

Respondent Names
Brandi Kruse; Let's Go Washington (Sponsored by Brian Heywood)
Complainant Name
Pam Stuart
Complaint Description
<p>Pam Stuart</p> <p>Tue, 12 May 2026 at 10:05 AM</p> <p>Brian Heywood's Let's Go Washington is in violation of RCW 29B.25.090 for failure to report the financial value, and include the required disclaimers, in at least 159 instances (see Appendix A of the enclosure) of political advertising by commercial advertiser Brandi Kruse on behalf of Let's Go Washington and its two ballot initiatives: IL26-638 and IL26-001. Let's Go Washington has also failed to report at least two instances of in-kind contributions in the form of Kruse's appearances at political rallies and in-kind contributions from one of Brian Heywood's other organizations, Project/Future 42.</p>
What impact does the alleged violation(s) have on the public?
<p>Kruse is possibly the most prolific of political content creators in Washington, and her promotions of Let's Go Washington's initiatives do not qualify as editorial content. Kruse is not an impartial journalist or just an opinionated member of the public; she is a commercial advertiser with multiple advertisers. Although Kruse was once employed as a reporter by bonafide news outlets, she is no longer commonly considered as a journalist in Washington State and was recently denied press credentials by the Washington State Capitol Correspondents Association, a decision that was upheld by both state and federal courts. Even if the PDC were to recognize Kruse as a journalist, the nature, reach, and frequency of her promotional activity on behalf of Let's Go Washington goes far beyond the scope of the PDC's editorial exemptions because the placements are "where payment for the space or time of such content" is normally provided by advertisers.</p>
List of attached evidence or contact information where evidence may be found
The attached complaint and exhibits (PDF) provide the evidence we've gathered of the alleged violations.
List of potential witnesses with contact information to reach them
<p>Persons we believe have knowledge of these matters include commercial advertiser Brandi Kruse, Let's Go Washington Chair Brian Heywood, and possibly Let's Go Washington's ministerial treasurer Jason Michaud.</p> <p>Brandi Kruse</p> <p>Brian Heywood</p> <p>Jason Michaud</p>

Certification (Complainant)

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that information provided with this complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Peter Frey Lavallee, Executive Director
Washington State Public Disclosure Commission
P.O. Box 40908
Olympia, WA 98504-0908
Via Email Only

May 12, 2026

RE: Violations of RCW 29B.25.090 by Let's Go Washington for failing to disclose in-kind political contributions by commercial advertiser Brandi Kruse/UnDivided

Dear Mr. Lavallee:

On behalf of Washingtonians For Ethical Government, we are filing the following complaint with the WA State Public Disclosure Commission and request an immediate investigation.

Brian Heywood's Let's Go Washington is in violation of RCW 29B.25.090 for failure to report the financial value, and include the required disclaimers, in at least 159 instances ([Appendix A](#)) of political advertising¹ by commercial advertiser Brandi Kruse on behalf of Let's Go Washington and its two ballot initiatives: 26-638 and 26-001. Let's Go Washington has also failed to report at least two instances of in-kind contributions in the form of Kruse's appearances at political rallies and in-kind contributions from one of Brian Heywood's other organizations, Project/Future 42.

This is not the first time Let's Go Washington and its initiatives have directly benefited from unreported advertising and promotion from Brandi Kruse and her many platforms. In 2024, Cascade PBS reported that "Redmond hedge fund manager Brian Heywood is spending millions to end cap-and-invest. The initiative [I-2117] has a web of organizations — and Brandi Kruse — backing it."²

Let's Go Washington failed to declare in-kind political advertising valued between \$345,000 and \$1.25 million

Kruse's 159 promotions of Let's Go Washington and Initiatives 26-638 and 26-001 between September 2025 and February 2026 are political advertising that can be valued between

¹ "Political advertising" includes any mass communication used for the purpose of appealing, directly or indirectly, for votes or for financial or other support or opposition in any election campaign pursuant to WAC 390-05-290.

²

<https://www.cascadepbs.org/environment/2024/05/wa-conservative-groups-are-banding-together-dump-carbon-pricing/>

\$345,900 and \$1,250,000 ([Appendix A](#)). This political advertising was not reported as an expense or an in-kind contribution by Let's Go Washington as of 5/11/2026.³

"Political advertising" includes any mass communication used for the purpose of appealing, directly or indirectly, for votes or for financial or other support or opposition in any election campaign pursuant to WAC 390-05-290.

Let's Go Washington failed to report up to \$1.25 million of in-kind contributions from Kruse and/or Project 42

As a commercial advertiser with an estimated 819,000 followers⁴ across multiple platforms, Kruse is advertising Let's Go Washington's ballot initiatives. The value of posts and promotions is linked to the influencers' followers and reach. The value of advertising on Kruse's platforms are estimated as:

- **Instagram:** "Mid-Tier" Influencers with 100,000 to 200,000 followers are frequently paid \$800 to \$2,500 per post.⁵
- **YouTube/Apple/Spotify Podcasts:** A sponsored segment of 2-5 minutes reaching 150,000 listeners can cost advertisers \$7,500 to \$22,500 per integrated segment.⁶
- **Twitter:** A sponsored tweet for accounts with 100,000 followers can cost \$500 to \$2,500 per single tweet, and up to \$3,500 for a tweet thread.⁷
- **Facebook:** A post can cost advertisers \$1,000 to \$5,000 per post for an account with 300,000 followers.⁸

Kruse is a commercial advertiser and paid content creator

In exchange for advertising dollars, Kruse promotes her advertisers and their interests through extensive endorsements and marketing on her podcast, social media posts, and showcasing their representatives.

