



FACT

FOUNDATION FOR
ACCOUNTABILITY
AND CIVIC TRUST

July 6, 2022

Michigan Department of State
Bureau of Elections
Richard H. Austin Building, 1st Floor
430 W. Allegan
Lansing, Michigan 48918

Email: elections@michigan.gov

Re: Campaign Finance Complaint against **One Fair Wage Action**

To the Michigan Department of State:

The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust (FACT) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting accountability, ethics, and transparency in government and civic arenas. We achieve this mission by hanging a lantern over public officials who put their own interest over the interests of the public good. We submit this complaint, pursuant to the Michigan Campaign Finance Act section 169.215, to request the Department of State immediately investigate and take appropriate enforcement action against One Fair Wage Action, 45 Mt. Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.¹

One Fair Wage Action is a 501(c)(4) organization that is not registered as a ballot question committee, but its activity clearly demonstrates it should have registered as a committee and filed the required reports.² **From December 2021 to April 2022, One Fair Wage Action contributed \$1,808,000 to a ballot question committee, Raise the Wage.** While this is a substantial amount to contribute in approximately four months, it was also a substantial amount to Raise the Wage—**comprising over 99.9% of its total funding during that period.** In fact, with the exception of a separate \$110 contribution, One Fair Wage Action was Raise the Wage's only contributor.

¹ One Fair Wage Action's website is: <https://onefairwage.site>.

² See, e.g., *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021) (attached as Exhibit A).

The two organizations are also tied to one another through Raise the Wage's Treasurer, who also works for One Fair Wage Action. Additionally, the specific details surrounding One Fair Wage Action's contributions and Raise the Wage's expenditures demonstrate the two entities were not independent of one another. One Fair Wage Action's initial \$1.35 million in contributions were made within 15 days of Raise the Wage forming, but thereafter One Fair Wage Action's contributions corresponded with Raise the Wage's expenditures in the exact same or similar amounts.

It is not a violation for an organization to make contributions to a ballot question committee.³ However it is "a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization's donors from the reporting requirements of the Act."⁴ The facts of this case demonstrate that this is precisely what occurred here, and they far exceed the facts in a 2021 Department decision that found organizations "were soliciting or receiving funds for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting the ballot question committee." Thus, we request the Department investigate and find there is reason to believe that a violation of the MCFA occurred.⁵

I. Law.

Under Michigan law, a "committee" is defined as an organization:

"that receives contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the action of the voters for or against the nomination or election of a candidate, the qualification, passage, or defeat of a ballot question, or the qualification of a new political party, if contributions received total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year or expenditures made total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year."⁶

The statute further specifies that an organization does not meet the definition of a committee solely because it makes an expenditure to a ballot question committee or an independent expenditure committee.⁷ However, the organization does meet the definition of a committee if it

³ *Id.* (citing MCL 169.203(4)).

⁴ *Id.* (citing MCL 169.203(4)).

⁵ MCL 169.15(10).

⁶ MCL 169.203(4).

⁷ *Id.*

“solicits or receives contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to that ballot question committee or independent expenditure committee.”⁸

Whether or not an organization meets the definition of a committee is consequential because a committee is required to report and publicly disclose information. An organization must file a statement of organization within ten days of formation and thereafter file statements disclosing the organization’s contributions and expenditures.⁹ If an organization fails to file the required statements, civil or criminal penalties are imposed.¹⁰

To determine whether an organization has “solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to a ballot question committee” and thus has become a committee itself, the Department examines facts showing the two organizations are not independent of one another.¹¹ For instance, prior to 2021, some specific facts the Department considered when it found a corporation has become a committee are: (1) the corporation and ballot question committee formed within a short period of time; (2) the organizations had the same officers; (3) the percentage of the ballot question committee’s total funding that was from the corporation; and (4) the flow of money between the corporation and ballot question committee demonstrated a relationship between the two groups.¹²

Then in an October 27, 2021 decision, the Michigan Department of State considered the case of *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Finance Complaint filed May 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021) (2021 Complaint). This

⁸ *Id.*; *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021); *LaBrant v. Unlock Michigan*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed Sept. 17, 2020 (decision filed April 9, 2021).

⁹ MCL 169.224.

¹⁰ *See, e.g.*, MCL 169.234.

¹¹ *Id.*; *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021) (explaining evidence the corporation raised significant funds, contributed the funds to a ballot question committee within the calendar year the funds were raised, and the ballot question committee immediately paid vendors supported a finding the corporation was a committee and must register with the Department); *LaBrant v. Unlock Michigan*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed Sept. 17, 2020 (decision filed April 9, 2021) (explaining evidence the corporation and ballot question committee are controlled by the same individuals and functioning as the same entity support a finding the corporation is a committee and must register with the Department).

¹² *LaBrant v. Unlock Michigan*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed Sept. 17, 2020 (decision filed April 9, 2021); *Turnaround Detroit v. Detroit Forward*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint (decision filed April 9, 2014), available at: https://www.michigan.gov/-/media/Project/Websites/sos/14delrio/Turnaround_Detroit_V_Detroit_Forward_and_MCEF_pt_2.pdf?rev=0e1efb6028ff45389da6de8c305aa677 (finding the corporation was required to file as a committee when it contributed over 33% of the ballot question committee’s total funding during the entire Detroit mayoral election cycle and was its largest contributor).

case involved two 501(c)(4) organizations, Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility (MCFR) and Michigan! My Michigan! (MMM), which were not registered as committees themselves but had made contributions to a ballot question committee, Unlock Michigan (Unlock).¹³

The Department had two pieces of evidence which led to their ruling: (1) the organizations' 2019 form 990 showing their assets at the end of the year and (2) the amount of contributions they gave as disclosed by Unlock in 2020.¹⁴ MCFR had \$715,137 in assets at the end of calendar year 2019 and contributed approximately \$1,780,000 to Unlock from June to October 2020.¹⁵ MMM had \$172,452 in assets at the end of calendar year 2019 and contributed approximately \$550,000 to Unlock from June to October 2022.¹⁶

