



COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT

All information on this form is private and confidential until a finding is issued by the Board.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE & PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BOARD
04 OCT -4 AM 11:50

Information about complaint filer

Name of complaint filer	HARLIN TAYLOR	
Address	RR 2, BOX 83	
City, state, zip	LANESBORO, MN 55949	Daytime telephone no. 507-867-1268 (W) 507-467-2347 (H)

Identify person/entity you are complaining about

Name of person/entity being complained about	PEOPLE FOR (GREGORY) DAVIDS COMMITTEE	
Address	308 PLEASANT ST NE	
City, state, zip	PRESTON, MN 55965	
Title of respondent (if applicable)		
Board/Department/Agency/District # (if legislator)		

Harlin Taylor
Signature of person filing complaint

10-1-04
Date

Send completed form to: Campaign Finance & Public Disclosure Board
Suite 190, Centennial Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155

If you have questions call: 651/296-1721; 800/657-3889; or
for TTY/TDD communication contact us through the Minn. Relay Service at 800/627-3529

Board staff may also be reached by e-mail at: cf.board@state.mn.us.

This document is available in alternative formats to individuals with disabilities by calling 651/296-5148; 800/657-3889; or through the Minnesota Relay Service at 800/627-3529.

Minn. Stat. Section 10A.01 subd. 26

Give the statute cite of the portion of Chapter 10A, or Minn. Rules you believe has been violated.

You will find the complete text of Minn. Stat. §10A and Minn. Rules Chapters 4501 - 4525 on the Board's website at www.cfboard.state.mn.us

Nature of complaint

Explain in detail why you believe the respondent has violated Chapter 10A, the Ethics in Government Act. Attach an extra sheet of paper if necessary. Attach any documents, materials, minutes, resolutions or other evidence which support your allegations.

see Attached 1 page "Addendum to complaint of September 17, 2004 against the People for (Gregory) DAVIDS committee", dated October 1, 2004

Minn. Stat. 10A.02, subd 11 - Violations; enforcement.

The board shall investigate any alleged violation filed in writing with the board. For an alleged violation of sections 10A.25 (expenditure limits) or 10A.27 (additional limits) the board shall either enter into a conciliation agreement or make a public finding of whether or not there is probable cause, within 60 days of the filing of the complaint. For alleged violations of all other sections, the board shall within 30 days after the filing of the complaint make a public finding of whether or not there is probable cause to believe a violation has occurred.

The deadline for action may be extended by a majority vote of the board. Within a reasonable time after beginning an investigation of an individual or association, the board shall notify that individual or association of the fact of the investigation. The board shall make no finding without notifying the individual or association of the nature of the allegations and affording an opportunity to answer those allegations.

Any hearing or action of the board concerning a complaint or investigation shall be confidential until the board makes a public finding concerning probable cause or enters into a conciliation agreement.

Except as provided in section 10A.28, after the board makes a public finding of probable cause the board shall report that finding to the appropriate law enforcement authorities.

October 1, 2004

From: Hanson for House Committee
RR 2, Box 83, Lanesboro, MN 55949

To: Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board
190 Centennial Building, 658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: Addendum to complaint of September 17, 2004 against the People for (Gregory) Davids Committee.

This is an addendum to **ISSUE FIVE**: "Should the expense of \$5,172.81 for "I have an idea for you" ads be re-classified from noncampaign disbursements to campaign expenditures? Evidence that these ads are designed and used "to influence the nomination or election of a candidate" rather than "constitute(s) a valid constituent service" is presented with the following two points:

1. The total expenditures for these ads go up in campaign years and down in noncampaign years.

campaign year 2000:	\$1,544.02
noncampaign year 2001:	\$821.66
campaign year 2002:	\$7,342.22
noncampaign year 2003:	\$2,177.96
Year to date on 8/23/04:	\$5,738.47

2. In the campaign year of 2002, the Davids committee placed "Idea Ads" in newspapers that were published and circulated outside of Representative Davids District of 31B. The ads listed as noncampaign disbursement, "constituent services" were directed to the then constituents of Michelle Rifenburg of District 32B. Caledonia, La Crescent and Rushford were in District 32B not District 31B at the time of these ads. These ads, at these dates, to these persons cannot be classified as constituent services because few, if any, of the subscribers to these newspapers were 31B constituents. These subscribers were; however, future voters in a redrawn District 31B in the upcoming fall 2002 election. Targeting non-constituents (albeit, future voters) with "Idea Ads" speaks volumes as to the real purpose and intent of these ads:

\$511.97 incorrectly classified as "Constituent services," noncampaign disbursements:
6/26/04, 7/22/04, 8/14/04; Caledonia; ECM Publishing, Inc (Caledonia Argus)
7/15/04, 7/18/04; La Crescent; Houston County News
7/08/04, 7/18/04; Rushford; Tri-County Record

\$2,126.17 correctly classified as campaign expenditures was spent in 2002 for "Idea Ads" in these same papers (plus the Spring Grove Herald, also in 32B at the time). The majority of money spent by the Davids Committee on "Idea Ads" is for ads that ran in Aug, Sept and Oct of this election year.

The "Idea Ad" used by the Davids Committee, in and of itself, does not provide a specific constituent service as contained in Minn. Stat. Section 10A.01, subd. 26. It does; however, serve the purpose of enhancing Rep. Davids name recognition and visibility. Based on when and where "Idea Ads" were published, they are clearly intended to influence future voters rather than to provide services to current or specific constituents.

We also ask the Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board to shed light on the following statement printed in the September 27, 2004 issue of the Fillmore County Journal: *Davids defended his use of paid newspaper surveys and "idea" ads, saying that they were pre-approved ten years ago by the campaign board.* We are not aware of any such approval of "Idea Ads". We would amend our complaint accordingly if documentation of this approval exists.