Kruse sells commercial advertising to the following listed advertisers on her webpage entitled "Advertisers"⁹:

- First Mark Insurance Group
- Bulwark Capital Management
- Wes Jones & Associates Real Estate

³ PDC search 5/11/2026

<https://www.pdc.wa.gov/political-disclosure-reporting-data/browse-search-data/committees/co-2026-30644#contributions>

⁴ [Youtube](#) 177,000 followers, [Instagram](#) 122,000 followers, [Twitter](#) 185,000 followers, [TikTok](#) 22,000 followers, [Facebook](#) 313,000 followers

⁵ <https://brandsforcreators.com/rates/instagram-influencer-rates>

⁶ <https://podscan.fm/blog/podcast-advertising-rates-cpm-benchmarks-2025>

⁷ <https://socialrails.com/blog/influencer-pay-per-post-rates>

⁸ <https://collabstr.com/blog/influencer-marketing-price-guide>

⁹ <https://www.undividedpod.com/advertisers>

- Rental Housing Association of Washington
- Valentine Roofing
- Future 42

It's important to note that Future 42 is a subsidiary of Project 42¹⁰, a 501c4 organization where Brian Heywood is one of two officers, according to 2024 IRS documents.¹¹ “Washington’s new initiative king Brian Heywood, who financed three anti-tax initiatives destined for the fall [2024] ballot, is a member of Project 42’s board.”¹² Future 42 lists Brandi Kruse and UnDivided as a “Future 42 Ambassador”¹³ and Kruse lists Future 42 as an advertiser on her website.¹⁴ Kruse admits she “sells ads to Project 42.”¹⁵

Kruse is not exempt from Washington’s political advertising reporting requirements

Much has changed about political advertising, especially online advertising, in the 13 years since the PDC issued Interpretation No. 07-004.¹⁶ Paid content marketing, although relatively new, is now a multi-billion dollar industry in the U.S.¹⁷ Spending on podcasters and influencers is expected to reach \$13.7 billion in 2027.¹⁸ Spending on native content advertising, where paid content closely resembles editorial content, is expected to exceed \$75 billion in 2026.¹⁹

“Political actors spent tens of millions on creator-driven messaging in 2024.”²⁰ A report by the Center for Democracy & Technology says “public reporting suggests that political influencers are commonly paid by campaigns, political committees, and via independent expenditure.”²¹

This lucrative advertising industry includes content creators who are paid for political endorsements, where the creator is compensated for endorsing an issue or candidate. This has

¹⁰ <https://www.pfortytwo.com/>

¹¹ https://irs-efile-renderer.instrumentl.com/render?object_id=202543209349300749

¹²

<https://www.cascadepbs.org/environment/2024/05/wa-conservative-groups-are-banding-together-dump-carbon-pricing/>

¹³ <https://future42.org/people/brandi-kruse/>

¹⁴ <https://www.undividedpod.com/advertisers>

¹⁵

<https://www.cascadepbs.org/environment/2024/05/wa-conservative-groups-are-banding-together-dump-carbon-pricing/>

¹⁶ <https://www.pdc.wa.gov/rules-enforcement/guidelines-restrictions/online-campaign-activities>

¹⁷ “Influencers play a central role in modern marketing by bridging the gap between brands and consumers through authentic engagement. Unlike traditional advertising, social media influencers create relatable content that resonates with their audiences, fostering trust and credibility. They drive brand awareness, shape purchasing decisions, and enhance customer loyalty by delivering personalized recommendations.” <https://www.lindenwood.edu/blog/the-power-of-influencer-marketing-in-the-digital-age/>

¹⁸ <https://www.emarketer.com/content/influencer-marketing-set-surpass--13-billion-by-2027>

¹⁹ <https://verve.com/blog/back-to-basics-native-advertising/>

²⁰ <https://democracyproject.org/posts/political-influencers-and-democracy-in-the-digital-age>

²¹ Architects of Online Influence, November 20205

<https://cdt.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/2025-11-13-Architects-of-Influence-Report-final-2.pdf>



become so commonplace that California requires²² content creators to disclose²³ their political advertisers, such as this one of many content creators²⁴ paid to post endorsements of Matt Mahan for Governor.

Kruse is possibly the most prolific of political content creators in Washington, and her promotions of Let’s Go Washington’s initiatives do not qualify as editorial content. Kruse is not an impartial journalist or just an opinionated member of the public; she is a commercial advertiser with multiple advertisers. Although Kruse was once employed as a reporter by bonafide news outlets, she is no longer commonly considered as a journalist in Washington State and was recently denied press credentials by the Washington State Capitol Correspondents Association, a decision that was upheld by both state and federal courts.²⁵

Even if the PDC were to recognize Kruse as a journalist, the nature, reach, and frequency of her promotional activity on behalf of Let’s Go Washington goes far beyond the scope of the PDC’s editorial exemptions because the placements are “where payment for the space or time of such content” is normally provided by advertisers.²⁶

²² CA SB 678: “A person who is paid by a committee to support or oppose a candidate or ballot measure on an internet website, web application, or digital application, as specified, to include a disclaimer, if not already required as specified, stating that they were paid by the committee in connection with the post.” https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240SB678

²³ “The [California] law requires paid sites that post messages of support or opposition to a candidate to include a disclaimer indicating the affiliation.” <https://www.theepochtimes.com/us/new-california-law-asks-paid-websites-social-media-accounts-to-disclose-campaign-contributions-spending-5490524>

²⁴ <https://www.instagram.com/p/DW1RH4xAL-8/>

²⁵ MyNorthwest: Lawsuit over denied WA Capitol press credentials for conservative media personalities <https://mynorthwest.com/mynorthwest-politics/press-credentials/4212055> (March 4, 2026)

²⁶ WAC 390-05-290 “Political advertising does not include letters to the editor, news or feature articles, editorial comment or replies thereto, in a regularly published print or electronic medium, or on a radio or television broadcast, where payment for the space or time of such content is not normally required.”

