you like to have your personal information published on-line?

Bill Werst
City Council & Mayor Pro Tem
White Salmon

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

FAMILY NAMES

From: [Anderson, Marcine](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 11:51:45 AM

I wouldn't leave office, but I would ask that the PDC be careful with our family information such as home address and names of children. m

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:18 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax
Follow the PDC on [Facebook!](#)

From: [Bashor, Gary](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
cc: [Warning, Steve](#); [Evans, Michael](#);
[Haan, Marilyn](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:09:51 PM

As a superior court judge I would certainly be concerned about my son's name and our home address being available to the public online for obvious security reasons. I wouldn't leave office because of it, but would certainly have concerns.

Sent from my iPhone
Judge Gary Bashor

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:19 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Dixie. Budke](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:14:29 PM

Hi Lori,

Thank you for asking this question.

I would leave office if my children's names were made public. I have chosen to be a public official...they have not. They deserve their privacy. I know of cases that adult children's past behaviors have been used as a tactic to discredit the child and the office holder during a contentious campaign. Ugly.

I am also not keen on having my address published. While I live on a small island I use a PO box for my mail. We have had recent vandalism at our school and the loss of waiver for NCLB will be difficult for most people to understand when the board scrambles to continue critical services for our students...while rearranging teacher and staff assignments. This will not be a happy time for those of us who hold education as a top priority and value in our lives. I am a retired college professor.

All this being said....I log countless hours as a volunteer school board member to preserve what has been created on Lopez Island. Our teachers create magic daily. As I see it...ONE of my responsibilities is to provide a safe environment for them to continue to do what they do so well. I believe school board members must be provided the same respect for privacy and safety.

If I leave office...who will be courageous enough to fill this volunteer position? Will the best and brightest step forward to run our schools?

With kind regards,

Dixie Adair Budke, Ph.D.
Lopez Island School District

360-468-4991

For a joyful life:

Dream Big
Follow Your Heart
Persevere
Be Kind
Be Honest
Live in Gratitude
Period.

From the iPad of Dr. D...

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:35 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Geoffrey Doy](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: doyg@svsd410.org;
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 11:41:45 AM

Lori,

I must have missed the email for the survey, however picking up on the request for reasons to leave office should personal details be made available on line, I have some comments.

In my view the details required by PDC are mostly irrelevant to my position on the Snoqualmie Valley School Board, indeed I contemplated long and hard about running for office even under the current disclosure regulations.

If someone can tell me why my address, family details, including my children's names and my financial status have any bearing what so ever on my meeting my school board obligations I would be pleased to hear them.

School Board issues are often highly emotive, I regularly receive for sake of a better word "unpleasant" emails and social media postings and that is fine, it goes with the territory but to increase the risk of my family being exposed to this type of behavior would mostly cause me not to run for reelection next year.

Geoff Doy
President, Snoqualmie Valley School Board

Our vision is to become the best School District in Washington State by any measure

email: doyg@svsd410.org

telephone: 425 233 4499

Please note that all correspondence to and from this email address is subject to public disclosure

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:37 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey

From: [DeLano, Lynne N. \(DOC\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:56:09 AM

Hello,

I somehow missed the survey, but wanted to share my comments. I'm generally supportive of the disclosure of information to the public with the exception of personal info such as salary and general financial worth, especially if this type of information is available on everyone, whether or not they're serving in an elected or appointed position. I'd prefer the personal address and children's names not be listed, although the reality is much of that can be found via the internet's various search engines. I would also prefer the names of the financial institutions not be disclosed. I certainly agree with the survey comments that the current levels of income are more disadvantageous to those who earn/are worth \$200,000 or less.

Regardless of the outcome of the Public Disclosure Commission's decision, I would continue to serve in my appointed position.

Lynne De Lano, Chair
Indeterminate Sentence Review Board

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:41 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this**

From: [Doherty, Mike](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 10:26:32 PM

Why can't a limited amount of the personal information (children's names) be redacted from the online copy? Folks should understand that in a democracy the residents should be able to understand the potential conflicts of interest of their elected officials. mike doherty

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:19 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax

From: [Feinstein, Deborah M. \(OFM\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: FW: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 9:39:11 AM

Thank you. I have several concerns for **professional staff** in addition to the ones I see on the survey. I may also send additional ones at a later date.

1. The spouse of the professional staff is also listed on the F1 form. Putting this information on the web may infringe on his/her privacy, job and safety.
2. Our salaries are already on line with fiscal.wa.gov. What purpose is served in the public knowing the value of professional staff's real estate, investments and debt? I am particularly concerned about having the value of real estate, investments and bank accounts online. I fear it will increase the likelihood of solicitations, theft and fraud.
3. Have you had anyone from the Attorney General's Office look into the implications of putting the F1 on line for professional staff?

Can you tell me the time of your meetings? Thank you again.

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 5:54 PM
To: Feinstein, Deborah M. (OFM)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey

I apologize for not responding sooner, Deborah. I tucked all the responses I received into a folder and am just now reading through them to prepare for next week's commission meeting.

The Public Disclosure Commission's strategic plan contains action items related to potential changes to the F1 filing requirements as well as posting F1s received on the PDC's website. Over the last few months, the PDC staff has been gathering information for the commission to consider if and when they take action. A [summary](#) of the stakeholder work so far and the input received was given to the commission when they last met in April. On p. 7 of the linked summary, you will see that we have received comments from professional staff that were shared with

the commission. **If you have additional general considerations to share with the commission regarding professional staff, email them to me.**

No decisions have been made yet. The agenda for the May meeting has not been finalized but, at this point in time, I believe that responses to my April 25 email will be reviewed with no action taken. So, if you have objections specific to particular personal information being available online, email them to me. The sooner the better because I am compiling them all and those received by the end of the day Wednesday, May 14, will be sent to the commission members in advance of the meeting.

A significant amount of time will be set aside at a future PDC meeting – perhaps in June – for an in-depth discussion and potential action.

You are also welcome to join the discussion by coming to a PDC meeting. Meetings are on the 4th Thursday of the month, so the next meetings are May 22. and June 26. Agendas are always finalized and posted on the PDC's website the Friday before the meeting.

From: Feinstein, Deborah M. (OFM) [<mailto:Deborah.Feinstein@OFM.WA.GOV>]

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 10:18 AM

To: Lori Anderson

Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey

Would professional staff's information be on-line as well? I am a budget assistant to the Governor at OFM. I would not want my information on line. Can you tell me how best to voice my objection. Thank you.

From: Lori Anderson [lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:41 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it

From: [Glenn](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:23:56 PM

My first objection is having to file and F1 at all for a non-paid office because the hassle discourages participation on unpaid commissions and boards.

Secondly, the idea that any family information would be just a click away for any unsavory purpose is repugnant.

Thirdly, the goal of ensuring a candidate has no conflict of interest is not furthered by public disclosure making said disclosure unnecessary.

First, do no harm.

glenn
503-730-3404

On 4/25/2014 8:37 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

> Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's
> survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have
> online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very
> happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results
> <<http://www.pdc.wa.gov/home/accountability/pdf/F1.Survey.2014.pdf>> are
> linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.
>
> The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The
> Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would
> leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission
> wants to know what is it about online access that you would find
> objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a
> particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address,
> children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of
> easy access to the F-1 content? *If you responded that online access to
> your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office,
> kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s). *I will be
> presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next
> meet on May 22. *If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May
> 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials
> provided to the Commission before the meeting.*
>

From: [Christie Goodenough](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:06:05 PM

I personally would not like my children's name listed or my home address listed. My personal reason is that my husband works for the Dept of Corrections and employees of DOC are constantly told to keep their information unlisted. As an elected official for a School Board, I know that my information needs to be available, but would prefer that it is not too easily accessible.

Thank you,
Christie Goodenough

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:35 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Lora](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Thursday, May 01, 2014 1:54:38 PM

Lori,

I do not recall having a chance to complete this survey. However, I would object to either actual dollar amounts or personal details such as home address and spouse or child information being posted online.

As Public Elected Officials, we have already chosen to forgo much of our privacy and I think that putting that information into the open accessibility of the internet is going too far.

As an elected official in the very grassroots Houghton neighborhood of Kirkland, most of my constituents know me personally and already know where I live. I don't need the rest of the world, who have no need to know any more about me, to have access to that information.

I might even reconsider my continued participation in the elected VOLUNTEER position for which I receive absolutely no compensation, were there to be such personal information about me and my family at the finger tips of anyone who wished to browse/troll for it.

Lora Hein,
Houghton Community Council

-----Original Message-----

From: Lori Anderson
Sent: Apr 25, 2014 8:39 PM
To:
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

From: [Andy Jewell](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 1:12:16 PM

I don't think we should have the f1on line at all as it makes it to easy for people to harass public servants but if you list home addresses and Children's names I would consider leaving office as I feel this would be an unneeded exposure to my family.

Sincerely
Andrew Jewell

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:22 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please**

From: [Samuel E. Low](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 5:30:54 PM
Attachments: [PDC F-1 survey.msg](#)

Lori,

I am not sure if i got the survey or not? As an elected official it does concern me when I have to include information and address for my 5 minor children. As a public official I would appreciate an extra layer of protection when it comes to my kids personal information. Sam Low Lake Stevens

Please note: message attached

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
To: Undisclosed-recipients:;
Subject: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:22:48 +0000

From: [Sheli Moore](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:42:03 AM

Hi Lori,

I can't remember if I answered the survey or not, it has been hectic. I would maybe leave office, even though I love it, if online access is made available. I am elected to an unpaid commissioner position. I object to the access of any information relating to my immediate family members that is included in the report. Our family investments should also be kept private. You can also add identity theft of any of my family members as another objection.