There was no evidence of the date or amount of contributions received by MCFR and MMM throughout 2020 or the total amount of their assets at any particular point during the year.¹⁷ Both MCFR and MMM filed affidavits stating that they neither "solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to Unlock Michigan or any other ballot question committee."¹⁸

After comparing MCFR and MMM's assets at the beginning of 2020 and the contributions each made to the ballot question committee during the year, the Department found that the assets MCFR and MMM each contributed to the ballot question committee during 2020 "far exceeds the assets controlled by the organizations" at the beginning of the year.¹⁹ Additionally, MCFR and MMM made contributions to the ballot question committee "within days of similarly sized payments" from the ballot question committee to its vendor, which demonstrated coordination "to some extent."²⁰ The Department found there "may be reason to believe" that MCFR and MMM should have registered as committees themselves and filed the required statements.²¹ The decision explained:

¹³ *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

“As previously stated, it is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization’s donors from the reporting requirements of the Act. The fundraising necessary to allow MCFR to contribute \$1,780,000 to Unlock and MMM to contribute \$550,000 to Unlock from June to October 2020 is substantial. Although it may be possible that each entity raised those funds in the first half of 2020 independently of each entity’s support for Unlock, to assume that the aggressive fundraising activity necessary for each organization to raise the sums that were then transferred to Unlock was completely independent strains credulity. The disparity between each organization’s assets going into 2020, the amount that each organization contributed to Unlock, and the timing of those contributions demonstrate a level of coordination showing the entities were not independent of each other.

In particular, the number of payments that MCFR and/or MMM made to Unlock days before Unlock made similarly sized payments to NPM suggests that MCFR and MMM were soliciting or receiving funds for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting Unlock. Such fundraising for the purpose of supporting a ballot question committee, as is evidenced in the instant case, makes MCFR and MMM themselves ballot question committees responsible for registration and for filing appropriate campaign statements under the MCFA, but neither organization, to date, has registered as a committee nor filed those campaign statements as required by sections 24 and 33 of the Act.

Given the coordination between Unlock, the proximity of contributions made to Unlock and the expenditures made by Unlock, and the fact that neither MCFR nor MMM would have been able to make such contributions to Unlock without soliciting/receiving additional funds during 2020, there is reason to believe that MCFR and MMM may have solicited/received funds for the purpose of making contributions to Unlock.”²²

Therefore, in addition to the factors established by the Department prior to the 2021 Complaint, one factual scenario where the Department found an organization “solicits or receives contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to that ballot question committee” and is thus a ballot question committee itself is when: (1) the organization solicited funds prior to or simultaneously with making contributions to a ballot question committee, and (2) the amount or timing of either contributions from the organization or payments the ballot question committee makes to its vendors indicate coordination.

²² *Id.*

II. Analysis

Issue Presented: Whether One Fair Wage Action Is A Committee Thereby Mandating Registration Obligations With the Department.

One Fair Wage Action is a social welfare organization formed under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, the same as MCFR and MMM in the 2021 Complaint.²³ **From December 2021 to April 2022, One Fair Wage Action contributed \$1,808,000 to a ballot question committee, Raise the Wage.**²⁴ One Fair Wage Action's contributions were also "substantial" to Raise the Wage—**comprising 99.9% of Raise the Wage's total funding during that period.**²⁵ In fact, One Fair Wage Action was Raise the Wage's only contributor with the exception of a \$110 contribution from one individual.²⁶ Simply put, Raise the Wage would not have existed without One Fair Wage Action.

It is important to note that the two organizations are clearly tied to one another. The Treasurer for Raise the Wage is Chantel Watkins.²⁷ The Department previously explained a treasurer is in a unique position to know the finances of an organization and when it is in need of a "cash infusion."²⁸ One Fair Wage Action also lists Watkins as a "contact" on its website and

²³ Donate, One Fair Wage, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: <https://onefairwage.site/donate#:~:text=One%20Fair%20Wage%20Action%20is,and%20subminimum%20wage%20workers%20nationwide>.

²⁴ Raise The Wage MI, Michigan Campaign Finance Contribution Search, Department Of State, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: https://miboecfr.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cfr/contrib_anls_res.cgi.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*


²⁷ Raise The Wage MI, Committee Statement Of Organization, filed Dec. 15, 2021, available at: <https://cfrsearch.nictusa.com/committees/520222#>.

²⁸ *D'Assandro v. Home Care First, Inc.*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint (decision filed Feb. 7, 2014) available at: https://www.michigan.gov/-/media/Project/Websites/sos/06diljak/DAssandro_v_Home_Care_and_Citizens_CA_cover_letter_and_Conciliation_Agreement.pdf?rev=1aa8a102696646e9a671d843e59a7615.

Watkins has a One Fair Wage Action email address.²⁹ In a May 11, 2022, news article, Watkins was described as a “One Fair Wage lead organizer.”³⁰

The precise timing of One Fair Wage Action’s contributions and the expenditures by Raise the Wage also clearly demonstrate coordination between the two organizations. Raise the Wage was formed on December 15, 2021, and within five days One Fair Wage Action contributed \$350,000 and then another \$1,000,000 just ten days later to Raise the Wage.³¹ Additionally, One Fair Wage Action’s subsequent contributions corresponded with payments Raise the Wage made to vendors. On March 25, 2022, Raise the Wage needed approximately \$310,000 to pay a vendor, and One Fair Wage Action made a contribution of \$330,000 that same day.³² On April 20, 2022, Raise the Wage paid a vendor \$128,000, and received a contribution in

²⁹ Michigan, One Fair Wage, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: <https://onefairwage.site/michigan>.