Kruse sells “native advertising” to sponsors

Kruse is providing endorsements as “native advertising” content for Let’s Go Washington’s initiative campaigns. Native content advertising is a non-disruptive, paid marketing strategy where ads match the look, feel, and function of the surrounding content on a platform.²⁷ Native advertising is widely recognized as advertising and it is regulated by the Federal Trade Commission.²⁸

In other words, Kruse may sound like she’s giving a personal opinion but she’s actually providing a paid endorsement for her advertisers. Examples of “native” advertising content with or on behalf of paying advertisers during the same time period include:

- Kruse native content for advertiser First Mark Insurance’s Dave Taylor ([Youtube 2/17/2026](#))
- Kruse native content for advertiser Bulwark’s Zach Abraham ([Facebook 2/27/2026](#))
- Kruse native content for Bluwark’s Zach Abraham ([Facebook 8/10/2025](#))
- Kruse native content for advertiser “Sell with Wes” Wes Jones ([Facebook, 11/30/2025](#))
- Kruse content for advertiser Valentine Roofing ([Facebook 12/19/2025](#))

Kruse also provides native advertising throughout her Youtube podcasts by talking about her sponsors in positive ways in casual, conversational tones with no clear indication that she is being paid for the promotion. For example:

“First, if you’re thinking about taking the first mark challenge, it only takes a little bit of time. And the rewards could be phenomenal. Like Christine, an undivided viewer and subscriber took the first Mark challenge. They saved her \$10,000 a year, you guys, \$10,000 a year, that’s almost a thousand dollars a month. And she said she was worried her carrier was dissolving. So she had 30 days to come up with a plan thought, oh gosh, I’ve heard Brandy nag me about First Mark, I’m gonna do that. I think it was our subscriber why, who sent me a message and said, Hey, you know, my husband called First Mark, they just let us know that our insurance we already had was great and they couldn’t actually beat the price. And she said, I really appreciated their honesty. So no matter what happens when you take the first mark challenge, you’re gonna get honesty, uh, and you’re going to get transparency. And when they come back, you know they’re working for you, not the insurance company. So at the end of it, you can always be, uh, feel, feel good about the fact that they gave you the best possible advice they could, whether it’s coming over to the first Mark family or sticking with your current insurance. So first, mark insurance.com. First mark insurance.com.”²⁹

“If you are a housing provider in the state, you’re probably wondering, what the hell should I do? Uh, what’s gonna happen this legislative session? We’ll reach out to our friends at the Rental

²⁷ “Native advertising is a way brands naturally blend ads into content, helping businesses reach audiences without disrupting their experience.”

<https://advertising.amazon.com/library/guides/native-advertising>; “Native advertising is distinct from traditional advertising because it focuses on providing valuable content that feels native to the user experience rather than interrupting it.” <https://www.outbrain.com/native-advertising/>

²⁸ <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/native-advertising-guide-businesses>

²⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/live/XFibHNQNhnl?si=y3WtWaZOpMlcHvvn&t=1533>

Housing Association of Washington and they can help you navigate this climate that we're in politically. So, first and foremost, on an individual basis, uh, if you've got, you know, a couple units, maybe this is like a retirement plan you had, and you're very worried about all these rules and regulations and how you're gonna be able to survive, they can help you on an individual basis navigate the situation. And then they are your eyes and ears in Olympia. They are your advocates in Olympia. They're gonna be down there trying to make sure that the stories of landlords are told that they're not just painted as the big bad wolf who just keeping people outta their homes and being evil or whatever it is. So join RHA today, rha wa.org rha wa.org. It's about \$260 a year to be a member of RHA. I think it's worth every single penny if you're trying to navigate this environment. R hha wa.org”³⁰

Let’s Go Washington received unreported in-kind native advertising from Kruse

Kruse’s political advertising to voters on behalf of Let’s Go Washington can be categorized in three different buckets:

1. Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638

“So just to, uh, keep you up to date on some housekeeping, we had a wonderful turnout this weekend, uh, at an event for Let’s Go Washington, that I spoke at, at Cougar Mountain Middle School in Issaquah. And of course, this has to do with the two initiatives to protect girls sports. Uh, one to protect girls sports, one to protect parental rights....I mean, the two initiatives are very simple. And of course you can go to [let’s go wa.com](https://letsgowashington.com) if you haven’t signed them yet, you can get one mailed right to you. But the two initiatives are very straightforward. One is a repeat of initiative that was passed by the legislature and then that they came back and upended.”³¹



For example, on February 10, 2026, Future 42 re-published an UnDivided podcast on its own channel as “On this week’s Future 42 sponsored Politics unPacked with Brandi Kruse...” During this podcast³² sponsored by Future 42, Kruse promoted Let’s Go Washington’s initiatives:

“It was a jam packed week in Olympia and I kicked off with a rally on the steps of the state capitol that I was part of. The rally was in support of the two Let’s Go Washington initiatives that so far,

³⁰ https://www.youtube.com/live/XFibHNQNhnl?si=vtTq_vja45X-4g3f&t=3381


³¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFibHNQNhnl>

³² <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1457880389458871>

Democrats in the majority party have refused to give hearings to the initiatives, which absent some sort of action from the legislature are gonna go to voters in November, would protect parental rights in education and would also protect girls' sports by prohibiting biological boys from competing against girls in public schools.”

2. Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638

"Yesterday was Girls and Women's Sports Day. And it's a very timely thing because of course, on Tuesday we were down in Olympia advocating for girls and women sports and to protect it, right?... Obviously, I don't have to mention the fact that there are girls in our state who have been trying to get an audience with the governor like Anna Lee Wilson and Francis Stout, who were literally outstanding on the steps, pouring their heart outs on Tuesday to support the Let's Go Washington initiatives so that they have a chance at fair play."³³



3. Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington

"The WEA will spend millions on this between now and November. We have some sources on the inside who've signed themselves up for his WA Families from Freedom campaign, which is the group of left wing organizations like the WEA, Gender Justice League, who are pushing back on these initiatives with these insane lies. Their singular effort in the last two weeks of signature gathering is to disrupt it by any means necessary. And they have absolutely had an impact on the ability to carry out the democratic process and collect signatures. [...]"The WEA is willing to paint its own members as pedophiles."³⁴

³³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RVswkqYSzOQ>

³⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3zJfDOg326I>



Let's Go Washington also failed to report Kruse's in-kind appearances at political events

Let's Go Washington has not declared the in-kind contribution of Kruse's performances at at least two Let's Go Washington political rallies: Kruse performed as MC at a Let's Go Washington political event on February 3, 2026.³⁵ Kruse performed at a Let's Go Washington political event on October 4, 2025.³⁶

According to PDC records, Kruse or her business unDivided have received at least \$16,500 for speaking at County Republican events between 2023 and 2025, including \$2,500 for performing for Pierce County Republicans on 5/23/2025.³⁷ She is scheduled to MC a Snohomish County Republican fundraiser alongside Brian Heywood and noted anti-marriage equality activist Katy Faust³⁸ on 5/16/2026.³⁹

Request for PDC Investigation

Washingtonians For Ethical Government request that the PDC investigate this matter fully and hold all parties accountable. If the PDC decides that these activities are exempted under PDC Interpretation No. 07-04, we request that it reexamine its policy and update it to reflect the current state of online creator advertising.

Signed:

[Washingtonians For Ethical Government](#)

³⁵ <https://www.facebook.com/reel/2011140386099697/>

³⁶ <https://x.com/BrandiKruse/status/1974916223621353913>

³⁷ <https://apollo.pdc.wa.gov/public/registrations/campaign-finance-report/110299675>

³⁸

<https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/meet-the-seattle-woman-behind-a-national-effort-to-end-same-sex-marriage/>

³⁹ <https://event.auctria.com/afb56ab2-c0f6-44ef-882d-079efae5b20c/>

APPENDIX A

Kruse Undeclared Political Advertising Contributions To Let's Go Washington's By Promoting Initiatives 26-001 and 26-638

From 9/17/25 to 2/26/26

Kruse's unDivided YouTube Channel & Podcasts

Estimated value of \$7,500 to \$22,500 for each of 36 segments: **\$270,000 - \$810,000**

1. [2/20](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "And maybe this is the thing that's gonna start to turn the tide in Washington state as we have the initiative that voters will vote on in November to protect girls' sports in our state once and for all."
2. [2/18](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "Maybe this is the thing that's going to turn the tide in Washington state as we have the initiative that voters will vote on in November to protect girls sports in out state once and for all."
3. [2/16](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638.***

Note 2/16 EP has since been deleted, [only this excerpt remains public](#)

 - a. Quote from existing segment: "We have an initiative in Washington state that will go to voters in November that would prohibit boys from competing against girls in designated girls sports."
 - b. Quotes from deleted video: "There is literally no way for us to prove that unless they come out and say, yeah, that's true. I'm a boy. Or unless the initiative passes and during their, uh, uh, physical exams that they have to go through to play sports, um, the doctor says, yeah, that's a biological boy. And that's what we're trying to do with the initiative."
4. [2/11](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "I think this simmering situation in Puyallup might be the turning point on this radical gender ideology stuff in Washington state, especially at a time when there are two initiatives that voters are gonna decide on in November. One to protect girls' sports. One to protect parental rights and prevent a situation like what happened with Eleanor to Eleanor's family."
5. [2/8](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "It was a jam packed week in Olympia and I kicked off with a rally on the steps of the state capitol that I was part of. The rally was in support of the two Let's Go Washington initiatives that so far, Democrats in the majority party have refused to give hearings to the initiatives, which absent some sort of action from the legislature are gonna go to voters in November, would protect parental rights in

education and would also protect girls' sports by prohibiting biological boys from competing against girls in public schools.”

6. [2/6](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "Yesterday was Girls and Women's Sports Day. And it's a very timely thing because of course, on Tuesday we were down in Olympia advocating for girls and women sports and to protect it, right?"
 - b. "Obviously, I don't have to mention the fact that there are girls in our state who have been trying to get an audience with the governor like Anna Lee Wilson and Francis Stout, who were literally outstanding on the steps, pouring their heart outs on Tuesday to support the Let's Go Washington initiatives so that they have a chance at fair play."

7. [2/5](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "On Tuesday we were down in Olympia advocating for girls and women's sports and to protect it. [...] Girls like Analy Wilson and Francis Stout who were pouring their hearts out on Tuesday to support Let's Go Washington's initiative so they have a chance at fair play."

8. [2/4](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "Thank you to everyone who showed up, and now we march towards November and try to combat the millions of dollars that are going to be spent vilifying these initiatives."

9. [1/29](#) ***Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***
 - a. "[Washington Families For Freedom] wants boys playing against girls, and they want to cut parents out of what's happening in public schools."