Thanks for your concern,

Sheli Moore
Blaine-Birch Bay Parks & Recreation District 2
Commissioner

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:28:01 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report**

From: [Angie Roarty](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:04:44 PM

Lori,

I don't believe I took the survey. However, I, too, would likely leave my appointment if my personal and financial information was readily accessible on line. My objection is that my address, my children and dependent information would be readily available. I am somewhat more sensitive to my personal and financial information being online since the passing of my spouse.

Thank you,
Angie Roarty
Trustee, Pierce College Board of Trustees

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:40 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Stokes, Timothy](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:50:09 PM

While I am perfectly comfortable with the F-1 information being publicly disclosed, I do believe that children who are minors should be redacted from the publicly disclosed information. While it would not force me to leave my position if it were disclosed, I would hold the state responsible if my children were the brunt of harm or ridicule because of the disclosure of my F-1 information to the public.

Timothy S. Stokes
President, South Puget Sound Community College

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:42 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Ray Teter](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 1:16:42 PM

Hi Lori,

I do not see how it is pertinent that any of my personal information is online. I would resign if my children's names, home address, investments, etc. were available online. It is not worth it to me to continue being a city councilman and have my entire personal life open to online public inspection. Actually, just filling out the report seems like a waste of my time and taxpayers money. What benefit is it to taxpayers to have a personal financial affairs statement filled out by a public official? Is it worth the time, effort, and money to have Washington state employees process and keep track of these forms?

Instead of having public officials fill out F1's, it seems like it would be better to have them fill out annual statements regarding the official's opinion on various topics. This could be put online and useful to taxpayers. It would allow voters to see if their representatives have the same viewpoints as the people they are supposed to be representing. A political choice public disclosure survey seems a lot more beneficial than a personal financial affairs statement.

Thanks,

Ray

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:20 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you

From: [Bill Trandum](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 10:29:21 PM

I serve as a Park Commissioner without pay as a public service. My personal information is nobody's business. I already get unwanted e-mails from outliers who hate public parks. Your publicizing information about me subjects me, my wife, my children and my grandchildren to being targeted for harassment. Of course I'll quit if you put my personal information on line.

Bill Trandum, President
Key Peninsula Metropolitan Park District Board of a
Commissioners.

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:28 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

<image001.jpg>
Lori Anderson

From: [Leah Wells](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 8:31:09 AM

Hi, my name is Leah Wells and I serve on the school board for North Thurston School District.

I would not necessarily leave office were the F-1 forms readily accessible, but I would have serious misgivings. The information seems private. Most of the material relates to my husband's business dealings and he is apprehensive about that information being public. I definitely would not like my home address and information about my children to be available.

Thank you for your time,

Leah Wells

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:35 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please**

From: [Eileen Weyrauch](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 11:17:44 AM

Hi Lori -

I do not think I responded to an email about this as this is the first time I remember seeing this information.

However - if the Commission were to choose to release information about my home address or my children - I may have to leave office for the safety of my child. Our community only uses my PO Box on communications, and very few selected individuals have my actual home address. I have an adopted son that would be at risk if his name or home address were publicized. For us it is about his personal safety. I have served my community for 10 years and was just re-elected for another 6. I take great joy in that service - but my son's safety would have to come before that service.

Thanks for sending this email so I could at least let you know how it would impact me personally.

If you need any additional information that would be helpful in explaining this - please contact me and I will happily help however I can.

Thanks so much,
Eileen Weyrauch
Fire Commissioner
Newman Lake Fire & Rescue

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:25 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

DOLLAR VALUES

From: [The England's](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 1:32:02 PM

Lori:

This is the first contact from your office that I have received about this survey. Although I did read about the proposal in the newspaper.

I understand the need for elected officials have their financial information available for inspection if the need arises to investigate a questionable use of public funds. However I find posting the same information in a public bulletin board is offensive and over-reaching. Especially my children's information.

I was raised in a family where who-makes-what is not discussed. You could call it don't ask don't tell. I almost withdrew my status as a candidate for public office when I read about the requirement to reveal my private financial information. If this becomes law I WILL step down from my non-compensated post as a fire commissioner, as soon as a replacement can be located.

I was asked to help run our little fire district by folks who were desperate for someone to fill a position that is time consuming and at best thankless. I just wanted to help out, but the people who are not helping are the ones who say we must "pay the price" for public office.

Chris England

----- Original Message -----

From: [Lori Anderson](#)

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:25 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

From: Steven.Fox@faa.gov
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 5:21:50 AM

Lori,

I have three jobs that require some form of disclosure:

1) I work for the United States and fill out a financial disclosure each year that is individually reviewed by our legal department looking for any conflict and resolving it. None of the data is publically available. The dollar amounts are not required since a conflict is a conflict no matter the value. \$1.00 or a \$1,000,000.00 The attorneys see it as the same.

2) Snohomish County Fire District 5, Commissioner Position 1.

3) Sultan School District No. 311, Director Position 3.

(Note: I can only do 1 because 2 and 3 are non-partisan, other wise its a conflict. Each of these were reviewed prior to running.)

I believe that PDC should track every last dollar related to campaign financing and that it should all be publically available and readily available. I fully support your efforts on this issue.

I do not believe that how much money I make at job 1 or the value of my house, etc. should be publically available. There's no value other than voyeurism.

Filing electronically..... it is too difficult. It far easier to do it on paper, so I do.

I can buy a house on line and file by paper without a notarized signature. The website is difficult to navigate unless you already know where to go. That's like a phone book where you can only find numbers if you already know them.

Just some thoughts from somebody with a broad background in disclosure.

Steven Fox, P.E.
Senior Aerospace Engineer
Airframe Branch
Seattle Aircraft Certification Office
Federal Aviation Administration
(425)-917-6425

From: [Randall Gaylord](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 10:09:42 AM

Lori,

I don't remember completing the survey, but I prefer that F-1s not be on line. F-1s are always available to an opponent and an opponent's committee or any other person. Easy access to the general public is not necessary.

I altered my investments and chose managed accounts instead of self-directed investments because it is easier to report and because it provides additional level of security between the details of my investments and the public. That choice is not free however, and it costs me money.

In my view, investments should only be listed in broad categories and amounts of any single investment should only be disclosed if there is a significant percentage of the company or investment, like ten percent (10%). Why should I have to list investment in 1000 shares of Amazon (even if I'm a city official and Amazon has a plan for a building in my jurisdiction – a small ownership interest would not be affected by the decision).

Also why should I have to individually list each mutual fund of which I am a holder? The investments section should be greatly simplified.

Real property should be limited to real property in the jurisdiction; or real property should be allowed to be aggregated. Report on debt should also be allowed to be aggregated.

I think that that the Commission is looking too narrowly by focusing on existing officials. You should ask *potential* candidates about exposing their finances through an F-1. I have encouraged people to run for office and been told that that they declined because they don't want to expose their family and finances to public scrutiny. I believe the easier the F-1 is available, the fewer people will want to run for office.

If the Commission is interested in changing the policy regarding access, what the Commission should focus on is making it easy to request a hard copy of the F-1 that will be mailed to people. I encourage the Commission to improve an on-line process to request the F-1 and waive any postage. That will make the F-1 very accessible.

Also, is there really a big demand for on line access to the F-1 or is this simply fall in the area of “making everything accessible.”

I have never had anyone tell me that they were disappointed that that they could not see more of a candidate’s finances.

Regards,

Randy Gaylord
Prosecuting Attorney
San Juan County, Washington
Elected in 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2010
Candidate for 2014

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:19 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission’s survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC’s website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children’s names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Bill Ward](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:01:21 AM

A VERY BADLY THOUGHT OUT IDEA!

I never saw your "survey". Who was it sent to?

Online access to information about my investments or children/ grandchildren would be cause for me to leave office. This is an open invitation to identity theft and targeted scams.

I have entrusted this information to the PDC to be used for legitimate purposes. You do not have permission to post this information online. It is enough that I contribute my time to public service. I surely do not need to make my personal life accessible to any flake having online access.

Please advise: What is the current protocol for gaining access to this information?

Thank you,

Bill Ward
Commissioner, Port of Camas-Washougal

On 4/25/2014 8:28 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

PROTECTING BUSINESS CLIENTS

From: [David Futcher](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 9:25:06 AM

One particularly sensitive part for me is the disclosure of clients who pay our firm more than \$10,000 for services in a year. I own half of a CPA firm, and feel like the disclosure could possibly be considered a breach of confidentiality by some clients. I've continued to report in accordance with the rules, but really wouldn't want that list to be part of an electronically-available piece.

I urge you to revisit the thought behind the foundation of the F-1 requirements, and whether all of the current disclosures are required to meet those goals. Also, it seems like the information that may be relevant to individuals making decisions on a broad span of issues, such as our state legislators, may not be relevant for a city council member or school board member in a smaller jurisdiction. Rules should be different in those situations.

Thanks,

David Futcher

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:19 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what

Emails from F-1 filers

Objection:

**GENERAL PRIVACY CONCERNS
and
OTHER COMMENTS**

From: [Gary Almy](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 8:02:52 AM

I believe the public should have access to this info but I also believe that they should be required to leave give some info back as to who and why the info is needed.