³⁰ Cody Butler, *UAW Joins Push for \$15 Minimum Wage Proposal for Michigan’s November Election*, WILX 10, May 11, 2022, available at: <https://www.wilx.com/2022/05/11/uaw-joins-push-15-minimum-wage-proposal-michigans-november-election/> (attached as Exhibit B).

³¹ Raise The Wage MI, Committee Statement Of Organization, filed Dec. 15, 2021, available at: <https://cfrsearch.nictusa.com/committees/520222#>; Raise The Wage MI, Michigan Campaign Finance Contribution Search, Department Of State, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: https://miboecfr.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cfr/contrib_anls_res.cgi.

³² Raise The Wage MI, Michigan Campaign Finance Expenditure Search, Department Of State, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: https://miboecfr.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cfr/exp_anls_res.cgi; Raise The Wage MI, Michigan Campaign Finance Contribution Search, Department Of State, accessed July 3, 2022, available at: https://miboecfr.nictusa.com/cgi-bin/cfr/contrib_anls_res.cgi.

that exact amount on the exact same date from One Fair Wage Action.³³ All transactions reported by Raise the Wage are in the following chart:

All Transactions Reported by Raise the Wage³⁴

Date	Contributing Organization or Vendor	Amount Contributed to Raise the Wage	Amount Paid by Raise the Wage	Running Balance
December 14, 2021	Dave Woodward	\$110.00		\$110.00
December 20, 2021	One Fair Wage Action	\$350,000.00		\$350,110.00
December 30, 2021	One Fair Wage Action	\$1,000,000.00		\$1,350,110.00
January 28, 2022	K2K Consulting		\$400,025.00	\$950,085.00
January 31, 2022	Allied Media		\$311.66	\$949,773.34
January 31, 2022	Allied Media		\$488.77	\$949,284.57
February 23, 2022	Allied Media		\$11,097.13	\$938,187.44
February 25, 2022	K2K Consulting		\$700,025.00	\$238,162.44
March 18, 2022	K2K Consulting		\$50,025.00	\$188,137.44
March 25, 2022	K2K Consulting		\$500,000.00	\$(311,862.56)
March 25, 2022	One Fair Wage Action	\$330,000.00		\$18,137.44
March 31, 2022	Allied Media		\$12,398.38	\$5,739.06
April 20, 2022	K2K Consulting		\$128,000.00	\$(122,260.94)
April 20, 2022	One Fair Wage Action	\$128,000.00		\$5,739.06

Because One Fair Wage Action does not publicly disclose its donations and expenditures, the total assets controlled by this entity or the timing of the contributions it received prior to December 2021 are not publicly known. Likewise, in the 2021 Complaint, the Department did not have this information for MCFR and MMM prior to their donations to Unlock. The Department found this information was unnecessary and, based upon the timing and amounts of contributions and expenditures, presumed the funds were raised for the purpose of financing Unlock in the 2021 Complaint. The same standard certainly must apply here.

It is clear One Fair Wage Action and Raise the Wage were not independent of one another and Raise the Wage Action was soliciting or receiving funds with the intent of financially supporting Raise the Wage given that (1) One Fair Wage Action was effectively Raise the Wage's

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ *Id.*

only contributor, made an initial contribution immediately after Raise the Wage was formed, and funded nearly all \$1.8 million of its activities; (2) that Raise the Wage's treasurer is affiliated with One Fair Wage Action; and (3) the timing of One Fair Wage Action's contributions with Raise the Wage's nearly identical expenditures.

As the Department stated in the 2021 Complaint and applying it to the facts of this case,

“[I]t is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization's donors from the reporting requirements of the Act. [The connection between the two organization through Raise the Wage's Treasurer, One Fair Wage Action's \$1,808,000 contributions to Raise the Wage immediately after it was formed in December 2021 and to March 2022 is substantial and funded all of its activities,] and the timing of those contributions demonstrate a level of coordination showing the entities were not independent of each other.

In particular, the number of payments that [One Fair Wage Action] made to [Raise the Wage] days before [Raise the Wage] made similarly sized payments to [its vendors] suggests that [One Fair Wage Action was] soliciting or receiving funds for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting [Raise the Wage]. Such fundraising for the purpose of supporting a ballot question committee, as is evidenced in the instant case, makes [One Fair Wage Action itself a] ballot question committee[] responsible for registration and for filing appropriate campaign statements under the MCFA, but [this] organization, to date, has [not] registered as a committee nor filed those campaign statements as required by sections 24 and 33 of the Act.

Given the coordination between [Raise the Wage], the proximity of contributions made to [Raise the Wage] and the expenditures made by [Raise the Wage], and the fact that [One Fair Wage Action was presumably soliciting/receiving funds before and during its control/support of Raise the Wage], there is reason to believe that [One Fair Wage Action] may have solicited/received funds for the purpose of making contributions to [Raise the Wage].”³⁵

While the above analysis of the 2021 Complaint applied to the facts of this case meets the standard, there is additional evidence in this case beyond the substantial contributions and timing

³⁵ *Id*; *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021).

of contributions and expenditures. The additional evidence includes that One Fair Wage Action provided 99.9% of funding shortly after Raise the Wage was formed and Raise the Wage's treasure was also working for One Fair Wage Action. It is not known what One Fair Wage Action's assets were when it was making the contributions or beforehand, however unless it stopped fundraising before and during the time it was supporting Raise the Wage then it was soliciting/receiving donations for the purpose of making contributions to Raise the Wage. All together the evidence in this case far exceeds the "reason to believe" standard that One Fair Wage Action "may have taken actions that qualify [it] as a ballot question committee" and thus violated Michigan Campaign Finance Act sections 24 and 34.³⁶

IV. Conclusion & Request for Action.

The facts support a finding that One Fair Wage Action solicited contributions for the sole purpose of making expenditures to a ballot question committee. We respectfully request the Department of State immediately investigate the apparent violations set forth in this Complaint and find reason to believe that One Fair Wage Action has violated the Michigan Campaign Finance Act. It is clear, given the facts in this case and the precedent set forth by the 2021 Complaint, that One Fair Wage Action must file as a committee, including filing all outstanding statements and reports, paying any late filing fees, and paying any applicable civil or criminal penalties.

