

**State of Washington  
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: [pdc@pdc.wa.gov](mailto:pdc@pdc.wa.gov) • Website: [www.pdc.wa.gov](http://www.pdc.wa.gov)

**MINUTES –Regular Meeting**

Evergreen Plaza Building, Room 206  
711 Capitol Way  
Olympia, Washington

9:30 a.m.  
May 26, 2016

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT**

Katrina Asay, Chair  
Anne Levinson, Vice Chair  
John Bridges, Member  
Jack Johnson, Member

**STAFF PRESENT**

Evelyn Fielding Lopez, Executive Director  
Penny Allen, Assistant Attorney General  
Jana Greer, Executive Assistant  
James Gutholm, Chief Information Officer  
Lori Anderson, Communication and Training Officer  
Kurt Young, Compliance Officer  
Chip Beatty, Filer Specialist  
Jennifer Hansen, Filer Specialist

---

The regular meeting of the Public Disclosure Commission was called to order by Commission Chair Katrina Asay at 9:30 a.m.

**Opening Comments**

Commissioner Asay called the meeting to order.

**Citizens Comments/Concerns**

Will Knedlik addressed the Commission asking for assistance with a matter involving the misuse of approximately \$1.3 million in public monies and public resources in support of a proposed ballot measure on the upcoming November 8 election in three counties.

Mr. Knedlik has filed a complaint letter with the PDC today. The complaint outlines the particulars which identify the alleged misuse.

Mr. Knedlik stressed that this is an important matter because it is a substantial amount of money, the largest request for tax authority in the history of Washington state. The funding if approved by the local voters will make it impossible for the Legislature to fulfill its obligation under the *McCleary* decision.

Mr. Knedlik urged the Commission to give this matter consideration.

Evelyn Fielding Lopez acknowledged the receipt of the complaint, and explained that it will be assigned to an Investigator to begin reviewing.

*Next Steps/Follow up*

Complaint will be assigned to staff and assessed to determine appropriate action.

**Commissioner Comments/Concerns**

Commission Chair Katrina Asay welcomed Commissioner Jack Johnson to the Public Disclosure Commission and asked him to say a few words of introduction.

Mr. Johnson shared his professional history and what he brings with him to the Commission: a background in public service and open government.

## **Meeting Minutes**

April 28, 2016 Regular Meeting

Commissioner Asay thanked Jana Greer for her hard work and effort in supporting the Commission.

Ms. Asay stated that as times change, methodology changes also. The meeting minutes are the face of the Commission to the public, and the Commissioners would like to change some of the aspects of the meeting minute records

The Commission discussed the need to move from action items to some other format to capture discussion, and to more clearly show the deliverables and follow up steps to reflect the Commission's instructions and expectations.

Items to implement/change:

- Capture and clarify when there are additional statements made after a motion.
- Record and track follow up/next step items.  
Examples of items to capture from past minutes: The delegation of authority review was in response to a rule change, and it was to come back to the Commissioners in May or June; the penalty collection update should have indicated that staff would report back on items discussed.
- Capture the substantively important discussion and actions to be taken.
- Commission members will signal, during discussion, if additional information should be captured within the minutes.

Discussion items/topics should be explained in such a way that those not present at the meeting and the public can easily understand what transpired. The April 28, 2016 minutes were not approved. Revisions will be made, and the minutes will be brought back to the Commission for consideration.

### Next Steps/Follow up

Minutes from April will be edited and will come back for approval at the June meeting.

Next Steps and Follow up items will be captured at the bottom of each item discussed.

Requested changes to the general format and style will be implemented beginning with the April 2016 meeting minutes.

Chip Beatty presented an informational training on the candidate and committee registration forms process.

The C1 registration form is required if the candidate is running for statewide, legislative, county wide office, other offices in districts with more than 5000 registered voters, or if the campaign plans to raise more than \$5000 (including candidate's own money).

Committees file the C1pc when they expect to receive contributions or make expenditures in support or opposition to any candidate or ballot measure.

Commissioner Levinson asked if the form required filers to update information if any item changes. Mr. Beatty noted that this is stated on the back of the form.

## **Training**

Commissioner Levinson also asked staff to determine if there is a need for clarity on section 7 of the form, where it asks for all committee members. She suggested simplifying information on the back regarding who is required to file by changing it to everyone is required to file except for the few campaigns that are not required to file.