I probably would not resign if this program is instituted but will not run again.
On Friday, April 25, 2014 8:29 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:
Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax
Follow the PDC on [Facebook!](#)

From: [JAMES BARNFATHER](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 7:53:40 PM

Lori,

Thank you for your work on this. It reflects a lot of time and effort in pursuit of your professional excellence.

I would like to add my comment to this survey. I have always believed that being a servant of the public should not require one to give up the privacy rights that all others enjoy. Even convicted felons have more rights, which make it illegal to post their addresses, bank accounts, phone numbers, next of kin, etc. To make available a candidate's personal and financial business is a breach of privacy rights, no matter if you serve the citizens or are supported by them.

James Barnfather

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:24:21 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this

From: [ginny](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: [Junk released by User action] RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:12 PM

I did not fill out a survey, but would like to put in my 2 cents. Personally I do not have a problem with my info being on the website, however, I feel it is not fair to make volunteers who have been lucky enough to be able to help our county in a low level locally elected office feel they are under scrutiny and unappreciated. This would do that as well make volunteers not want to step up as readily. I guess that what I am saying is. What is the problem that will be solved by publishing the F1 information for these local officials? If the problem is great, then yes. If the problem is minor, then no.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:36 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: patbraman@comcast.net
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:14:14 AM

Hi, Lori,

I did not respond to the initial survey but have some thoughts for you. Know a member of MI Board did not run for reelection a few years back because the spouse was a financial planner/analyst and felt that the information requested was too invasive and gave an advantage to competitors about the way their own money was invested.

Know also that I would not want my kids listed if they were still young and dependent upon us. Given horror stories about on-line and other connection to kids today, I simply would not want to risk it for my loved ones. Add the addresses to this as well, and it is unsettling for certain. Realize that addresses are in phone book or on-line as well, but would not want to make any of this too easy for people.

Want to say that I am glad you and the commission are looking at revisions to the form. Anything that will simplify the reporting will be helpful. Also, you may want to consider a more in-depth and detailed form for those with more fiscal responsibility. Our school district budget is only \$43M--small compared to state, country, and many city budgets--and there are 5 of us who oversee it as required by law. We have a strong conflict of interest policy and adhere to it. Am not certain that the detail needed for the big guys should apply to little guys--especially when we are not compensated for our work but serve as volunteers.

Thanks. Pat :)

From: "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:35:13 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520

From: [Mark O. Brown](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 7:01:54 AM

Lori this isn't the feedback you requested but I thought the on-line F-1 filing process was easy to understand and navigate and well done. I can't imagine why anyone would object to F-1 data being available on-line. That's the price of transparency in government.

Keep up the good work and thanks.

Mark O. Brown
Connections Public Affairs
Brown Family Trust
Member, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
360 790 4427

From: "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:40:40 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Stephen Buxbaum](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Thursday, May 01, 2014 5:57:18 PM

Hi Lori:

I appreciate your thoughtful engagement regarding the issue of electronic access to F-1 information. Overall, I appreciate open public access to information about elected officials – and would like to encourage looking at ways to keep information about potential conflicts apparent and available to citizens. With that said, I also think it is important to acknowledge that the PDC has not been able to prevent abuse of the information that is available. For example, all of the addresses of my donors was down-loaded from the PDC web site and then used for two fraudulent mailings that contained inflammatory and misleading information about me. The envelopes used in the mailing also posted my home address on them – so they had the appearance of being from me.

I think these incidents are germane to the current issue of F-1 information being posted because they illustrate that when information is available on-line it can be accessed anonymously and then put to use in mischievous, even hostile, ways. I believe in public disclosure being a two-way street. If we are to preserve the credibility of our public elected offices we need to ensure that local electeds are reasonably protected from harassment and unfair treatment, otherwise, no one is going to want to run for local offices... I don't think it is reasonable to look at every transaction on line as a simple matter of efficiency and client service. I think people engaging in this process need to do so as citizens – not completely anonymously. Having my home address easily accessible – especially following the incident which occurred in my neighborhood where a local judge opened the door to have an assailant throw an astringent liquid in his face – gives me some angst for my family's safety. I am aware that I will continue to be subjected to anonymous harassment and anything that is put on-line will potentially be used for this purpose.

Personally, I wish the PDC was better funded and supported. I think we get a huge benefit from what staff have been able to provide the public in terms of information – and basic support to office holders and seekers during the elections process. With this said, I am distressed that we can't do more to protect the integrity of our process from abuse.

Whether or not F-1 information is made available entirely on-line or not is not likely to be the final determinant for my continuing to seek public office. I hope

that the PDC and Sunshine advocates will not ignore that purely looking at this issue from the principle of efficiency will continue to create some unintended consequences. You are welcome to the facts and information about my finances, employment, expenses, gifts... Please give consideration to keeping the process fair and balanced as much as possible so that it is truly a public engagement process, not a process where anonymous individuals are free to throw things from the dark without any consequence.

Thanks for your service.

Sincerely,

Stephen

Stephen H. Buxbaum

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:19 PM

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Norma Walker](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: FW: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:01:13 PM

Lori,
Alice Cabe, one of our Board Members asked me to forward you her input, right below this message.

Norma Walker
Executive Assistant and
Public Records Officer
(360)794-1489

From: Cabe, Alice <Alice.Cabe@overlakehospital.org>
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2014 2:53 PM
To: Norma Walker
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey

Norma,
Please respond to the initial email. I really think that having individuals request documents from PDCA is appropriate. We should also be notified when someone has asked for our particular information as there is so much online theft these days. I do think that the information should be available to those who request it by petition.
Alice

From: Norma Walker [mailto:nwalker@valleygeneral.org]
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2014 2:30 PM
To: smat4@comcast.net; Tony Balk (anthonywbalk@gmail.com); charles strub; Cabe, Alice
Subject: FW: PDC F-1 survey

Norma Walker
Executive Assistant and
Public Records Officer

From: [Susan Chapin](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:53:55 PM

The F1 contains confidential information that has nothing to do with my ability to perform the duties of the job that I was elected to fill. It is simply not necessary to put that information on line.
Susan Chapin

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:36 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

<image001.jpg>
Lori Anderson

From: [Linda Cowan](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:49:30 PM

Good evening Ms. Anderson

Thank you for seeking input. I am unsure as to whether I would leave office; however, I would not be comfortable with the public having easy on-line access to my financial information. Thank you for compiling and sharing this data.

Regards,
Linda Cowan

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:39 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Skip DAVIS](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:20:49 AM

Lori, I must admit that I chose to leave the Life Science Discovery Board in part because of the personal exposure in the F1 information. While I do not mind reporting to the commission, in this era of privacy invasion, I am concerned for my family. I would appreciate not being included on the web site since I will no longer be serving in a public role.

I appreciated the alpha format for grading the investments. The electronic entry could be simplified by permitting more than one entry at a time for stock, etc. Would it be possible to scan an attachment in to the electronic doc.?

I appreciate the work you do and found the staff helpful and supportive.

Thanks,
Skip Davis

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:43 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular**

From: [Bob & Dianne Douthitt](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: [r.douthitt@comcast.net;](mailto:r.douthitt@comcast.net)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 11:33:39 AM

Lori,

From the point of view of a school board member, I look at it this way:

It is a big enough hassle to run for the office, which essentially pays nothing, and try to understand and comply with all the rules that apply to an election campaign. I'm an attorney (retired), so I should understand all the rules better than most, but it is still new territory, confusing, you have to learn ORCA, different issues pop up unexpectedly, and that is all just in the realm of rule compliance, to say nothing of the nuts and bolts of actually conducting an effective campaign.

Those campaigns can take a lot of work and are a huge detriment to even wanting to serve in the first place. I raised around \$19,000 last time because I was running against someone who had raised \$15,000 in the 2011 election with about \$7,500 of it coming – directly or indirectly -- from one of the state's major anti-school bond/levy financiers, Duane Alton and Citizens for Responsible Taxation. In fact, her campaign was the reason the law got changed to make the \$900 limit apply to school boards too. But with all their family members and relatives in Alton's family, I felt my opponent could easily amass a similar amount from the same basic group regardless of the new limit, and that I had to go all out. But it was an enormous amount of work for an office like this.. Not many people are willing to do it, and I probably would not have been willing or even understood how to do it had I not been an incumbent with some experience.

If on top of that you throw in the extra benefit of having a portrait of your finances be posted for the world to see, I think you will just reduce the pool of potential office holders even more. I am retired, so I don't care so much now. But when I was working and hustling for clients and so forth, I definitely would not have wanted clients, potential clients, competitors, or anyone else in the community to have an idea of how much I was making or had saved, owned, or owed, or anything else along those lines.

The only person with whom I have discussed the issue (and it wasn't in the context of making the info public, but just in the context of completing the forms) was a former board member who was from a family that owned a car dealership. They made a lot of money and had complicated finances. She told me one time how much time they spent just trying to fill the thing out correctly and what kind of strife it caused. I have to think that if it had been public information, she never would have served, even though she was a great board member for 2 terms.

Let me know if anyone wants to discuss.
Bob Douthitt/Spokane

From: [Dan and Ann Fagerlie](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: [Junk released by User action] Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:11 PM

It is hard in a small town, especially in a very low income rural area, where people do not wear their wealth level on their "sleeves" or even discuss their possessions (in order to all feel as a close community), to find a reason that easy public access is necessary to assure officials are not taking illicit funds. The law I understand is needed for PDC to have the information of investments, banking, etc, to oversee and enforce proper behavior by public officials. But to put it all on the internet is a gross erosion of privacy, when privacy is a concept that seems to be disappearing completely in our society. It definitely could detour some good potential officials from running.