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, formed after a reasonable inquiry under the circumstances, each factual contention of this complaint is supported by evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust



By: Kendra Arnold
Executive Director
Foundation For Accountability and Civic Truést
1717 K Street NW, Suite 900, Washington, D.C., 20006

³⁶ *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021).

Exhibit A



STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOCELYN BENSON, SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
LANSING

October 27, 2021

Brian D. Shekell
Clark Hill
500 Woodward Ave., Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226

Dear Mr. Shekell:

The Department of State (Department) has finished its initial investigation of the campaign finance complaint filed against your clients Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility (MCFR) and Michigan! My Michigan! (MMM), as well as against Unlock Michigan (Unlock), by Robert LaBrant alleging violations of the Michigan Campaign Finance Act (MCFA or Act). This letter concerns the current disposition of the complaint against your clients.

The complaint alleged that MCFR and MMM solicited or received donations for the purpose of making expenditures to Unlock. Unlock is a ballot question committee regulated by the MCFA. In support of these claims, Mr. LaBrant stated that MCFR and MMM together contributed over \$2.3 million in funding to Unlock from June to October 2020, “nearly 86%” of Unlock’s total funding during that period. The complaint also showed that MCFR and/or MMM frequently provided large amounts of funding to Unlock within days of Unlock making a large payment to the outside signature-gathering firm National Petition Management (NPM).

MCFR and MMM also jointly responded to the complaint.¹ In their response, MCFR and MMM claimed that neither organization “solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to Unlock Michigan or any other ballot question committee.” MCFR and MMM included a September 9, 2020 affidavit from Heather Lombardini stating that “MCFR ha[d] not

¹ MCFR and MMM also alleged that the instant complaint should be dismissed as a successive complaint. However, as indicated in the Department’s April 9, 2021 dismissal to Mr. LaBrant, the prior complaint asked the Department only to investigate whether 5 contributions were violative of the Act. Because the instant complaint raises allegations not previously addressed in the first complaint, and adds an additional party, the Department does not treat this as a successive complaint.

solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to Unlock Michigan or any other ballot question committee.”²

Mr. LaBrant provided a rebuttal statement. In his rebuttal, Mr. LaBrant cited the failure of MCFR or MMM to provide financial statements or other information showing that the organizations did not violate the MCFA as evidence that the organizations had in fact violated the Act.

On October 8, 2021, the Department requested that MCFR and MMM provide the Department with IRS Form 990s for calendar year 2019 and 2020. The Department also requested that each organization provide the date and amount of each donation received in excess of \$500 or expenditure made in excess of \$500 between January 1, 2020 and the present, as well as the total value of assets controlled by each organization after each of those donations and expenditures. MCFR and MMM each provided a Form 990 for calendar year 2019 but declined to provide a Form 990 for calendar year 2020 and declined to provide the requested information about expenditures, contributions, and assets.

In Michigan, a committee is an organization which “receives contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the action of the voters for or against the nomination or election of a candidate, the qualification, passage, or defeat of a ballot question, or the qualification of a new political party, if contributions received total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year or expenditures made total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year.” MCL 169.203(4). The MCFA requires committees to file certain campaign statements detailing contributions and expenditures. See, e.g., MCL 169.234. Failure to file these required statements can result in civil and criminal penalties. *Id.* An organization making an expenditure to a ballot question committee is not a committee under the MCFA and is not subject to the reporting requirements of the MCFA, however, unless that organization “solicits or receives contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to that ballot question committee.” MCL 169.203(4). Upon meeting the definition of committee, the organization is obligated to file a statement of organization with the appropriate filing official within 10 days of the committee’s formation, MCL 169.224, and is also required to file various campaign statements detailing the organization’s contributions and expenditures.

As discussed below, the Department finds that there may be reason to believe that MCFR and MMM violated the MCFA. Both MCFR and MMM may have taken actions that qualify each organization as ballot question committees under the MCFA. At the end of calendar year 2019, MCFR had \$715,137 in assets, and MMM had \$172,452 in assets. From June to October 2020, MCFR contributed approximately \$1,780,000 to Unlock, while MMM contributed

² For the reasons more fully set forth below, despite these statements presented in the affidavit, they are not enough to overcome the other evidence submitted.

approximately \$550,000. In each case, the contributions by each organization to Unlock during 2020 far exceeds the assets controlled by each entity at the start of 2020. Moreover, the contributions by MCFR and/or MMM to Unlock were often made within days of similarly sized payments by Unlock to NPM, as set out in the following chart:

Date	Contributing Organization	Amount Contributed to Unlock	Amount Paid by Unlock to NPM
June 9, 2020	MCFR	\$10,000	-
June 18, 2020	MCFR	\$150,000	-
June 24, 2020	MCFR	\$400,000	-
June 25, 2020	-	-	\$300,000
July 20, 2020	MCFR	\$100,000	-
July 21, 2020	-	-	\$100,276.21
July 31, 2020	MCFR	\$35,000	\$100,000
August 3, 2020	-	-	\$44,784.85
August 6, 2020	MCFR	\$150,000	-
August 6, 2020	MMM	\$100,000	\$228,212
August 14, 2020	MCFR	\$25,000	-
August 20, 2020	MMM	\$100,000	-
August 21, 2020	MCFR	\$110,000	-
August 21, 2020	MMM	\$100,000	\$330,000
August 27, 2020	MCFR	\$700,000	-
August 28, 2020	-	-	\$166,248.86
August 31, 2020	-	-	\$160,317.68
September 11, 2020	-	-	\$183,298.30
September 18, 2020	-	-	\$150,000
October 1, 2020	MCFR	\$100,000	-
October 1, 2020	MMM	\$150,000	-
October 5, 2020	-	-	\$218,203.96
October 21, 2020	MMM	\$100,000	-