10. [1/22](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. "So Brian Heywood, who is the founder of Let's Go Washington, pushing all these initiatives that they're trying to fight back against. He posted this on X..."
 - b. "And the two initiatives that are running right now have to do with radical gender ideology. One, keeping boys outta girls' sports. The other one of course has to do with parental rights widely." [...] "So of course this guy now has two motivations and it's important to recognize that the WEA motivation, which is financial and then the ideological motivation, the initiatives being run, are largely being run by conservatives. They're starting to run initiatives on things that challenge radical gender ideology.
 - c. "And remember we had a leaker who recorded a WEA meeting. It was a strategy meeting where they were going through how to defeat specifically the initiative to protect girls' sports."
 - d. "And when this whole thing is done, when we get to escape from it, whether it's through the voter initiative from Let's Go Washington that we're gonna vote on in November, [...] I will never let a single one of those Democrats forget. They, they

either condoned this, they pushed this, or they stayed silent during this 'cause it's one of the dumbest things in human freaking history.”

11. [1/21](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. “How does the initiative [Heywood] spent more than a million dollars of his own money on to protect girls from having to play against boys, how does that benefit him personally? How does the initiative to restore parental rights benefit him personally?”

12. [1/19](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638; Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let’s Go Washington***
 - a. “So, as you know, the Washington Education Association and its allies have been pushing this really bizarre lie that if the initiative to protect girls' sports passes, it will expose every female high school athlete to invasive genital exams where they'll have to prove what's in their pants and it'll be, it'll be, uh, lead them, uh, open them up to more instances of abuse if, if this goes through, which of course is not true. It's been debunked about a million times.”
 - b. “And yes, that includes a physical examination and the doctor who gives you that physical exam will be able to attest to whether you're a boy or a girl. That's the point of the initiative. The initiative is just trying to make it find the simplest way possible to keep biological boys outta girls sports. And so what the initiative says is you can do this through the requirement already that athletes get a physical exam.”

13. [1/13](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***
 - a. “One of the key things that's happening this uh, year in the legislative session are the two voter initiatives. One, to protect girls' sports. One, to protect parental rights and education.”

14. [1/12](#) ***Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let’s Go Washington***
 - a. “So continuing on their, uh, lack of a relationship with the truth, I guess I was a little bit surprised that the lie that's been pushed by the, uh, teacher's union about the initiative to keep boys outta girls sports” [...] “So, as you know, the Washington Education Association and its allies have been pushing this really bizarre lie that if the initiative to protect girls sports passes, it will expose every female high school athlete to invasive genital exams“ [...] “And the doctor who gives you that physical exam will be able to attest to whether you're a boy or a girl. That's the point of the initiative. The initiative is just trying to make it find the simplest way possible to keep biological boys outta girls' sports. And so what the initiative says is, you can do this through the requirement already that athletes get a physical exam.”
 - b. “They don't want, I think that scenario, which went viral after I posted over the weekend to play out again and again and again, this legislative session, if there are hearings on the initiatives”

15. [1/12](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638***

- a. “So of course, we have the two initiatives from Let’s Go Washington.” [...] “Well, we now know that both of those initiatives will not be considered by the legislature.” [...] “If they are so passionate about keeping secrets from parents, if they’re so passionate about boys playing against girls, why would they not want to hold hearings and argue their case and argue against these initiatives?” [...] “And, and they don’t want, I think that scenario, which went viral after I posted over the weekend to play out again and again and again, this legislative session, if there are hearings on the initiatives...” [...] “I don’t know that they would be so willing to ignore the initiatives if the Legacy media was doing its job, and if the legacy media was covering these issues fairly, was pushing back, was challenging them on the decision to completely ignore voter initiatives. [...] So Drew Stokes, who’s the Republican leader in the house, uh, very different from the responses we got from Democrats. He urged Democrats who are in charge to hold hearings on the initiatives.” [...] “Now, all of this might be just for nothing at the end of the day. I mean, the initiatives are important, I do believe that. And they’ll go to voters. So now we know that a hundred percent it’s gonna be a very long 11 months. I will tell you, there’ll be millions of dollars spent trying to paint these as transphobic initiatives or whatever it is.”
- b. Clip of Drew Stokesbarry at leg meeting: “Speaker, I hope that we hold hearings on these initiatives [...] to understand to what extent, uh, the initiative would change the requirement for physical examination [...] what better chance to hash out these debates than to hold hearings on the bills and hold debates on the bills in accordance with the state constitution, which says these initiatives shall take precedence over all of their matter...”
- c. “Why would Democrats give these initiatives a hearing when they fought for marriage equality? What the hell does that have to do with anything?”
- d. “So the initiatives are gonna proceed as planned in Washington state and a ruling from the US Supreme Court wouldn’t automatically upend the law here, but it’s happening in tandem.”

16. [12/17](#) ***Explicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***

- a. “_____ is a paid signature gatherer. And this is what he does for a living. He goes around the country and he collects signatures for ballot measures and initiatives, uh, brings employees with him as well. And so Let’s Go Washington in this latest round of signature gathering for the initiative to protect girls sports and the initiative to restore parental rights. They’re relying less on paid signature gatherers. They, um, are doing a lot of by mail to people who they know will sign the initiatives.” [...] “He really believes in these initiatives that he’s out collecting signatures for.”
- b. “I asked you guys on our daily subscribers show, pull on Patreon, locals and acts if all of this that we’ve been talking about since late September has influenced your decision to either sign the initiatives in public or to actually go out and collect

signatures in public places given the harassment and the threats and the physical assault that you could face.”