On Fri, April 25, 2014 8:29 pm, Lori Anderson wrote:

> Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's
> survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have
> online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very
> happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The
> results <<http://www.pdc.wa.gov/home/accountability/pdf/F1.Survey.2014.pdf>>
> are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.
>
> The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The
> Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would
> leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission
> wants to know what is it about online access that you would find
> objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a
> particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address,
> children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy
> access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your
> F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office,
> kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s). I will be
> presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next
> meet on May 22. If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May
> 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials
> provided to the Commission before the meeting.
>
> Thank you,
>
>

- > [cid:image001.jpg@01CF60C5.10C39270]
- > Lori Anderson
- > (360) 664-2737 - phone
- > 1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
- > (360) 753-1112 - fax
- > Follow the PDC on
- > Facebook<<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Washington-State-Public-Disclosure>
- > -Commission/176667902376847>!
- >
- >
- >

Dan and Ann Fagerlie
509 775 3087

From: [Mike Fredrickson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: [Junk released by User action] RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:11 PM

Lori –

Thank you for the opportunity to tell you again why I'm so against the F-1 being available online.

The main reason is that even though we have decided to ask the voters of this county to elect us for a position does not mean that we give all rights to some level of privacy. I think it is fundamentally wrong that anybody for any reason can look up what my properties are and how I paid for them (and all assets for that matter). I understand that reason for the state to know it so that there is no fraud, but not for the general public.

I also think that we should be notified when a request comes in for the F-1, because of the very nature of the disclosure, being very personal and that it is only used for personal attacks against the elected. I feel that we should be able to prepare for the potential attacks, again we should have the same rights as the people requesting the information. This is very personal to me because how my opponent (same individual) in my two races launches personal attacks.

I have talked to many qualified people that do not want this information out in the public domain and say that is the main reason they don't run for public office. The entrepreneurs are who we need to run for office, but a lot of us have many sources of income because of families and owning several LLC's. This is a strong asset to the organizations that we serve, but the typical 9-5'er may not understand all of it. So I just think that it should be at a minimum kept the same and if any change is made it is letting the elected know when it has been requested.

Mike

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:30 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are

From: ccvh@localaccess.com
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:09:47 PM

Leaving office because of elected officials F-1's are online is to simple of a response. It would be more appropriate that anyone wanting to see any version of my F-1 needs to fully disclose their identity and have it recorded at the PDC. Their right to know about my personal finances should balance with my right to know who is looking.

Thank you Mark Giffey

From: [Lori Anderson](#)
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:28 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Don Grafstrom](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 10:00:06 AM

It honestly was something I seriously considered when deciding to run for office. I chose to make the sacrifice(which I view disclosing my private information to the public is) for the better good of the community, however I personally know many qualified candidates for office that have decided to not run based largely on the fact that they would have to disclose things about their personal lives that they do not feel has a bearing on their ability to perform the job. I understand why this is a requirement, but I don't agree with it. It certainly should not be put on line to make it easier for nosy people to snoop into my personal life.

[Donald N. Grafstrom](#)

Commissioner for the Quiullayute Valley Parks and Recreation District
Forks, WA 98331
360-640-0499-Cell

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:28 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Blake Griffith](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 6:03:08 PM

Hi Lori,

I really don't have anything to hide but I am very much against having this information on line. I feel that there is way to much access to my personal information now and since my office is not a paid position this would be reason enough for me to resign as chairman of the White Pass School Board.

Thank You
Blake Griffith

On Friday, April 25, 2014 8:40 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:
Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State
(360) 753-1112 - fax

State of
Washington
House of
Representatives



May 13, 2014

Washington Public Disclosure Commission
711 Capitol Way #206
Olympia, WA 98504 - 0908

Commissioners:

We understand that the Commission is developing Washington Administrative Code amendments and internal process improvements to the financial affairs disclosure provisions under your jurisdiction. As you know RCW 42.17A.700 specifies that after January 1st and before April 15th of each year, every elected official and every executive state officer shall file with the commission a statement of financial affairs for the preceding calendar year. For the purposes of this law, the term "executive state officer" includes those listed in RCW 42.17A.705 which calls for reports from each "professional staff member" of the legislature.

The phrase "professional staff member" however is not defined in statute and only generally described in administrative rule. In practice, the House has provided annually to the PDC a list of our employees who we consider in some broad sense to be our professional staff. The functional concept of professional staff used by us does not necessarily align with staff persons who are subject to influence from lobbyists or others. Nevertheless, only staffers we designate are required to report their financial affairs to the PDC on the F-1 Form. This information has been collected by the PDC and is available for public inspection, but is not published on the agency's website. Now that the PDC is considering changing its procedures to publish these disclosure forms, we believe some consideration needs to be given to the purpose and effect of such a decision and whether the information is being collected from the appropriate people in the first place.

The House as an institution believes the public interest is best served when resources are expended in alignment with public expectations. We have learned over the two decades that these records have been collected that there are very few requests made to review the financial disclosures of House professional staff members. This is dramatically out of alignment with the effort and resources required to collect and process the information as compared with requests for information regarding elected and higher level agency officials. Furthermore, the decision to publish this information on the PDC's website will create a tremendous amount of anxiety with legislative staff persons who are not public officials and seek no personal publicity. Many of our staff feel very strongly that they

would rather not work for us if their private financial affairs, clear of any financial relationships with lobbyists, are nevertheless to be published by you. We believe you will see that sentiment clearly expressed in responses to your own recent survey. Additionally, in an era of identity theft and cyber-crimes, publishing this type of information on the internet seems to be inviting trouble into the lives of legislative staff persons.

At this time the House asks that you not publish the financial affairs disclosure forms of professional staff members. The House believes the definition of professional staff member needs to be reexamined and realigned with the purpose and intent behind the disclosure laws and that only after that has been done can the publishing of that information be considered part of the fulfillment of the intent of the statutory scheme. We are ready to work cooperatively with you in this endeavor as we agree that transparency in government, when balanced with the reasonable expectation of personal privacy and safety, is an important public policy for the people of Washington.

Sincerely,



Timothy Sekerak
House Counsel

cc: Barbara Baker, Chief Clerk of the House
Bernard Dean, Deputy Chief Clerk of the House

From: [Steve Houston](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 2:34:34 PM

Lori,

As a minor elected public official, I would consider leaving office if the F-1 form was easily and anonymously available. I've assumed the PDC was created to shed light on conflicts of interest by elected officials. Today on my local news, it was reported that the issue was transparency. Under the guise of transparency, I cannot think of any reason to withhold anything from anybody, and I wonder who will be the arbitrator of what is necessary. As it is, minor public officials already labor under extensive rules governing all aspects of their responsibilities. At some point you will discourage good people from running for office.

I would be more inclined to review the history of public disclosure prior to establishment of the PDC and determine if we have solved the problems which led to the creation of the PDC. Furthermore, we could look for problems which the system of public disclosure has failed to address or new problems which it has created. I fail to see how allowing instant and anonymous access to F-1 reports does any of these things.

Sincerely,
Steve Houston
Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:29 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you

From: [Iniguez, Uriel \(CHA\)](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:06:47 PM

The only information that should be available is the business affiliation and compensation. Any mother information is too intrusive.

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:43 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

<image001.jpg>
Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State

From: [Mike And Kelly Keogh](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 6:46:03 AM

Lori,

I responded that I would consider resigning if F-1 Reports are made available to the public.

I am a volunteer School Board member. In fact, like a couple of my peers, I was appointed and not elected do to the lack of interest in participating in an election for this level of office. Other rural school districts may have the same issue. Bottom line, I receive absolutely no financial resourcing from the State and perform an important function that many others are unwilling to do.

As a volunteer, I see no reason for the public to have access to my personal information. I am just an ordinary citizen trying to do the right thing in support of our community's children... on my own time. I consider publication of this information as an unwarranted invasion of my privacy. No one has the right to free access to this information.

Sincerely,

Michael Keogh

-----Original Message-----

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Fri, Apr 25, 2014 8:33 pm
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The results are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s). I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so

From: [D McCaslin](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, May 04, 2014 10:22:35 AM

I am greatly disturbed that so much information is available about our persons. I do not have children but in now way would want their personal information available to others. Why is a name and age necessary instead of just a statement of existence?

Why do we have to give out our addresses at all? why not just a city or zip?

We have to give some flexibility of the privacy to those that choose to serve in public because without those persons, how well would our democracy work ?

I was amazed at how much information we must provide to serve in public dedication. I still am and I am a bit disgusted because this information can be used to invade our lives and cause detriment in so many ways.

We have to face the facts, public disclosure is necessary to maintain an honest pool of public servants. But we must also give concern to the individual person that pays the price when others do wrong.

Please give consideration for the individual person and their personal information and the ease of the access to the information in the F-1.

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:37:40 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

From: [Donna Michelson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 1:03:31 PM

Hi Lori,

I see you are out of the office until May 5 so I thought I would amend my comments I previously sent you about the F-1's being on line. I sent my comments earlier today.