Given that contributions by MCFR and MMM to Unlock were closely followed by expenditures Unlock made to NPM totaling an almost identical value, it is clear that MCFR and MMM coordinated to some extent with Unlock. Accounting for the assets controlled by each organization at the end of calendar year 2019, between January 1, 2020, and October 1, 2020, MCFR solicited/received at least \$1,064,863 in contributions, while between January 1, 2020, and October 21, 2020, MMM solicited/received at least \$377,548.

As previously stated, it is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise

money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization's donors from the reporting requirements of the Act. The fundraising necessary to allow MCFR to contribute \$1,780,000 to Unlock and MMM to contribute \$550,000 to Unlock from June to October 2020 is substantial. Although it may be possible that each entity raised those funds in the first half of 2020 independently of each entity's support for Unlock, to assume that the aggressive fundraising activity necessary for each organization to raise the sums that were then transferred to Unlock was completely independent strains credulity. The disparity between each organization's assets going into 2020, the amount that each organization contributed to Unlock, and the timing of those contributions demonstrate a level of coordination showing the entities were not independent of each other.

In particular, the number of payments that MCFR and/or MMM made to Unlock days before Unlock made similarly sized payments to NPM suggests that MCFR and MMM were soliciting or receiving funds for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting Unlock. Such fundraising for the purpose of supporting a ballot question committee, as is evidenced in the instant case, makes MCFR and MMM themselves ballot question committees responsible for registration and for filing appropriate campaign statements under the MCFA, but neither organization, to date, has registered as a committee nor filed those campaign statements as required by sections 24 and 33 of the Act.

Given the coordination between Unlock, the proximity of contributions made to Unlock and the expenditures made by Unlock, and the fact that neither MCFR nor MMM would have been able to make such contributions to Unlock without soliciting/receiving additional funds during 2020, there is reason to believe that MCFR and MMM may have solicited/received funds for the purpose of making contributions to Unlock.

When presented with a complaint, the Department is tasked to determine "whether or not there may be reason to believe that a violation of [the MCFA] occurred."³ MCL 169.15(10). Once the

³ The MCFA directs the Department to initiate the resolution process if "there may be reason to believe that a violation of [the MCFA] occurred." MCL 169.15(10). The Department notes that, under federal law, the Federal Election Commission (FEC) will initiate an investigation into a campaign finance complaint if the Commission finds that "reason to believe that a violation of [federal law] has occurred or is about to occur." 11 CFR § 111.10. The FEC will find that "reason to believe" a violation has occurred or is about to occur when "the available evidence in the matter is at least sufficient to warrant conducting an investigation, and where the seriousness of the alleged violation warrants either further investigation or immediate conciliation." Federal Election Commission; Policy Statement; Commission Action in Matters at the Initial Stage in the Enforcement Process, 72 Fed. Reg. 51, 12545 (March 16, 2007). Because the MCFA sets a lower threshold for the Department to initiate an informal resolution process – whether there "*may be* reason to believe that a violation of [the MCFA] occurred" (emphasis added) – than federal law sets for the FEC to initiate an investigation – whether there *is* "reason to believe" – the Department's longstanding practice is to initiate the informal resolution process when the evidence available to the Department at the time that a determination is issued can reasonably support an inference that the MCFA has been violated.

Department has made this determination, the Department must employ “informal methods such as a conference [or] conciliation” to correct the potential violation or to prevent further violation. *Id.* As part of the informal resolution process, parties may furnish the Department with evidence showing that a potential violation of the MCFA has not actually occurred. It is possible that MCFR and/or MMM can provide information tending to show that its fundraising activities in 2020 were in fact independent of subsequent or concurrent donations to Unlock, and thus demonstrate that MCFR and/or MMM are not ballot question committees regulated by the MCFA. However, such information has not been made available to the Department, and the evidence available to the Department at this time suggests that “there may be reason to believe” that MCFR and MMM “solicit[ed] or receiv[ed] contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure” to Unlock, and thus that MCFR and MMM are ballot question committees under the MCFA with corresponding and unfulfilled filing obligations.

This letter serves to notify you and your clients that the Department has determined there may be reason to believe that your clients have violated the Act, and serves to notify you and your clients that the Department is beginning the informal resolution process. “If, after 90 business days, the secretary of state is unable to correct or prevent further violation by these informal methods, the secretary of state shall do either of the following:

- (a) Refer the matter to the attorney general for the enforcement of any criminal penalty provided by this act.
- (b) Commence a hearing as provided in subsection (11) for enforcement of any civil violation.”

MCL 169.215(11).

Please contact the undersigned at fracassia@michigan.gov by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, November 5 to discuss a resolution to matter, including additional information your clients may be able to provide that may affect the Department’s determination of the scope of any violation that may have occurred.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adam Fracassi".

Adam Fracassi
Bureau of Elections

UAW joins push for \$15 minimum wage proposal for Michigan's November election

[Cody Butler](#)

LANSING, Mich. (WILX) - The [Fight for \\$15](#) may be coming to the ballot in Michigan.

The United Auto Workers (UAW) is backing a ballot proposal raising the minimum wage to \$15 an hour for everyone, including tipped workers and minors.

As of May 11, Michigan's minimum wage is \$9.87 an hour. Organizers behind the ballot drive said raising it will help protect workers, but people in the business community tell News 10 the job market is already raising pay on its own.