- c. “And of course, I have the ongoing case from the woman who threatened to come to my home over my support of these initiatives.”
 - d. Reading social media comments on this case “Sally Joe: my daughter and I met ____ yesterday afternoon at Hagen. He was not pushy. He asked us if we would like to sign the initiatives, which we are, uh, totally are for...”
17. [12/15](#) ***Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***
- a. “The WEA will spends millions on this between now and November. We have some sources on the inside who've signed themselves up for his WA Families for Freedom campaign, which is the group of left wing organizations like the WEA, Gender Justice League, who are pushing back on these initiatives with these insane lies. Their singular effort in the last two weeks of signature gathering is to disrupt it by any means necessary. And they have absolutely had an impact on the ability to carry put the democratic process and collect signatures. [...] “The WEA is willing to paint its own members as pedophiles.”
18. [12/12](#) ***Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***
- a. “WA Families for Freedom held a press conference opposing the two initiatives and spreading this insane lie that keeping boys outta girls' sports means that o on site kids are just gonna have to drop their pants to prove their gender or subject be subjected to invasive physical examinations. I wanna focus on one of the people who spoke at this WA Families for Freedom press conference.”
 - b. “Lie, lie, nothing in the text of the initiative would suggest that this is gonna create an environment or a mandate where a girl walks in to play volleyball and a coach says, you have to show me your genitals. And that's literally what WA Families for Freedom is suggesting. In fact, you can take a look at the text of the initiative yourself. It's not a secret.”
19. [12/12](#) ***Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***
- a. “So here you have a long time Seattle police detective who is at this political press conference and she is going to oppose the two initiatives, but she did much more than that. She lied. “ [...] “Lie, lie, nothing in the text of the initiative would suggest that this is gonna create an environment or a mandate where a girl walks in to play volleyball and a coach says, you have to show me your genitals.”
 - b. “She also lied about the other initiative, the parental rights law.”
20. [12/3](#) ***Promoting Let's Go Washington's signature gathering***
- a. “We were starting to see all these attacks and harassment and threats of signature gatherers for the two Let's go Washington initiatives, one of them to protect girl sports, the other one to protect parental rights. And we played many, many videos of various things happening in various places. But one of the things we played, there was an incident in Spokane where a guy was collecting

signatures outside a grocery store. And this woman came up to him, she had her kids with her and she was signing the two initiatives."

- b. "The Washington State Democratic Party, WA Families for Freedom and the teacher's union, her rhetoric in these videos that have now landed her in two criminal cases, it mirrors the rhetoric being pushed out by the anti initiative crowd, by the progressives."

21. [11/25](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638; Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***

- a. "We have a well-placed mole in the Washington Education Association, and you won't believe, or maybe you will, the insane stuff that they're saying about the two initiatives to protect girls sports and parental rights"
- b. "Uh, but Alicia had the source, uh, who provided her with video of a WEA leadership membership meeting, a zoom meeting that happened last week where they were talking about the two Let's go Washington initiatives. Of course, those two initiatives are IL 26-001, which is another effort to protect parental rights in Washington state saying, Hey, you can't keep secrets from parents about what's happening with their kids at school. Common sense stuff. And the other one, IL 26-638, which is protecting fairness in girls' sports [...] So this mole within the WEA, uh, knew that there was going to be this zoom meeting for leadership and membership to talk about how they were gonna fight back against these initiatives. [...] Uh, so we're gonna play some snippets of this zoom meeting and it talks a lot about their strategy around how they're gonna try to fight back against these initiatives..."
- c. "So a parent might have a child that's a boy goes to school and they call that child by a different name, by a girl's name, by girls' pronouns. And the teacher and the school counselor and the other students and faculty are forced. And some of them want to keep this secret from parents. So parents are left completely in the dark. So the, um, initiative on parental rights would upend that."
- d. "They actually disproved their central argument against this initiative themselves in this meeting. Oh, they have to have physicals every other year. It's already required. [...] And this is a lie that's being perpetrated by the Washington Families for freedom, that's against these initiatives, where they're saying only girls by law will be subjected to invasive physical exams."

22. [11/24](#) ***Explicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638; Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***

- a. "So just to, uh, keep you up to date on some housekeeping, we had a wonderful turnout this weekend, uh, at an event for Let's Go Washington, that I spoke at, at Cougar Mountain Middle School in Issaquah. And of course, this has to do with the two initiatives to protect girls sports. Uh, one to protect girls sports, one to protect parental rights."

- b. "I mean, the two initiatives are very simple. And of course you can go to let's go wa.com if you haven't signed them yet, you can get one mailed right to you. But the two initiatives are very straightforward. One is a repeat of initiative that was passed by the legislature and then that they came back and upended."
- c. From clip of Jonathan Choe interview "I was told by the people inside that, uh, if you sign these, that, uh, parents would actually get their rights back so they could have more access to information for their kids and so on and forth. I think you should read it. I've read the entire initiative and it shows what the, um, original text is and what the new text is"
- d. "So there's this group called wa, families for Freedom, which is such a stupid name. 'cause they're, you know, what they're trying to do. They're trying to, it's a misdirection. They are not for freedom. They want to control your kids. But this is the organization that's been, um, put together to try to oppose the initiatives."
- e. "I don't believe that Democrats in the legislature are gonna be willing to pass these initiatives into law. So what happens then? Well, they'll end up on the ballot for voters in the midterms, so next November. And so this is really a preview of the lies that they're gonna tell in the lead up to that election."
- f. "Uh, and thank you to everyone who showed up on Sunday who has signed the initiative. And please go to let's go wa.com for both the initiatives. Uh, and you can get one sent right to your door if you haven't already."

23. [11/24](#) ***Promoting Let's Go Washington's rally***

- a. "I want to introduce you to one of the two young women who we're going to have speak today. Frances came on our radar because she was being bullied online. She did something that I think 15 at the time was probably hard for any 15-year-old to do. She sat down at her final basketball game of the year, realized quickly there was a biological boy playing on the Shelton team and she decided she wasn't going to play. She's now been making her voice heard on this issue."