I mentioned that I would consider not running for office IF the F-1's were on line. I am not sure that I would NOT run for office but I would definitely give it some thought. I do remember years ago when I ran for office in 1999 and that was definitely a concern. My husband and I discussed it and had some thoughts about it. I knew then that the reports were relatively private. Now, things have changed in the internet and there seems to be so many other things happening in this world, I would really have to think hard and long before filing for public office. So, I can't say I wouldn't, just that I would have to give it a lot more thought if F-1's were on line for all to see.

Remember the issue with the police department in Kirkland? A disgruntled citizen who apparently had an ax to grind with one of the officers decided to find and publish all police officers names, addresses, etc. What was the end game there? Just a lot of worry for the officer and his family. There are people out there that just like to get information and make noise and/or trouble.

Thank you again for adding this to my previous e-mail comments.

Donna Michelson
Councilmember
City of Mill Creek

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov
To: donna223@hotmail.com
Subject: Automatic reply: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2014 15:24:12 +0000

From: [Donna Michelson](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:24:13 AM

Hi Lori,

I didn't fill out the online form but do wish to make a comment regarding this topic.

I am not in favor of changing anything as to the access of the F-1 online. I believe it is already available by request and I really do not feel it should be made "easier" for someone, sitting at home, maybe a little bored, can just start scanning all of the information about public officials. There are a lot of "nosey" folks out there and some, even one, could be up to no good. Why should I expose myself to these type of people?

If they want to take the time and trouble to request a F-1 on me, go ahead, but don't make it easy to just to sit at a computer and "troll" for information.

With all of the information online being compromised CONSTANTLY, why do you want the PDC to be subject to something like that happening? I would really dread the news that all of the F-1's online at PDC have been hacked into and we should all be put on notice to watch out. No thank you! With all of the wireless hubs at every restaurant, shopping mall parking lot, coffee shops, it is so easy to hack into a computer, not to mention folks using wireless at home.

So, as you ponder this item, ask yourself, is the system broken? If not, why change it?

Would it change my mind about running for office if everything was on line for everyone to look at anytime? Yes.

Thank you for considering my comments as you deliberate.

Donna Michelson
Councilmember

City of Mill Creek

From: lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov

Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2014 03:22:48 +0000

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,



Lori Anderson

(360) 664-2737 - phone

1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State

(360) 753-1112 - fax

Follow the PDC on [Facebook!](#)

From: [Rick & Sandy Moore](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 4:47:12 PM

Hi Lori,

Thanks for your email and the link to the survey results. I just want to say that I don't believe I ever received a request to take the original survey. It could have been my oversight (like everyone else, I'm inundated with emails!) but I don't recall seeing an email about it, and I really do try to pay attention to things that come in from the PDC...

In any case, I just want to weigh in and say that I think it is critically important for the public to have access to candidate/elected official financial information. Sure, none of us likes to provide it, but money definitely has influence and the public has a right to know where elected officials get their money. Some tweaks to make the process less onerous, such as a higher threshold for reporting stock ownership for example, would be fine but the financial information should be available to the public.

Thanks!

Sandy Moore
Colville School Director
Colville, WA

On 4/25/14, 8:31 PM, Lori Anderson wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you

From: nicandri@comcast.net
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 12:58:12 PM

Well, since you asked, I'll be candid. Certain interest groups, nominally identified as liberal or progressive, have established the very troubling pattern of using public disclosure documentation to harrass individuals by hounding them out of public office, or even private sector positions. That's usually associated with political contributions, but this slope is slippery and can easily extend to other arenas. This is all the more troubling to me because I'm a lifelong liberal.

From: "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:39:32 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Bill Pelozo](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
cc: [Bill Pelozo;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 11:01:35 AM

I read through the survey results quickly and I go along with the majority survey results.

Confidentiality is important to me as a citizen and elected.

Thanks.

Bill Pelozo
Councilmember
City of Auburn
253-261-3235

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 3:36 PM
To: Bill Pelozo
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey

The invitation to participate was included in Chip Beatty's 3/24/14 email reminder regarding the annual April 15 filing deadline. The survey is done, but the Commission is still digesting the feedback. As you saw in my 4/25 email, they want to hear more from the people who responded that online access to F1s would or may be a reason for F1 filers to leave office. I am just compiling those responses now in preparation of next week's PDC meeting. If you want to add something, please send me comments by tomorrow at noon – Wednesday, May 14.

If you have had a chance to look through the survey results and have ideas/recommendations about the other subjects, feel free to share them with me. I expect that most of the June 26 PDC meeting will be spent discussing the recommendations received thus far and deciding which ones the Commission wants to pursue.

From: Bill Pelozo [<mailto:bpelozo@auburnwa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 3:06 PM

To: Lori Anderson
Cc: Bill Pelozza
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey

Hi Lori, just curious, I don't recall being asked to participate in this survey?

Did I miss something?

Thanks.

Bill Pelozza
Councilmember
City of Auburn
253-261-3235

From: Lori Anderson [<mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:20 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included**

From: [Pickett, Erica](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Sunday, April 27, 2014 9:39:07 AM

Thank you so much for all the good work done by the PDC. While I have no objection to all the information being online, I can understand why others might. I have been involved in city decision making for the past 28 years, first as a planning commissioner and then as a council member for the past eight years. We have had a handful of cases in that time where I might have felt queasy about having my home address listed. Still, I think it is really important for people to know where I live. Perhaps the best insurance for all of us, elected and unelected alike, is to spend a little more on mental health treatment for those who need it.

Best,
Erica Pickett
Councilmember at Large, Position 7
293-6264

From: Lori Anderson [lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:20 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

From: [Ned Piper](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:29:14 AM

Hi Lori,

I am a strong believer in transparency and open access to all information, not only for public officials, but also for the public entities we serve. I am, as a matter of fact, in a struggle with the management at Cowlitz PUD, where I serve as an elected Commissioner, over a request to receive all of the invoices from all of the law firms that have done business with Cowlitz PUD over the past year and four months. I am being told to go fly a kite, even though all of these invoices were approved in open meetings. My name and number appear in the local phone book. I have told the employees in our service department that they are encouraged to give out my home and cell phone numbers and my e-address to any customer who wishes to contact a commissioner. I am frankly pleased that the PDC is considering putting this personal information online. I doubt that everyone agrees with me on this. I suspect that my wife, for example, could be uncomfortable with this.

Thank you.

Edward M. "Ned" Piper
Commissioner, Cowlitz County PUD
(360) 749-2632

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:30 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this**

From: [Don Powell](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:01:39 AM

I did not respond to the survey but would like to respond to this question. I believe in the public's right to know our general financial status, but am against everyone worldwide to be able to look at my information. At least by having to request the information we have a record of who is looking.

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:35 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond,**

From: [Bill Provost](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 8:26:37 AM

Thank you for the opportunity to voice an opinion about public "exposure" of personnel information. We are already exposed to divulging more personnel information than a non-public official! Does this really do what the commission thinks it does? Being in a smaller jurisdiction we are subjected to more harassment than an official in a larger one! Why because I want to service the public do I have to open my private life to the press and the opinions of some that have a grudge against government? I have been in public office for more than 25 years. I pride myself of high moral integrity and honesty. I don't mind answering question that would expose manipulation of government funds etc. Although through my many years of public service I have seen many instances of misappropriation of funds by both elected and non-elected public officials. I have also known of good officials that have just said "no" to holding office only to be put under the magnifying glass for doing a "public service".

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:20 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included**

From: [Richardson, Jim](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 10:27:53 AM

Dear Commissioners:

I may not leave office, but several of my trustees may leave. Why should my wife's employment status and personal information, and our investments and debts be available to the public? None of that information has anything to do with my position and how I carry out the duties of that position.

I am hired by a local, governor-appointed board of trustees. None of us are elected. With public disclosure of finalists for president positions, it is already difficult to get well-qualified candidates to apply for many of these positions. It can also be difficult to get good, strong candidates for local trustee positions. The disclosure of irrelevant personal information will only make it more difficult to get well-qualified candidates for all of these positions.

Putting this information online for anyone to view would be an intrusion into my, my wife's, and my trustees' private lives and personal information. What would be the purpose? Why would you see this as an important issue? What benefit would it bring to the public to know personal information of this nature about NON-ELECTED officials?

Thank you for listening.

Jim Richardson, Ph.D.
President
Wenatchee Valley College

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:42 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

From: [Vince Santiago](#)
To: [Lori Anderson](#);
cc: [Wedfa](#);
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:15:09 AM

Lori,

I did not volunteer to have my personal information posted on the internet. Perhaps I am naive, but I always assumed that the information I provided was confidential.

I understand that there are guidelines for elected and/or paid officials that are set forth by federal, state, and local laws. Adherence to the laws should always be of paramount importance. Why the State government would take an activist position and create reporting that is not required is beyond my comprehension. Aren't we trying to reduce the cost of government in our state?

Perhaps my comments are off-base. If they are, please forgive me. However, if I am correcting in concluding that my information would be made public, I would resign from WEDFA immediately.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback.

Vince Santiago - **VETRANS**
Office: (253) 833-4688
Fax: (253) 737.5754
Visit us at www.go-VETRANS.com

VETRANS LLC is certified as a service-disabled veteran's business by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Washington State DVA. VETRANS LLC is certified as a Minority Business Enterprise by the Northwest Minority Supplier Development Council and Washington State's OMWBE. VETRANS LLC is a Registered SmartWay® Transport Partner.