Next Steps/Follow up Determine if there is a need for more clarity on section 7 of the C1 form and report back to the Commission at the June 2016 regular meeting.

### **Lobbyist Demonstration**

James Gutholm demonstrated the Lobbyist application highlighting the additions made to the “help” section and other features since the last demonstration. He noted that in a week the stakeholder group will get test access to the new system to try out the application.

Mr. Gutholm and staff are working on a release strategy for the new application, keeping in mind the timing of report filing dates. He will continue to update the Commission through the Information Technology activity report and in meetings.

### **Reporting Modification**

*Aaron Chad Allred – Superior Court Judge, King County Superior Court Depart. 34*

Jennifer Hansen presented Judge Aaron Allred’s request for reporting modification to the Commission for consideration.

Judge Allred requested a reporting modification that would exempt him from reporting his residential address/real estate including the street address, parcel number, or legal description, on his 2015 Personal Financial Affairs Statement, as well as a retroactive modification for his residence previously listed on the F-1 report filed in May 2014. As a Superior Court Judge he has sentenced, and will continue to sentence, defendants for violent crimes and therefore would like his residential address redacted.

Ms. Hansen noted that by not disclosing his residential address, Judge Allred felt that it will not hinder the public’s ability to ensure whether a conflict of interest exists.

Staff recommended approval of the request.

### **Motion 16-26**

Moved by Commissioner Bridges, seconded by Commissioner Levinson that:

**The Commission grant the partial reporting modification as requested, finding that literal application would cause a manifestly unreasonable hardship on the applicant and that a limited modification would not frustrate the purposes of the act.**

The motion passed.

### **Follow Up From Prior Meetings**

Letter From Legislators  
Regarding Freedom  
Foundation

In March the PDC received a letter from Legislators requesting that the PDC take a look at the Freedom Foundation (FF) and provide answers to three questions:

1. Do the Freedom Foundation’s actions disqualify it from tax exemptions, such as under RCW 82.04.3651(2)(c), which states that no organization shall qualify as a non-

profit if its activities include a “substantial amount of political activity”?

2. Do the Freedom Foundation’s activities qualify as in-kind contributions to candidates and/or political parties, and do they, or the beneficiaries of their actions, violate Washington Public Disclosure Commission rules regarding political activity?
3. Is the Freedom Foundation at risk of violating any other state rules regarding non-profit activity?

A similar letter was sent to the Attorney General.

Director Lopez referenced the Attorney General’s responses and added that the questions about state tax laws fall outside the authority and expertise of the PDC and is more appropriate for the State Department of Revenue to address; the question about whether the Freedom Foundation is at risk of violating any other State rules regarding non-profit activity is vague, and probably outside the expertise of the PDC as well. The Attorney General has provided general information regarding the campaign finance and political committee complaint that is currently in litigation.

The second question, regarding in-kind contributions, does fall within the PDC’s expertise and authority. It might be helpful for the PDC to provide some general information regarding the standards for making and reporting in-kind contributions in addition to responding to the specific question. We could also provide an overview of other issues that we have looked at regarding the Freedom Foundation.

Staff recommended sending a letter back to the Legislators that is similar to the response from the Attorney General, clarifying what areas fall within the expertise and authority of the PDC, and what issues should be addressed by other State agencies.

Stephanie Olson, was present and addressed the Commission. She is litigation counsel to Freedom Foundation. She agreed that questions 1 and 3 have no oversight by the PDC, and noted that the current status of the campaign finance lawsuit against the Freedom Foundation is that it was dismissed in superior court.

Ms. Olson stated that the Freedom Foundation has not engaged in prohibited activity, seeks to inform workers of their constitutional rights, and it believes that these repeated attacks are simply ideological.

Commissioner Bridges stated that regarding question 2, in his opinion, the PDC can't answer and should not answer as we would be pre-adjudicating on an issue that we don't have details on. The PDC could simply state the law regarding in-kind contributions, but he has a concern about going too far.

Commissioner Johnson stated that it could be an educational statement about what is within jurisdiction of the PDC.

Commissioner Levinson agreed with Commissioner Johnson.

Commissioner Asay agreed. She also noted that if there is a specific concern, then there is a formal complaint process and that could be used to provide for an investigation.