24. [10/18](#) ***Attacking Let's Go Washington's opponents***

- a. "So his argument is about Brian Heywood has been making the rounds on news, and he of course is the backer of the Let's Go Washington initiatives."
- b. "Remember we talked about WA Families for Freedom. This is a group that opposes the initiatives and they've called themselves WA Families for Freedom, which is just stupid. But a couple weeks ago on their website, they had a form and a hotline that you could call to report signature gathering. Uh, it said, have you seen someone collecting signatures for a Washington ballot measure?"
- c. "But as soon as we started raising awareness for the fact that this snitch line that's being funded by the Washington Education Association, the Gender Justice League Pro-Choice Washington, A CLU of Washington, as soon as we pointed out that this was obviously a coordinated effort to undermine democracy that was being paid for by some of the largest donors to the Democratic party, guess what happened? They took it down about a week ago. They decided to take it down."

25. [10/16](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638; Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington***

- a. "Brian Heywood has been making the rounds on news and he of course is the backer of the Let's Go Washington initiatives. And he's been talking about these very numerous, very severe instances of signature gatherers being harassed."
- b. "Remember we talked about WA Families for Freedom. This is a group that opposes the initiatives and they've called themselves WA Families for Freedom, which is just stupid."
- c. "So he is, uh, citing anonymous eyewitnesses telling him that Brian Heywood has black people out collecting these signatures and these dumb black people don't even know what the initiatives are all about. Which is quite fascinating because unlike Northwest Progressive Institute, I have actually gone out and spoken to and met many of these paid signature gatherers. Yes. Many of whom are black. One of the examples we had him on our show is a man named ____ Scott, who has been subjected to some of this harassment of these left wing lunatics. And one of the questions I asked him is, do you know or support the initiatives?"
- d. Conversation between Kruse and signature gatherer
- e. Kruse: "Do you support these initiatives, the idea behind them?" Paid Signature Gatherer: "Absolutely. [...] You have to have, there's gotta be something in the initiative that you've gotta like and want, you know, for yourself before you could give it to the public."

26. [10/10](#) ***Promoting Let's Go Washington signature gathering***

- a. "There's been all this harassment of lawful signature gatherers. We talked about this case in Covington outside of a Walmart where a man named ____, a paid signature gatherer for Let's Go Washington, was posted up trying to collect signatures for the two initiatives for parental rights and to protect girls sports."

27. [10/7](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***

- a. "Uh, we talked about this case in Covington outside a Walmart where a man named ____ uh, a paid signature gatherer for Let's Go Washington was posted up trying to collect signatures for the two initiatives for parental rights and to protect, uh, girls' sports."
- b. Paid Signature Gatherer interview clip:
 - i. Paid Signature Gatherer: "Sign the initiative. Help us get the issues on the ballot." [...]
 - ii. Kruse: "Do you support these initiatives, the idea behind them?"
 - iii. Paid Signature Gatherer: "Absolutely. [...] You have to have, there's gotta be something in the initiative that you've gotta like and want, you know, for yourself before you could give it to the public." [...]
 - iv. Kruse: "What would your message be to some of the Washingtonians who feel compelled to shout at those people, to harass them, maybe even to steal or destroy signatures? What would you ask of them be?"

- v. Paid Signature Gatherer: “It would be to tell them that, Hey, you know what, let's let democracy take its toll. Let's let the people decide. Let's leave it up to the people. Um, and if you continue to act like this, you know, like the gentleman that did to me, I would say that's not fair to us because every registered voter in this state has the right to hear the initiative, to see the initiatives.”
- vi. Kruse: “ Uh, are you gonna be anywhere today that I can send my viewers to come see you and sign?”
- vii. Paid Signature Gatherer: “I will be going back to the Covington Walmart, um, tomorrow morning. I will be there from 7:00 AM till 6:00 PM and I invite all others who wanna sign the initiative, who can't find a circulator to please come out and sign. This is something that we need to get on the ballot.”
- viii. Kruse: “Love that. All right. Covington, Walmart back at the scene of the crime tomorrow, all day long. Go see ____ and sign it.”
- c. “So go visit ____ if you haven't signed, and you're gonna be near Covington tomorrow. He's gonna be there all day back at the Covington Walmart in action. So I'm sure he would love to have some sane people come and say hello to him and shake his hand and sign those initiatives if you have an opportunity to do so.”
- d. “Glenn says, ‘I met ____ at the Walmart. Super nice guy. Yes, I did sign the initiatives’. Awesome. Yeah. Go visit ____ at the Covington Walmart tomorrow and show him support...”

28. [10/6](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***

- a. “Cause Democratic politicians, they can say the right things, but are they really gonna take the steps behind the scenes to make sure that something happens? No, I don't think so. Why would they? Their largest owners, the people who give them the money that keeps them in office and keeps them getting reelected, don't want these initiatives to be successful. They're the ones out there harassing signature gatherers.”
- b. “And so they've resorted to harassing lawful signature gathers. They did it all throughout 2023. It was a big deal, and now they're doing it. And it's even worse right now. As Let's Go Washington runs these two initiatives, one to restore parental rights, uh, the other one to protect girls' sports.”
- c. “He also posted, uh, this video right before we had an event for these initiatives on Saturday.”
- d. “So one of the first examples in this latest round of initiatives of the harassment of signature gatherers happened September 24th at the Walmart in Covington.”
- e. “Great explanation of what happened, understands and appreciates the fact that people have entrusted him with their sensitive information when they sign those initiatives. So he chased this dude down because he wanted to get the forms back.”
- f. “He was just running two initiatives that this Walmart employee didn't agree with. And later on in the body camera footage, the deputy asks his manager, do you

know why he would do this? And he says, well, he is gay. And of course, you know, some are painting these initiatives as an attack on the L-G-B-T-Q community.”