"The cost of everything is going up and that's not really reflective with wages," said Loki Williamson, Midtown Brewery bar manager.

He said raising the state minimum wage to \$15 an hour could be good for the community.

"Honestly, our bosses take really good care of us here so having the minimum increase like that wouldn't really affect us," said Williamson.

"We want these employers who have raised their wages to keep them there," said Chantel Watkins, One Fair Wage lead organizer.

[One Fair Wage](#) is the group leading the effort to raise Michigan's minimum

wage to \$15 an hour by 2027. This includes tipped workers, kids, and people with disabilities, who currently can be paid less than minimum wage.

Watkins is worried that people will get pay cuts when the job market slows down without the increase.

"Whenever they get ready, they can decrease them. That will affect workers and then we will have another great resignation in the workforce," said Watkins.

The UAW joined the effort. In a statement, the union said adjusting the wage will help protect workers from being exploited.

But Wendy Block, Vice President of Business Advocacy at the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, said the ballot drive isn't needed.

"This is a fierce job market. The market is already responding in this regard. Most employers already paying well above Michigan's current minimum wage and even above a 15 minimum wage because that's what markets require," said Block.

Block said raising the minimum wage could backfire, especially since inflation is so high right now.

"This could have the adverse effect of actually causing employers to have to shed workers so they can absorb the cost increases associated with this proposal," said Block.

One Fair Wage has 250,000 signatures. It needs 340,000 by June 1 to get the proposal on the November ballot.

Washington, D.C. has the highest minimum wage at \$15.20 an hour. States are working their way up to \$15 an hour.

Copyright 2022 WILX. All rights reserved.

Subscribe to our [News 10 newsletter](#) and receive the latest local news and weather straight to your email every morning.



STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOCELYN BENSON, SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
LANSING

August 29, 2022

One Fair Wage Action
45 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Re: *The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust v. One Fair Wage Action*
Campaign Finance Complaint No. 2022-07-46-215

Dear One Fair Wage Action:

The Department of State (Department) has received a formal complaint filed against you by The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust alleging that you violated the Michigan Campaign Finance Act (MCFA or Act). Specifically, the complaint alleges that you solicited or received funds to your organizations for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting the ballot question committee Raise the Wage. A copy of the complaint is included with this notice.

As the Department stated in a 2020 campaign finance complaint determination,¹ "it is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization's donors from the reporting requirements of the Act." The complaint alleges that your groups' activities amount to such a violation.

If, as the complainant alleges, you solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to a ballot question committee, and if you met applicable contribution and expenditure thresholds, you would be required to file as a ballot question committee yourselves, and to report and publicly disclose certain information. MCL 169.203(4), MCL 169.234.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the Department's examination of these matters and your right to respond to the allegations before the Department proceeds further. It is important to understand that the Department is neither making this complaint nor accepting the allegations as true. The investigation and resolution of this complaint is governed by section 15 of the Act and

¹ *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021)

the corresponding administrative rules, R 169.51 *et seq.* An explanation of the process is included in the enclosed guidebook.

If you wish to file a written response to this complaint, you are required to do so within 15 business days of the date of this letter. Your response may include any written statement or additional documentary evidence you wish to submit. Materials may be emailed to BOERegulatory@michigan.gov or mailed to the Department of State, Bureau of Elections, Richard H. Austin Building, 1st Floor, 430 West Allegan Street, Lansing, Michigan 48918. If you fail to submit a response, the Department will render a decision based on the evidence furnished by the complainant.

A copy of your answer will be provided to The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust, who will have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal statement to the Department. After reviewing the statements and materials provided by the parties, the Department will determine whether “there may be reason to believe that a violation of [the MCFA] has occurred [.]” MCL 169.215(10). Note that the Department’s enforcement powers include the possibility of entering a conciliation agreement, conducting an administrative hearing, or referring this matter to the Attorney General for enforcement of the penalty provided in section 33(11) of the Act.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, you may contact the Regulatory Section of the Bureau of Elections at BOERegulatory@michigan.gov.

Sincerely,

Regulatory Section
Bureau of Elections
Michigan Department of State

From: MDOS-BOERegulatory
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 9:16 AM
To: info@factdc.org
Subject: RE: Status of Complaints
Attachments: 2022.09.16 Response (ACLU Natl) Foundation v. ACLU, Sixteen thirty.pdf; 2022.09.19 evidence (Sixteen thirty) Foundation v. ACLU, Sixteen thirty.pdf; 2022.09.19 Response (Sixteen thirty) Foundation v. ACLU, Sixteen thirty.pdf; 2022.09.20 Rebuttal letter Foundation v. ACLU, Sixteen thirteen.pdf

Dear Ms. Arnold,
Notices of all five complaints were mailed on August 29, 2022, to the addresses you provided for the respondents and to you. Your delayed receipt of the notices is an indication of the delays in mail delivery. We have received responses from both respondents in your "Michiganders for Fair Lending" complaint and mailed those responses to you on September 20, 2022. They are also included here, and I will make a note to conduct all further correspondence with you via email. The other respondents have been issued second notices of the complaint.

Regulatory Section
Bureau of Elections
Michigan Department of State

From: info@factdc.org <info@factdc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 8:45 AM
To: MDOS-BOERegulatory <MDOS-BOERegulatory@michigan.gov>
Subject: RE: Status of Complaints

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Good morning, and thank you for your response below. Could you please advise me as to the status of these complaints? In the past couple of weeks I received copies of the letters dated August 29, 2022, notifying the respondents in two of the five complaints. It appears the deadline for the respondents to respond to the complaints was September 19, 2022.