The Commission's preference is for staff to draft a response written at the request of the Commission for the Director to sign.

Next Steps/Follow up

Prepare a response for the Director to sign, written at the request of the Commission.

**Strategic Plan**

Preliminary ideas for 2017 legislative package:

Director Lopez discussed preliminary ideas for 2017 legislative package.

The funding of the PDC legal expenses has become a critical issue this year. It is imperative that a component is built into the budget to avoid this in the future.

Director Lopez met with the Attorney General's office to discuss the beginnings of ideas of how to develop a coordinated approach in getting legislation passed, and also received some ideas for possible legislative changes from the PDC's policy contact at the Governor's Office.

As a starting point, the following ideas were discussed as options:

- Increase the PDC budget to handle the increased campaign finance litigation costs; an original supplemental request of \$200,000 this year was denied. It would be beneficial to obtain \$400,000 in the next biennial budget for these types of costs.
- Establish a litigation fund. A fund where a percentage of the amount awarded would be placed and used for future litigation costs.

Any monies received now as a result of litigation go directly into the General Fund.

There may be some sensitivity in the Legislature to giving the PDC a dedicated fund for litigation, or to authority to retain a portion of the penalties. The concern would be the same as with other agencies, that the agency might file more cases in order to increase its budget. One option discussed was that there could be dedicated funding simply for ballot initiative litigation since those cases tend to be the 'big ticket' items that have driven costs.

- Review of the 45-day citizen action complaint process.

Director Lopez reviewed the process and the consequences to the State if a citizen files an action under RCW 42.17A.765(4). Due to the time limits involved in a 45-day letter complaint, staff is required to re-prioritize already important and timely matters to assess and respond the request.

A cap on legal fees related to these complaints could be an

option that would allow the PDC to better manage resources and cases. There are a number of items that the Attorney General's Office would like to change in this process too if the PDC wanted to develop a proposal to amend the statute.

- Search for new Commissioners and the process.  
Taking a look at changing some of the prohibitions on Commissioner political activity in RCW 42.17A.100. Could some political activity be allowed, for example national political campaigns since they are regulated by the FEC not the PDC? If the Commission wanted to pursue this, Staff would work directly with the Governor's office to see if they were in support of this.
- 2016 legislative proposals: All of the 2016 proposed bills were provided to the Commissioners, and information on the 2015 proposals. If the Commissioners wanted to reintroduce the prior proposals in some format, Director Lopez suggested
  - Combining legislative requests into packages
  - Not pursuing the request on mandating electronic filing this session.

Commissioner Levinson asked that last year's list of identified issues for possible legislation (a larger list than the final legislative proposals), as well as any legislative items discussed during the strategic planning process and those raised during the year as a result of enforcement actions and stakeholder input be incorporated into the current list of items for the Commission to consider. She also asked that the Commission review proposed rule-making at the same time it is considering proposed legislation so as to have a more comprehensive picture.

The Commission discussed whether it wanted to have a special meeting before the regular June meeting to discuss possible legislative proposals or to have that discussion as part of the June meeting. The Commission asked if Director Lopez could send a revised proposed legislative agenda in the next couple of weeks so that Commissioners could assess whether they'd prefer to have a special meeting with more time for discussion.

Next Steps/Follow up

Director Lopez will provide a revised list of legislative and rules proposals for consideration at either a special meeting before the June meeting or at the June meeting.

Format of commission meeting materials:

This was identified a strategic plan item: Input on the current format of the meeting materials and needs for Commission meetings.

The Commissioners' consensus was that they were fine with receiving electronic versions of the meeting materials, but they asked to have documents and materials sent to them as soon as they are available so that they will have ample time to review. It is fine to send materials in parts, especially when there is a high volume of material as there has tended to be with enforcement matters.

For enforcement matters, the Commissioners agreed that it was very important to have a planned schedule for anything that would be coming to them. They need to have time to review materials and talk with their legal counsel before the hearing, and they need enough time before the hearing so that they can ask the parties to provide additional information or be ready to answer specific questions.

Director Lopez noted that the protocol is to have pre-hearing conferences for all hearings to be heard by the full Commission, and as part of that process there would be a case schedule established for witness lists and briefs. But, scheduling has recently been somewhat problematic—and that case materials such as the report of investigation and charges in one matter were provided to the Commissioners a couple of months before the hearings occurred.