The contents of this e-mail are not intended to represent or form a legally binding offer or an acceptance, nor should the contents otherwise be considered as a contract or interpreted to create a contract or other legally binding obligation on the part of VETRANS LLC unless this e-mail expressly states otherwise.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The information contained in this email message is legally privileged and confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above in the address line(s). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copy of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Lori Anderson [mailto:lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2014 8:41 PM
Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission

From: [chad searls](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Friday, April 25, 2014 9:31:17 PM

There is a legal way for people to get this information and that has not changed. To give people extra access would be wrong!!!!

Chad E. Searls

On Apr 25, 2014, at 8:29 PM, "Lori Anderson" <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

Thank you,

<image001.jpg>
Lori Anderson
(360) 664-2737 - phone
1-877-601-2828 toll free in WA State

From: usk.wetend@resolutefp.com
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: F-1 Reports
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 10:55:50 PM

Lori,

I too would consider resigning if F-1 Reports are made available to the public.

I am a volunteer School Board member. In fact, like a couple of my peers, I was appointed and not elected do to the lack of interest in participating in an election for this level of office. Other rural school districts may have the same issue. Bottom line, I receive absolutely no financial resourcing from the State and perform an important function that many others are unwilling to do.

As a volunteer, I see no reason for the public to have access to my personal information. I am just an ordinary citizen trying to do the right thing in support of our community's children... on my own time. I consider publication of this information as an unwarranted invasion of my privacy. No one has the right to free access to this information.

Sincerely,

Tye Shanholtzer

From: steve@stevevermillion.com
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: RE: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 4:09:15 PM

Ms Anderson: I would suspect that if you already release every detail of the F1 report in response to a Public Records Request, then it probably doesn't matter if they are electronic and available to every idiot who wants to snoop into my personal life and then in turn make trouble where trouble never existed.

I have been on city council for over two years and am a member of the Pierce Transit Board, Pierce County Regional Council, Puget Sound Regional Council Transportation Board (alternate) and their Growth Management Board (alternate) as well as Zoo Trek and numerous other committees for little compensation. I didn't sign up for the harassment though, indirectly through one of your board members, Kathy Turner, and puppet friends who come to every council meeting and speak negatively about council members they do not like in an effort to drive us out of politics. My current cyberstalker is Dave Churchman, who I suspect has requested my F1 report already. Why would I know that: see the clip from the letter he sent me which is indicative of the postings which I have on file that he has made over the last two years in the News Tribune.

"Real men fly jets, errand boys fly aerial lawn mowers, and that was 50 years ago. According to NWH you weren't much of a pilot and your last employer says you weren't much of an errand boy or janitor either.

The public are sick of your 50 year old fantasy war story. **If you were so brave, how come you are a classified nutter ? Vietnam, anyone would think you won it, all by yourself too.**

The public are looking forward to you running for re-election as it will be great fun to expose your lies, deceit and the fact you really belong in western state hospital.

Military hero, what a fucking joke that is. You would shit your pants in real combat. Some of us who have been in real combat just don't brag or even talk about it. But its so long ago, your mind conjures up greater heroics with every passing decade, you fucked up freak.

Regards
Dave

For background, I flew 1400 + combat missions in Vietnam as an aircraft commander of an unarmed medical evacuation helicopter and was awarded the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, and thirty awards of the air medal and one for valor. If he has received my F1 report, he knows I draw a VA disability so he conjures up that I should be in the Western State Hospital because I am a so called "nutter".

With Kathy Turner, Dave Churchman provided her with a clip of my resume when I was the Director of Operations for a defense contractor. He provided that to Kathy Turner who in

turn approached my former employer at a local coffee company where I worked part time to help them out through the recession and Turner clearly made it known that she was now a PDC commissioner and asked if she knew what I used for my job title with their company-- and if they had concerns she could take care of it. Contact Debbie Bennett at Martin Henry Coffee if you doubt my statement.

It is very difficult for a public official to do business when I have to constantly look over my shoulder wondering what PDC commissioners are doing under the radar and the allies they keep in order to control politics here in "Meekerville".

Cordially,

Steve Vermillion
LTC(R) US Army Aviation
Puyallup Wa

----- Original Message -----

Subject: PDC F-1 Survey

From: Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov>

Date: Fri, April 25, 2014 8:23 pm

To:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

The survey results were shared with the Commission yesterday. The Commission would like to hear from anyone who responded that they would leave or maybe leave office if the F-1s were online. The Commission wants to know what is it about online access that you would find objectionable. In other words, would you perhaps leave office if a particular section of the F-1 was online, such as the home address, children's names, investments, etc.? Is it just the overall idea of easy access to the F-1 content? **If you responded that online access to your F1 report would or would maybe be a reason for you to leave office, kindly respond to this email with the particular reason(s).** I will be presenting this additional information to the Commission when they next meet on May 22. **If you respond, please do so no later than Monday, May 12, so that your reasons can be included with the meeting materials provided to the Commission before the meeting.**

From: [Dave Wyman](#)
To: [Lori Anderson;](#)
Subject: Re: PDC F-1 Survey
Date: Saturday, April 26, 2014 9:47:52 AM

Lori,

If I understand correctly, the F1 information would be accessible to anyone online. I understand that a person can make a public records request anyway and get the information, but that usually is for a reason and takes a little effort. I am not really supportive of a system that allows a more casual way of accessing my personal information. I believe that people should have access to public officials information only to detect conflicts of interest. If our information is published online, it becomes more like surfing tv channels or the internet, which, to me, allows anyone access to my personal information without cause.

I am not supportive of the idea and would consider resigning my position as a result.

Thank you for including us in the decision making process. Please feel free to contact me if you need further clarification of my position or if I am in error about the process.

David Wyman
Commissioner
Cowlitz County Fire District 5
360-673-3925

On Fri, Apr 25, 2014 at 8:25 PM, Lori Anderson <lori.anderson@pdc.wa.gov> wrote:

Thank you to everyone who completed the Public Disclosure Commission's survey about F-1 filing requirements and whether the public should have online access to F-1 reports. The members and staff of the PDC are very happy that we had 520 responses to the survey. The [results](#) are linked to the PDC's website, if you are interested.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION 711 CAPITOL WAY RM 206 PO BOX 40908 OLYMPIA WA 98504-0908 (360) 753-1111 TOLL FREE 1-877-601-2828		PDC FORM F-1 (1/12)	PERSONAL FINANCIAL AFFAIRS STATEMENT	PDC OFFICE USE M A R K P O S T R E C E I V E D
Refer to instruction manual for detailed assistance and examples.		A	C	
Deadlines: Incumbent elected and appointed officials – by April 15. Candidates and others – within two weeks of becoming a candidate or being newly appointed to a position.		B	DOLLAR CODE A \$1 to \$3,999 B \$4,000 to \$19,999 C \$20,000 to \$39,999 D \$40,000 to \$99,999 E \$100,000 or more	
SEND REPORT TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION				
Last Name First Middle Initial		Names of immediate family members, including registered domestic partner. If there is no reportable information to disclose for dependent children, or other dependents living in your household, do not identify them. Do identify your spouse or registered domestic partner. See F-1 manual for details.		
Mailing Address (Use PO Box or Work Address) *		D		
City County Zip + 4		E		
Filing Status (Check only one box.)		F		
<input type="checkbox"/> An elected or state appointed official filing annual report <input type="checkbox"/> Final report as an elected official. Term expired: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate running in an election: month _____ year _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Newly appointed to an elective office <input type="checkbox"/> Newly appointed to a state appointive office <input type="checkbox"/> Professional staff of the Governor's Office and the Legislature *		Office Held or Sought Office title: _____ County, city, district or agency of the office, name and number: _____ Position number: _____ Term begins: _____ ends: _____		
1 INCOME List each employer, or other source of income (pension, social security, legal judgment, etc.) from which you or a family member, including registered domestic partner, received \$2,000 or more during the period. Include stock options received during the reporting period that had a value of \$2,000 or more. (Report interest and dividends in Item 3.)		G		
Name and Address of Employer or Source of Compensation		Occupation or How Compensation Was Earned		
H Occupation name of employer, business address		I Compensation of \$2,000 or more from anyone other than individual J Disclosing Sales Commissions		
Check Here <input type="checkbox"/> if continued on attached sheet				
2 REAL ESTATE List street address, assessor's parcel number, or legal description AND county for each parcel of Washington real estate with value of over \$10,000 in which you or a family member, including registered domestic partner, held a personal financial interest during the reporting period. (Show partnership, company, etc. real estate on F-1 supplement.)		K		
Property Sold or Interest Divested	Assessed Value (Use Code)	Name and Address of Purchaser	Nature and Amount (Use Code) of Payment or Consideration Received	
L ←-----→				
Property Purchased or Interest Acquired		Creditor's Name/Address	Payment Terms	Security Given Mortgage Amount - (Use Code) Original Current
M ←-----→				
All Other Property Entirely or Partially Owned				
N ←-----→				
O ←-----→				
Check here <input type="checkbox"/> if continued on attached sheet				

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

	RCW	WAC
A	RCW 42.17A.700(1)	WAC 390-24-025
B	RCW 42.17A.700(2) and (3)	
C	RCW 42.17A.710(2)	WAC 390-24-301
D	RCW 42.17A.710(1)	WAC 390-24-010
E	RCW 42.17A.135	
F	RCW 42.17A.700(1) , RCW 42.17A.705 , RCW 44.05.080	
G	RCW 42.17A.705(2) and (3)	WAC 390-24-160 Definition
H	RCW 42.17A.710(1) (a)	
I	RCW 42.17A.710(1) (f)	
J	WAC 390-24-202	
K	WAC 390-24-200	
L	RCW 42.17A.710(1)(i)	
M	RCW 42.17A.710(1)(h)	
N	RCW 42.17A.710(1)(j)	
O	WAC 390-24-010	

3 ASSETS / INVESTMENTS - INTEREST / DIVIDENDS

List bank and savings accounts, insurance policies, stock, bonds and other intangible property (including but not limited to stock options) held during the reporting period.