Because our organization has received only two of the five letters and they were mailed to us weeks later, we want to ensure we are receiving your correspondence. Also, if possible, we'd appreciate it if we could be emailed copies of all correspondence as well. Thank you,

Kendra

Kendra Arnold
Executive Director of the Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust

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

Subject: RE: Status of Complaints
From: "MDOS-BOERegulatory" <MDOS-BOERegulatory@michigan.gov>
Date: 8/30/22 8:29 am

To: "info@factdc.org" <info@factdc.org>

Dear Ms. Arnold,

Notices regarding those complaints have been sent to the applicable respondents. We will send along their responses as we receive them.

Thank you,

Regulatory Section

Bureau of Elections

Michigan Department of State

From: info@factdc.org <info@factdc.org>

Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 11:20 AM

To: SOS, Disclosure <Disclosure@michigan.gov>

Subject: Status of Complaints

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Good morning. Our organization filed the complaint attached and four other on July 6 and 7. All were filed by email and mail. Can you please advise me as to their status?

Thank you,

Kenra Arnold

Executive Director of FACT

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

Subject: Campaign Finance Complaint against Bipartisan Solutions

From: "info@factdc.org" <info@factdc.org>

Date: 7/6/22 7:33 pm

To: "elections@michigan.gov" <elections@michigan.gov>

Good evening,

Please find attached a campaign finance complaint against Bipartisan Solutions. Please let us know if you require a paper copy to be delivered to your office. Thank you,

Kendra Arnold

Executive Director

The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust



STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOCELYN BENSON, SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
LANSING

September 29, 2022

SECOND NOTICE

One Fair Wage Action
45 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Re: *The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust v. One Fair Wage Action*
Campaign Finance Complaint No. 2022 – 07 – 46 – 215

Dear One Fair Wage Action:

The Department of State (Department) has received a formal complaint filed against you by The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust alleging that you violated the Michigan Campaign Finance Act (MCFA or Act). Specifically, the complaint alleges that you solicited or received funds to your organization for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting the ballot question committee Raise the Wage. A copy of the complaint is included with this notice.

The Department sent you notice of this complaint on August 29, 2022. That letter informed you that you had 15 business days from that date to provide a response to the complaint. **As a courtesy, the Department is extending you an opportunity to submit a response within 15 business days of the date of this second notice.** If you do not submit a response within 15 business days of the date of this notice, the Department will have no choice but to adjudicate the complaint based on the facts and allegations included in the complaint alone.

As the Department stated in a 2020 campaign finance complaint determination,¹ “it is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization’s donors from the reporting requirements of the Act.” The complaint alleges that your groups’ activities amount to such a violation.

If, as the complainant alleges, you solicited or received contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to a ballot question committee, and if you met applicable contribution and expenditure thresholds, you would be required to file as a ballot question committee yourselves, and to report and publicly disclose certain information. MCL 169.203(4), MCL 169.234.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the Department's examination of these matters and your right to respond to the allegations before the Department proceeds further. It is important to understand that the Department is neither making this complaint nor accepting the allegations as true. The investigation and resolution of this complaint is governed by section 15 of the Act and the corresponding administrative rules, R 169.51 *et seq.* An explanation of the process is available on the Department's [website](#).

If you wish to file a written response to this complaint, you are required to do so within 15 business days of the date of this letter. Your response may include any written statement or additional documentary evidence you wish to submit. Materials may be emailed to BOERegulatory@michigan.gov or mailed to the Department of State, Bureau of Elections, Richard H. Austin Building, 1st Floor, 430 West Allegan Street, Lansing, Michigan 48918. If you fail to submit a response, the Department will render a decision based on the evidence furnished by the complainant.

A copy of your answer will be provided to The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust, who will have an opportunity to submit a rebuttal statement to the Department. After reviewing the statements and materials provided by the parties, the Department will determine whether “there may be reason to believe that a violation of [the MCFA] has occurred [.]” MCL 169.215(10). Note that the Department's enforcement powers include the possibility of entering a conciliation agreement, conducting an administrative hearing, or referring this matter to the Attorney General for enforcement of the penalty provided in section 33(11) of the Act.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, you may contact the Regulatory Section of the Bureau of Elections at BOERegulatory@michigan.gov.

Sincerely,

Regulatory Section
Bureau of Elections
Michigan Department of State



STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOCELYN BENSON, SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
LANSING

November 30, 2022

One Fair Wage Action
45 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Re: *The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust v. One Fair Wage Action*
Campaign Finance Complaint No. 2022 – 07 – 46 – 215

Dear One Fair Wage Action:

The Department of State (Department) has finished its initial investigation of the campaign finance complaint filed against you by The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust (FACT) alleging violations of the Michigan Campaign Finance Act (MCFA or Act). This letter concerns the current disposition of the complaint against your clients.

The complaint alleged that One Fair Wage Action solicited or received donations for the purpose of making expenditures to Raise the Wage. Raise the Wage is a ballot question committee regulated by the MCFA. In support of these claims, FACT stated that One Fair Wage Action contributed over \$1.8 million in funding to Raise the Wage from December 2021 to April 2022, “nearly 99.9%” of Raise the Wage’s total funding during that period. The complaint also showed that One Fair Wage Action frequently provided large amounts of funding to Raise the Wage within days of Raise the Wage making a large payment to other entities.

The Department sent you notice of this complaint on August 29, 2022. That letter informed you that you had 15 business days from that date to provide a response to the complaint. As a courtesy, the Department sent you a second notice on September 29, 2022. To date, you have not submitted a response, therefore the Department has no choice but to adjudicate the complaint based on the facts and allegations included in the complaint alone.