The Commission would like to continue to get a notification of items when it looks as if the matter will go to a full hearing. This allows for planning for the Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson suggested looking at having the meeting agenda become an accessible online document that can be viewed as materials are added; an evolving document. One option could be to allow the Commission access while the agenda and materials are unpublished, and then publish the final agenda and materials prior to the meeting for the public to view.

Next Steps/Follow up

Look at the option of having the meeting agenda become an accessible online document that can be viewed as materials are added, an evolving document. The Commission would have access to the unpublished version, and then publish the final version prior to the meeting for the public to view.

45-day Citizen Action  
Complaints

Director Lopez informed the Commission of two 45-day Citizen Action letters.

The first matter was recently filed with the Attorney General's Office against Tim Eyman for placing "hit" ads on Democratic legislators. Linda Dalton, Sr. AAG, has spoken with PDC staff members about some of the assertions, and noted that a briefing with Attorney General Ferguson will occur. The AGO will notify the PDC if we are asked to weigh in on this matter.

Director Lopez reported on the 45-Day letter filed by the Automotive Trade Organization (AUTO). This is very similar to the rulemaking petition AUTO filed earlier this year, except the complaint is filed against the Friends of Bob Ferguson campaign. The allegation is that the campaign accepted illegal campaign contributions by accepting contributions from the Snoqualmie and Muckleshoot Indian tribes.

Director Lopez noted that under current statutes, as interpreted by the PDC, the contributions were legal and within the contribution limits. The assertion of AUTO is that any money in the possession of an Indian Tribe is "public funds" and because

there is a statute that says that public funds may not be used for campaign finances. AUTO asserts that any monies from a tribe may not be accepted.

Since the complaint is filed against the Bob Ferguson campaign, the AGO is conflicted out and has sent this matter to the PDC and the King County Prosecutor's office for review. The AGO has suggested that King County could take the lead, or the PDC could hire outside counsel to address this matter.

The King County Prosecutor's office has declined to investigate, and has deferred to the PDC on this matter. The PDC's procedural difficulty is that the statute that covers the hiring of an outside counsel for activities such as investigation of complaints or legal advice to the PDC, does not cover the 45-day letter matters. Director Lopez does not think that RCW 42.17A.765(4) allows the PDC to stand in the shoes of the AGO in this matter. Additionally the PDC does not have the funding at this time (the last month of the fiscal year) to hire outside counsel.

Next Steps/Follow up

Director Lopez will send a letter to AUTO referencing the previous response to a rule-making petition, and explain that under the current definition of public funds, contributions from Tribes would not be prohibited, and candidates are not prohibited from accepting these contributions.

**Executive Session**

The Commission went into Executive Session at 12:00 p.m. to discuss matters allowed in executive session pursuant to RCW 42.30.110, including but not limited to discussion of enforcement matters, pending and potential litigation with legal counsel, and review of performance of public employees.

Possible action regarding pending litigation, or other matters properly discussed during executive session, will be taken following the executive session.

The Commission returned to open session at 1:01 p.m.

**Enforcement**

Hearing:

**PDC Case 735** | *National Rifle Association of America: Washingtonians Opposed to I-594 &*

Kurt Young presented the PDC staff allegations in two related matters: First, that the National Rifle Association of America: Washingtonians Opposed to I-594 (NRA WA PAC), a political committee registered with the PDC, allegedly violated RCW 42.17A.235 and 42.17A.240 by failing to timely file reports disclosing contribution and expenditure activities undertaken by the committee in opposition to I-594. Second, that National Rifle Association of America (NRA of America), a lobbyist employer registered with the PDC, allegedly violated RCW 42.17A.630 by failing to timely file monthly lobbyist employer contribution reports (L-3c report) disclosing contributions made of more than \$100 to support or oppose a statewide ballot proposition.

Mr. Young presented a stipulated settlement to the Commission for consideration.

Jason Torchinsky and Steve Donaldson, attorneys with Holtzman, Vogel, Josefiak, Torchinsky, PLLC, counsel for the

respondents, participated via telephone.

After hearing from both parties the Commission went into a brief recess for the purpose of deliberations.

Commissioner Levinson proposed modifications to the stipulation regarding the suspended portion of the penalty for NRA of America to state that there would be no violations of any PDC statutes and rules within the four-year time period.