A. Name and address of each bank or financial institution in which you, a family member, including registered domestic partner, had an account over \$20,000 any time during the report period.	Type of Account or Description of Asset	Asset Value (Use Code)	Income Amount (Use Code)
	P/Q ←-----		↑ ↓
B. Name and address of each insurance company where you, a family member, including registered domestic partner, had a policy with a cash or loan value over \$20,000 during the period.	P/R ←-----		
C. Name and address of each company, association, government agency, etc. in which you, a family member, including registered domestic partner, owned or had a financial interest worth over \$2,000. Include stocks, bonds, ownership, retirement plan, IRA, notes, stock options, and other intangible property. If you, your spouse, registered domestic partner and/or dependents had decision making authority regarding individual assets/investments list each asset or investment, the value and any income amount. EXAMPLE: If you self-directed an investment account identify each stock or other asset in that account.	P/S/T ←-----		

Check here If continued on attached sheet.

4 CREDITORS List each creditor you or a family member, including registered domestic partner, owed \$2,000 or more any time during the period. Don't include retail charge accounts, credit cards, or mortgages or real estate reported in Item 2.

Creditor's Name and Address	Terms of Payment	Security Given	AMOUNT (USE CODE)	
			Original	Present
U/V ←-----"Debt" defined-----→				

Check here If continued on attached sheet.

5 All filers answer questions A thru D below. If the answer is YES to any of these questions, the F-1 Supplement must also be completed as part of this report. If all answers are NO and you are a candidate for state or local office, an appointee to a vacant elective office, or a state executive officer filing your initial report, no F-1 Supplement is required.

Incumbent elected officials and state executive officers filing an annual financial affairs report also must answer question E. An F-1 Supplement is required of these officeholders unless all answers to questions A thru E are NO.

- A. At any time during the reporting period were you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents (1) an officer, director, general partner or trustee of any corporation, company, union, association, joint venture or other entity or (2) a partner or member of any limited partnership, limited liability partnership, limited liability company or similar entity including but not limited to a professional limited liability company? If yes, complete Supplement, Part A.
- B. Did you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents have an ownership of 10% or more in any company, corporation, partnership, joint venture or other business at any time during the reporting period? If yes, complete Supplement, Part A.
- C. Did you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents own a business at any time during the reporting period? If yes, complete Supplement, Part A.
- D. Did you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents prepare, promote or oppose state legislation, rules, rates or standards for compensation or deferred compensation (other than pay for a currently-held public office) at any time during the reporting period? If yes, complete Supplement, Part B.
- E. **Only for Persons Filing Annual Report.** Regarding the receipt of items not provided or paid for by your governmental agency during the previous calendar year: 1) Did you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents (or any combination thereof) accept a gift of food or beverages costing over \$50 per occasion? or 2) Did any source other than your governmental agency provide or pay in whole or in part for you, your spouse, registered domestic partner and/or dependents to travel or to attend a seminar or other training? If yes to either or both questions, complete Supplement, Part C.

Y
Z
Z1
Z2/
Z3

- ALL FILERS EXCEPT CANDIDATES.** Check the appropriate box.
- I hold a state elected office, am an executive state officer or professional staff. I have read and am familiar with RCW 42.52.180 regarding the use of public resources in campaigns.
 - I hold a local elected office. I have read and am familiar with RCW 42.17A.555 regarding the use of public facilities in campaigns.

*CANDIDATES: Do not use public agency addresses or telephone numbers for contact information.

Z4

CERTIFICATION: I certify under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Z5/Z6

Signature _____ Date _____
 Contact Telephone: () *
 Email: _____(work) *
 Email: _____(Home) Optional

REPORT NOT ACCEPTABLE WITHOUT FILER'S SIGNATURE

RCW

WAC

- P [WAC 390-24-100 Definition](#)
- Q [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(b\)](#)
- R [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(b\)](#)
- S [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(b\)](#)
- T [WAC 390-24-010](#)
- U [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(c\)](#)
- V [WAC 390-24-110 Definition](#)
- W [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(d\) and \(g\)](#)
- X [WAC 390-24-201](#)
- Y [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(g\)](#)
- Z [WAC 390-24-010](#)
- Z1 [RCW 42.17A.710\(1\)\(e\)](#)
- Z2 [RCW 42.17A.710\(l\) and \(m\)](#)
- Z3 [WAC 390-24-010](#)
- Z4 [RCW 42.17A.700\(7\)](#)
- Z5 [RCW 42.17A.700\(6\)](#)
- Z6 [WAC 390-24-105 Definition](#)

PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR YOURSELF, SPOUSE, REGISTERED DOMESTIC PARTNER, DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND OTHER DEPENDENT YOUR HOUSEHOLD

Last Name	First	Middle Initial	DATE
-----------	-------	----------------	------

A OFFICE HELD, BUSINESS INTERESTS: Provide the following information if, during the reporting period, you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependent:

- (1) were an officer, director, general partner, trustee, or 10 percent or more owner of a corporation, nor organization, union, partnership, joint venture or other entity; and/or
- (2) were a partner or member of a limited partnership, limited liability partnership, limited liability company or similar entity, including but not limited to a professional limited liability company.

- Legal Name: Report name used on legal documents establishing the entity.
- Trade or Operating Name: Report name used for business purposes if different from the legal name.
- Position or Percent of Ownership: The office, title and/or percent of ownership held.
- Brief Description of the Business/Organization: Report the purpose, product(s), and/or the service(s) rendered.
- Payments from Governmental Unit: If the governmental unit in which you hold or seek office made payments to the business entity concerning which you're reporting, show the purpose of each payment and the actual amount received.
- Payments from Business Customers and Other Government Agencies: List each corporation, partnership, joint venture, proprietorship, union, association, business or other commercial entity and each government agency (other than the one in which you hold or seek office) which paid compensation of \$10,000 or more during the period to the entity. Briefly say what property, services or other consideration was given or performed for the compensation.
- Washington Real Estate: Identify real estate owned by the business entity if the qualifications referenced below are met.

Interpretation No. 91-01

ENTITY NO. 1

LEGAL NAME: A

TRADE OR OPERATING NAME: A

ADDRESS: A

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION: B

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTAL UNIT IN WHICH YOU SEEK/HOLD OFFICE: C

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES OF \$10,000 OR MORE: D

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM BUSINESS CUSTOMERS OF \$10,000 OR MORE: E

Customer name: E | Financial institution disclosure option

WASHINGTON REAL ESTATE IN WHICH ENTITY HELD A DIRECT FINANCIAL INTEREST (Complete only if ownership in the ENTITY is 10% or more and assessed value of property is over \$20,000. List street address, assessor parcel number, or legal description and county for each parcel): F/G

Check here if continued on attached sheet

Reporting For: Self Spouse
 Registered Domestic Partner Dependent
 POSITION OR PERCENT OF OWNERSHIP

CONTINUE PARTS B AND C ON NEXT PAGE

	Interpretation No. 91-01
A	RCW 42.17A.710(1)(g) WAC 390-24-010
B	RCW 42.17A.710(g)(i)
C	RCW 42.17A.710(g)(ii)
D	RCW 42.17A.710(g)(ii)
E	RCW 42.17A.710(g) WAC 390-24-010
F	RCW 42.17A.710(1)(k)
G	WAC 390-24-100 Definition

Name

ENTITY NO. 2 Reporting For: Self Spouse

Registered Domestic Partner Dependent

LEGAL NAME: POSITION OR PERCENT OF OWNERSHIP

TRADE OR OPERATING NAME:

ADDRESS:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTAL UNIT IN WHICH YOU SEEK/HOLD OFFICE:

Purpose of payments Amount (actual dollars)

\$

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES OF \$10,000 OR MORE:

Agency name: Purpose of payment (amount not required)

PAYMENTS ENTITY RECEIVED FROM BUSINESS CUSTOMERS OF \$10,000 OR MORE:

Customer name: Purpose of payment (amount not required)

WASHINGTON REAL ESTATE IN WHICH ENTITY HELD A DIRECT FINANCIAL INTEREST (Complete only if ownership in the ENTITY is 10% or more and assessed value of property is over \$20,000. List street address, assessor parcel number, or legal description and county for each parcel):

Check here if continued on attached sheet

B LOBBYING: List persons for whom you, or any immediate family member, including registered domestic partner, lobbied or prepared state legislation or state rules, rates, or standards for compensation or deferred compensation. Do not list pay from government body in which you are an elected official or professional staff member.

Person to Whom Services Rendered	Description of Legislation, Rules, Etc.	Compensation (Use Code)
<div style="background-color: #e0f0ff; border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> H/I ←-----→ </div>		

Check here if continued on attached sheet

C FOOD TRAVEL SEMINARS Complete this section if a source other than your own governmental agency paid for or otherwise provided all or a portion of the following items to you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents, or a combination thereof: 1) Food and beverages costing over \$50 per occasion; 2) Travel occasions; or 3) Seminars, educational programs or other training.