In Michigan, a committee is an organization which “receives contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the action of the voters for or against the nomination or election of a candidate, the qualification, passage, or defeat of a ballot question, or the qualification of a new political party, if contributions received total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year or expenditures made total \$500.00 or more in a calendar year.” MCL 169.203(4). The MCFA requires committees to file certain campaign statements detailing contributions and expenditures. See, e.g., MCL 169.234. Failure to file these required statements can result in civil and criminal penalties. *Id.* An organization making an expenditure to a ballot question committee is not a committee under the MCFA and is not subject to the

reporting requirements of the MCFA, however, unless that organization “solicits or receives contributions for the purpose of making an expenditure to that ballot question committee.” MCL 169.203(4). Upon meeting the definition of committee, the organization is obligated to file a statement of organization with the appropriate filing official within 10 days of the committee’s formation, MCL 169.224, and is also required to file various campaign statements detailing the organization’s contributions and expenditures.

As the Department stated in a 2020 campaign finance complaint determination,¹ “it is not a violation of the Act for a group to raise funds in its normal course of conduct and make contributions to a ballot question committee or to coordinate with that ballot question committee. It is, however, a violation of the Act for an organization to raise money on behalf of the ballot question committee in order to shield the organization’s donors from the reporting requirements of the Act.” The complaint alleges that your groups’ activities amount to such a violation.

As discussed below, the Department finds that there may be reason to believe that One Fair Wage Action violated the MCFA. One Fair Wage Action may have taken actions that qualify the organization as ballot question committees under the MCFA. From December 2021 to April 2022, One Fair Wage Action contributed approximately \$1,808,000 to Raise the Wage. Moreover, the contributions by your organization to Raise the Wage were often made within days of similarly sized payments to other entities, as set out in the following chart:

Date	Contributing Organization or Vendor	Amount Contributed to Raise the wage	Amount Paid by Raise the Wage	Running Balance
12/14/21	Dave Woodward	\$110		\$110
12/20/21	One Fair Wage Action	\$350,000.00		\$350,110.00
12/30/21	One Fair Wage Action	\$1,000,000.00		\$1,350,110.00
1/28/22	K2K Consulting		\$400,025.00	\$950,085.00
1/31/22	Allied Media		\$311.66	\$949,773.34
1/31/22	Allied Media		\$488.77	\$949,284.57
2/23/22	Allied Media		\$11,097.13	\$938,187.44
2/25/22	K2K Consulting		\$700,025.00	\$238,162.33
3/18/22	K2K Consulting		\$50,025.00	\$188,137.44
3/25/22	K2K Consulting		\$500,000.00	\$(311,862.56)
3/25/22	One Fair Wage Action	\$330,000.00		\$18,137.44
3/31/22	Allied Media		\$12,398.38	\$5,739.06
4/20/22	K2k Consulting		\$128,000.00	\$(122,260.94)
4/20/22	One Fair Wage Action	128,000.00		\$5,739.06

¹ *LaBrant v. Michigan Citizens for Fiscal Responsibility, Michigan! My Michigan!*, MI Campaign Finance Complaint filed May, 25, 2021 (decision filed Oct. 27, 2021)

Given that contributions by One Fair Wage Action to Raise the Wage were closely followed by expenditures Raise the Wage made to other entities totaling an almost identical value, it is clear that One Fair Wage Action coordinated to some extent with Raise the Wage.

The fundraising necessary to allow One Fair Wage Action to contribute \$1,808,000 to Raise the Wage December 2021 to April 2022 is substantial. Although it may be possible that your organization raised those funds in the first half of 2021 independently of your support for Raise the Wage, to assume that the aggressive fundraising activity necessary to raise the sums that were then transferred to Raise the Wage was completely independent strains credulity. The amount that your organization's contribution to Raise the Wage and the timing of those contributions demonstrate a level of coordination showing the entities were not independent of each other.

In particular, the number of payments that One Fair Wage Action made to Raise the Wage days before (or sometimes the same day) Raise the Wage made similarly sized payments to other entities suggests that your organization was soliciting or receiving funds for the purpose of collecting contributions with the intent of financially supporting Raise the Wage. Such fundraising for the purpose of supporting a ballot question committee, as is evidenced in the instant case, makes One Fair Wage Action itself a ballot question committee responsible for registration and for filing appropriate campaign statements under the MCFA, but your organization, to date, has not registered as a committee nor filed those campaign statements as required by sections 24 and 33 of the Act. Because of the coordination involved in your organization's contributions to Raise the Wage, and One Fair Wage Action's failure to file campaign statements, the Department concludes there may be reason to believe that a potential violation of the Act has occurred.

Resolution

Upon review, the evidence submitted supports the conclusion that a potential violation of the Act has occurred. When the Department finds that there may be reason to believe a violation has occurred, the Act requires the Department to use "informal methods such as a conference [or] conciliation" to correct the potential violation or to prevent further violation. MCL 169.215(10). The Department has 90 business days to reach an informal resolution of the matter. *Id.*

Given this, please contact the undersigned by emailing BOERegulatory@Michigan.gov to informally resolve this complaint. If the Department is unable to informally resolve the complaint by April 14, 2023, the Act requires the Department to refer the matter to the Department of Attorney General with a request that her office prosecute the criminal penalties outlined under the Act. MCL 169.233(11).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Adam Gurnea".

Adam Fracassi, Regulatory Manager
Regulatory Section
Bureau of Elections
Michigan Department of State

c: The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust



STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOCELYN BENSON, SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
LANSING

April 18, 2023

The Honorable Dana Nessel
Department of Attorney General
G. Mennen Williams Building
525 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: *The Foundation for Accountability and Civic Trust v. One Fair Wage*
Michigan Campaign Finance Complaint

Dear Attorney General Nessel:

Please allow this letter to serve as a referral to the Attorney General of the above referenced campaign finance matter for the enforcement of any criminal penalties under the Michigan Campaign Finance Act. MCL 169.215(10)(a).

If you or your staff would like any additional information regarding this case, please contact this office.

Sincerely

s/ Michael J. Brady

Michael J. Brady, Chief Legal Director
Michigan Secretary of State

cc: Heather Meingast, Division Chief, CLEE Division