Mr. Donaldson stated that the NRA is concerned about the possibility of any minute error, or scrivener's error, resulting in a \$5000 penalty, and asked, alternatively, could the period of risk be 2 years rather than 4 years?

Commissioner Levinson stated that as the maker of the motion she is not inclined to shorten the time frame, but would state for clarification that the suspended amount of the penalty would remain suspended if there were no material violations of PDC statutes or rules requiring a brief or full enforcement hearing within 4 years. The parties agreed to this language and amended the stipulation to add this provision. The amended stipulated penalty would be as follows:

- The Respondent, National Rifle Association of America Washingtonians Opposed to I-594, is assessed a civil penalty of \$10,000 for the violations of RCW 42.17A.235 and .240 to be paid within 60 days of the date of the PDC Order.
- The Respondent, National Rifle Association of America, is assessed a civil penalty of \$10,000 for the violations of RCW 42.17A.630, of which \$5,000 is suspended on the conditions that there are no further material violations of RCW 42.17A or PDC Rules resulting in a Full Commission Hearing or a PDC Brief Adjudicative Proceeding for four years from the date of the Order, and the \$5,000 non-suspended portion of the penalty is to be paid within 60 days of the date of the PDC Order.

#### **Motion 16-27**

Moved by Commissioner Levinson, seconded by Commissioner Johnson that:

**The Commission accept the Stipulation with modification to the language as discussed. The Commission assess a penalty of \$10,000 against the National Rifle Association of America Washingtonians Opposed to I-594 to be paid within 60 days of the date of the order in this matter. In addition, the Commission assess a penalty of \$10,000 against the National Rifle Association of America, of which \$5,000 is suspended on the conditions that there are no further material violations of RCW 42.17A or PDC Rules resulting in a full Commission hearing or a PDC brief adjudicatory proceeding for four years from the date of the order in this matter, and that the \$5,000 non-suspended portion of the penalty is to be paid within 60 days of the date of the order in this matter.**

The motion passed.

Next Steps/Follow up

Final Order will be sent within 10 business days.

Request for Reconsideration:  
**PDC Case 16-015** | *Michael Cusick*, Fire Commissioner for Okanogan Fire District No. 3

Kurt Young presented Mr. Cusick's request for reconsideration of the final Order in PDC Case 16-015.

Michael Cusick participated by telephone.

Mr. Cusick is a Fire Commissioner for Okanogan Fire District No. 3, He is seeking reconsideration by the Commission of a final order entered in an Enforcement Hearing before the Full Commission in PDC Case No. 16-015 for failing to file his annual Personal Financial Affairs Statement (F1 report).

Staff noted that Mr. Cusick has now filed all outstanding F1s. Mr. Cusick stated that he did attempt to electronically file the report, and the computer would signal that there was no report due, so he thought it was fine.

Commissioner Johnson inquired as to whether staff had counted the days to determine if the motion for reconsideration had been timely filed. Ms. Allen clarified that the PDC WAC [390-37-150] subsection (3) indicates that the request must be filed within 21 business days after service of the decision. Director Lopez commented that if it is 21 business days you could have 4 ½ weeks right there. Commissioner Johnson noted that even with 21 business days that may have passed before the request, but he didn't want to bog down the process. Mr. Young noted that the respondent had also called the PDC before filing the request and it was his understanding that a party could request reconsideration orally as well.

Mr. Young was asked for staff's position on the order, and he responded that given the confusion over the respondent's address, and the difficulties with electronically filing F1s, staff would be open to reducing the penalty in Mr. Cusick's case.

Director Lopez stated that she had added a note to look at the reconsideration information that the PDC was providing with orders as it might not be accurate.

The Commission took a brief adjudication recess to discuss the case with legal counsel.

**Motion 16-28**

Moved by Commissioner Levinson, seconded by Commissioner Bridges that:

**The Commission grant the request for reconsideration.**

The motion passed.

**Motion 16-29**

Moved by Commissioner Levinson, seconded by Commissioner Bridges that:

**The Commission suspend \$500 of the original \$750 penalty assessed against Mr. Cusick on the condition that there are no further violations of PDC statutes or rules for a period of 4 years from the date of the order and that the \$250 penalty is paid within 30 days.**

The motion passed.