Date Received	Donor's Name, City and State	Brief Description	Actual Dollar Amount	Value (Use Code)
<div style="background-color: #e0f0ff; border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> J Field trip disclosure clarification </div>				

Check here if continued on attached sheet

H	<p>RCW 42.17A.710(1)(e)</p> <p>WAC 390-24-205</p>
I	<p>RCW 42.17A.710(1)(e)</p>
J	<p>RCW 42.17A.710(1)(l) and (m)</p> <p>WAC 390-24-203</p>



711 CAPITOL WAY RM 200
 PO BOX 40908
 OLYMPIA WA 98504-0908
 (360) 753-1111
 TOLL FREE 1-877-601-2828

PDC FORM

F-1A
 (1/12)

PERSONAL FINANCIAL AFFAIRS STATEMENT
 Short Form

P M PDC OFFICE USE
 O A
 S R
 T K

The F-1A form is designed to simplify reporting for persons who have no changes or only minor changes to an F-1 report previously filed.
A complete F-1 form must be filed at least every four years; an F-1A form may be used for no more than three consecutive reports.
Deadlines: Incumbent elected and appointed officials -- by April 15.
 Candidates and others -- within two weeks of becoming a candidate or being newly appointed to a position.

DOLLAR CODE	AMOUNT
A	\$1 to \$3,999
B	\$4,000 to \$19,999
C	\$20,000 to \$39,999
D	\$40,000 to \$99,999
E	\$100,000 or more

R
E
C
E
I
V
E
D

Last Name _____ First _____ Middle Initial _____

Mailing Address (Use PO Box or Work Address) * _____

City _____ County _____ Zip + 4 _____

Names of immediate family members, including registered domestic partner. If there is no reportable information to disclose for dependent children, or other dependents living in your household, do not identify them. Do identify your spouse or registered domestic partner. See F-1 manual for details.

Filing Status (Check only one box.)

An elected or state appointed official filing annual report

Final report as an elected official. Term expired: _____

Candidate running in an election: month _____ year _____

Newly appointed to an elective office

Newly appointed to a state appointive office

Professional staff of the Governor's Office and the Legislature

Office Held or Sought

Office title: _____

County, city, district or agency of the office, name and number: _____

Position number: _____

Term begins: _____ ends: _____

Select either "No Change Report" or "Minor Change Report," whichever reflects your situation. Supply all the requested information.

NO CHANGE REPORT. I have reviewed my last complete F-1 report dated _____ and F-1A reports (if any) dated (1) _____ and (2) _____. The information disclosed on those reports is accurate for the current reporting period.

MINOR CHANGES REPORT. I have reviewed my last complete F-1 report dated _____. The changes listed below have occurred during the reporting period. Specify F-1 Form Item numbers and describe changes. Provide all information required on F-1 report.

Check here if continued on attached sheet

FOOD TRAVEL SEMINARS Complete this section if a source other than your own governmental agency paid for or otherwise provided all or a portion of the following items to you, your spouse, registered domestic partner or dependents, or a combination thereof: 1) Food and beverages costing over \$50 per occasion; 2) Travel occasions; or 3) Seminars, educational programs or other training.

Date Received	Donor's Name, City and State	Brief Description	Actual Dollar Amount	Value (Use Code)
Check here <input type="checkbox"/> if continued on attached sheet				

ALL FILERS EXCEPT CANDIDATES. Check the appropriate box.

I hold a state elected office, am an executive state officer or professional staff. I have read and am familiar with RCW 42.52.180 regarding the use of public resources in campaigns.

I hold a local elected office. I have read and am familiar with RCW 42.17A.555 regarding the use of public facilities in campaigns.

***CANDIDATES:** Do not use public agency addresses or telephone numbers for contact information

CERTIFICATION: I certify under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature _____ Date _____

Contact Telephone: () * _____

Email: _____ (work) *

Email: _____ (Home) Optional

Name

Select either "No Change Report" or "Minor Change Report," whichever reflects your situation. Supply all the requested information.

- NO CHANGE REPORT.** I have reviewed my last complete F-1 report dated _____ and F-1A reports (if any) dated (1) _____ and (2) _____. The information disclosed on those reports is accurate for the current reporting period.
- MINOR CHANGES REPORT.** I have reviewed my last complete F-1 report dated _____. The changes listed below have occurred during the reporting period. Specify F-1 Form Item numbers and describe changes. Provide all information required on F-1 report.

**FOOD
TRAVEL
SEMINARS** (Continued)

Date Received	Donor's Name, City and State	Brief Description	Actual Dollar Amount	Value (Use Code)
			\$	


 SEARCH

- HOME
- PUBLIC RESOURCES
- FILER RESOURCES
- SEARCH THE DATABASE
- VIEW REPORTS (ALL PAPER & E-FILED)
- ONLINE FILING

PDC News
ENFORCEMENT
May 22, 2014
(45-day Citizen Action Complaint) Report to Commission re: Supporters of I-522 (Organic Consumers Association; Organic Consumers F...
[Read More...](#)

[Past PDC News](#)

MEDIA RELEASES

PDC Media Release

- ELECTION TOTALS
- CANDIDATES
- COMMITTEES
- INDEPENDENT SPENDING
- LMC - LAST MINUTE CONTRIBUTIONS
- LOBBYING
- ADVANCED SEARCH

About this Web Site

The Washington State Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) Website is divided into five (5) Sections.

PDC Home

Find information on Commission meeting agendas, minutes, enforcement activity, laws, rules, rulemaking and stakeholder meetings.

NOTICE re: PETITION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER

Click Here

Petition For Declaratory Order

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS STATEMENTS


 SEARCH

- HOME
- PUBLIC RESOURCES
- FILER RESOURCES
- SEARCH THE DATABASE
- VIEW REPORTS (ALL PAPER & E-FILED)
- ONLINE FILING

PDC News
ENFORCEMENT
May 22, 2014
(45-day Citizen Action Complaint) Report to Commission re: Supporters of I-522 (Organic Consumers Association; Organic Consumers F...
[Read More...](#)

[Past PDC News](#)

MEDIA RELEASES

PDC Media Release

135

About this Web Site

The Washington State Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) Website is divided into five (5) Sections.

PDC Home

Find information on Commission meeting agendas, minutes, enforcement activity, laws, rules, rulemaking and stakeholder meetings.

- CANDIDATES
- COMMITTEES
- INDEPENDENT SPENDING
- LOBBYING
- COMPLIANCE
- ADVANCED SEARCH

NOTICE re: PETITION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER

Petition For



- HOME
- PUBLIC RESOURCES
- FILER RESOURCES
- SEARCH THE DATABASE
- VIEW REPORTS (ALL PAPER & E-FILED)
- ONLINE FILING
- ELECTION TOTALS
- CANDIDATES
- COMMITTEES
- INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES
- LAST MINUTE CONTRIBUTIONS
- LOBBYING
- ADVANCED

SEARCH THE DATABASE

- ELECTION TOTALS
- CANDIDATES
- POLITICAL COMMITTEES
- INDEPENDENT SPENDING
- LOBBYING
- ADVANCED SEARCH
- PERSONAL FINANCIAL AFFAIRS



- HOME
- PUBLIC RESOURCES
- FILER RESOURCES
- SEARCH THE DATABASE
- VIEW REPORTS (ALL PAPER & E-FILED)
- ONLINE FILING
- CANDIDATES
- COMMITTEES
- LOBBYING
- INDEPENDENT SPENDING
- COMPLIANCE
- LAST MINUTE CONTRIBUTIONS
- ADVANCED SEARCH

VIEW ACTUAL REPORTS

- CANDIDATES
- POLITICAL COMMITTEES
- LOBBYIST/EMPLOYER
- INDEPENDENT SPENDING
- COMPLIANCE
- ADVANCED SEARCH



Public Disclosure Commission
Shining Light on Washington Politics

HOME PUBLIC RESOURCES FILER RESOURCES **SEARCH THE DATABASE** VIEW REPORTS (ALL PAPER & E-FILED) ONLINE FILING

ELECTION TOTALS CANDIDATES COMMITTEES **INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES** LAST MINUTE CONTRIBUTIONS LOBBYING ADVANCED

CASH CONTRIBUTIONS INKIND CONTRIBUTIONS EXPENDITURES **INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES**

Cash Contributions for: GREGOIRE CHRISTINE O [Contact Information](#) [C1 Report](#)

Total Raised: \$339,403.55 **Total Spent:** \$339,403.55
Total IE Supporting: \$0.00 **Total IE Opposing:** \$0.00
(Cash Contributions (Inkind Contributions (Anonymous (Personal (Loans (Miscellaneous (Small Contributions
 \$337,265.16 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$8,677.79 \$21,307.50

NOTE: Click on a column header to sort by that column, or click on the icon to filter your results

Drag a column header and drop it here to group by that column

Report	Name	Date	Amount	P/G	City	State	Zip	Employer	Occupation
Report	ABBOTT LABORATORIES EMPLOYEE PAC	7/20/2009	\$1,600.00	P	NORTH CHICAGO	IL	60064		
Report	BAKER F. GREGORY	6/30/2009	\$1,600.00	P	BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	WA	98110	WESTWARD SEAFOODS	EXECUTIVE
Report	RIG I PAC	8/4/2009	\$1,600.00	P	RELIANCE	WA	980080459		

F-1 Report

New button could potentially link to:

- Copy of F-1 report,
- Selected F-1 data, or
- Public records request form.