Commissioner Levinson noted that as a follow up for staff, there should be a review of the rule on motions for reconsideration to look at the time period of 21 days, the use of business days, and anything else that would increase clarity in the rule. She noted that requests for reconsideration come up infrequently so a review would be helpful.

Commissioner Bridges noted that it would be unusual for a reconsideration period to be 40 days. Director Lopez commented that staff would look into this.

Next Steps/Follow up

Final Order will be sent within 10 business days.

Staff will review the reconsideration and appeals information included with orders.

The PDC rule on motions for reconsideration, the time periods for requesting reconsideration and the use of “business days” compared with calendar days for calculating time periods, will be added to the list of possible rule-makings that the Commission will be reviewing in June and July

Report to Commission:

**PDC Case 13-016** | *National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML)-National; NORML – Washington; NORML-Pierce County*

Kurt Young presented Staff’s recommendation to the Commission to send a letter to Attorney General’s Office dismissing a 45-Day Citizen Action Complaint against National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML)-National; NORML-Washington; and NORML-Pierce County alleging the entities failed to register and report as political committees in support of I-502, concerning legalization of marijuana.

PDC staff investigation determined that there was no evidence that the three groups, NORML-National, NORML\_Washington, or NORML-Pierce County, solicited contributions or made expenditures in support of the ballot initiative. There was no evidence that the groups were political committees or required to register and report with the PDC.

Staff recommended that the Commission dismiss the complaint, and recommend no further action to the Attorney General.

**Motion 16-30**

Moved by Commissioner Bridges, seconded by Commissioner Johnson that:

**The Commission dismiss PDC case 13-016, and return the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation for no further action.**

The motion passed.

## **Process Review Update**

Director Lopez updated the Commission on the status of reviewing PDC processes, part of the PDC's ongoing process improvement initiatives, started in 2015.

Lori Anderson reported on the recent process improvement review of closing procedures for case files, what is included, retained, and how the information is captured and posted on the website.

### *Next Steps/Follow up*

Next steps are to reconvene and finalize the updated process regarding closing procedures.

## **Staff Reports**

Executive Director

Director Lopez discussed the PDC Budget issue regarding the over-expenditure on legal expenses this fiscal year. She has continued discussions with the Attorney General's Office about the current and future legal expenses and how to approach paying for current charges as well as future budget planning.

The Commission had previously requested an updated Delegation of Authority, and a draft Delegation had been discussed at the April meeting. Director Lopez noted that this is still under development, and she has been reviewing the delegations used by other agencies. Director Lopez will continue to look for other comparisons and will bring a revised draft back to the Commissioners for review in June.

Commissioner Johnson recommended a source for good examples is the University of Washington, and suggested contacting the UW Division at the Attorney General's Office.

Director Lopez reported on the status of pending compliance matters. The compliance division will be at 18 open matters after the enforcement actions in the May meeting. Staff continues to make great and timely progress. Most open matters are in final stages, writing up the report of investigation, or moving toward hearing.

The compliance staff goal has been to clear these items in anticipation of the complaints that may arise during this summer's election season.

Chief Technology Officer

James Gutholm reported that since the launching of the new PDC website, the website traffic has been over 32,000 unique visitors to the home page and 33,000 unique users of the query system. About 10% of users are using the search function on home page. Staff have been fine tuning certain searches, so now if you put in lobbyist you will get "starting out on the right foot" in the first results.

Mr. Gutholm noted that it is also declaration time for candidate filing and the PDC collaborates with the Secretary of State (SOS) to exchange data. This year IT started working with the SOS codes and their database of voter identification to better correlate the candidate names on declarations. This method has produced

a more complete list and is an improved process for eliminating duplicate names.

Customer Service

Following up on F1 compliance, Lori Anderson reported that staff have sent reminders to those required to file annual F1 reports, but still had about 15% unfiled reports at the end of April. Staff have been contacting the offices and organizations of the people who did not file, as the Commission had suggested trying to see if that increased responsiveness. Out of the 850 people who had not filed, PDC staff have alerted the jurisdictions associated with 650 of those filers, and about half of them have now filed. Staff will continue with the contacts.

With the end of June approaching we should start thinking about the PDC's Annual Report. Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners to send any ideas for topics for the Annual Report to her.

Next Steps/Follow up

Commissioners should send any ideas regarding Annual Report to Ms. Anderson.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

**Approved**

June 23, 2016.