29. [10/5](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. [Kruse intro at Let’s Go Washington rally] "It's a sad state of affairs when a 16-year-old girl needs private security to come here and speak with you all today to feel safe. It's not right. We won't stand for it. We're going to make sure she can come up here and talk about how this impacts her and she can feel safe."
30. [10/1](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. “Ah, this is just delicious. This is delicious. It's horrible, but it's good. It's good for the show. You know, um, if I'm being honest, so of course we have been talking nonstop about what's happening with these two. Let's go Washington initiatives that are, may I add, they're moderate positions protecting girls sports, saying biological boys should not be able to compete against girls. And then the other initiative that let's go Washington is running right now, would restore parental rights.” (shows image of initiatives on Let's Go Washington website) [...] But since in the last two weeks, uh, people have been out collecting signatures on those initiatives, we've seen a level of unhinged behavior from the left...”
 - b. “And it was a Fred Meyer store, grocery store, and there was a guy outside the Fred Meyer who was collecting signatures on these two initiatives.”
 - c. Audio recordings of emergency calls regarding signature gatherers, shows images of initiative names on screen:
 - i. “Uh, I came in to go shopping and there is a table set up outside with signs to sign up for supporting, um, different initiatives and that sort of thing. And one of them is specifically to keep trans girls out of sports.”
 - ii. “...Like a person trying to get signatures on some initiative, um, outside Fred Meyer...”
 - iii. “Uh, there's two people here with, um, valid initiatives, but the store has asked them to leave and they're not leaving.”
 - d. “So on Sunday, this Sunday, if you haven't made plans yet, I want you to not make plans because at noon we're gonna be hosting with Let's Go Washington, a large, uh, not only signature gathering event for these two initiatives, but a rally so we can get together. I want dads there, I want moms there.”
31. [10/1](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. [audio from 911 caller] “I came in to go shopping and there is a table set up outside with signs to sign up for supporting, um, different initiatives and that sort of thing. And one of them is specifically to keep trans girls out of sports and Fred Meyer has asked them to leave and they've apparently tried calling the police and has been told that they will not make them leave. And so I'm calling to report it because it's absolutely ridiculous and they should not be out there.”

32. [10/1](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. "Holy smokes, you guys, the lefties are so unhinged about these initiatives. They're calling 9 1 1. Can you imagine being so brainwashed and ideologically extreme that you see signature gatherers collecting signatures to like protect girl sports or restore parental rights?"
33. [9/27](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. "Is it any surprise that two years later, well, let's go Washington launches two new initiatives that Democrats are doing the exact same thing."
 - b. "What are the two new initiatives? As a reminder? Protect girls' sports by keeping biological boys outta girls' sports. And then to try, once again to reinstate the parental bill of rights. So parents know what's happening with their kids at school for any common sense person. Those are very reasonable initiatives, but not for the Democratic Party."
 - c. "How sad and sick is that if I did a signature gathering event for this today, I would hire security for it. I would hire armed security to be out collecting signatures for two common sense initiatives that I think most Washingtonians would support."
34. [9/25](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. "The two latest Let's Go Washington initiatives are attracting the same kind of left wing vitriol that let's go Washington Initiatives did in 2023. So there's been, you know, harassment of lawful signature gatherers. We told some stories about, you know, signature gatherers being blocked with cards, having their pages stolen or scribbled out, and all of these things going on."
 - b. "So this video got sent to me, uh, after the show yesterday, and we exposed some of what's been happening to signature gatherers collecting initiative, uh, signatures for two initiatives. One is to restore parental rights. The other is to protect girls' sports common sense. Parents have a right to know what's happened to their kids at school. We already passed it once. Let's pass it again. And no biological boys shouldn't be competing against girls. So there's those two initiatives. You'll see them out in the community. Now, if you're looking for a place to sign them, go to, let's go wa.com, letsgowa.com."
 - c. "These are, these are lines directly from the Democratic party. You know, they put out a fundraising email about these two new initiatives, and here's how they characterize it. Characterize them to all their democratic minions. Protecting fairness in girls' sports, they call it a deceptive proposal that would ban transgender girls from playing on teams that match their gender identity. Forcing students to undergo invasive physicals to prove their sex."
35. [9/24](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. "So we broke the news yesterday that the two latest, let's go Washington Initiatives are attracting the same kind of left wing vitriol that let's go Washington

Initiatives did in 2023. So there's been, you know, harassment of lawful signature gatherers." (image of signed petition)

- b. "So this video got sent to me, uh, after the show yesterday, and we exposed some of what's been happening to signature gatherers collecting initiative, uh, signatures for two initiatives. One is to restore parental rights. The other is to protect girls' sports common sense. Parents have a right to know what, what's happened to their kids at school. We already passed it once, let's pass it again. And no biological boys shouldn't be competing against girls. So there's those two initiatives. You'll see them out in the community. Now, if you're looking for a place to sign them, go to, letsgowa.com, letsgowa.com."
 - c. "I don't know, I don't know why they're right, but is angry about the parental rights initiative, saying there's this kid named Marcus who was being beat at home, found a loving environment at school, and then killed themselves." [...] "She's talking about, oh, caring about the parents of a trans child. That's literally what we're talking about with the initiative. That if there's a child who thinks they're trans, making sure the parents can help them through this moment in their lives."
36. [9/23](#) ***Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638***
- a. "What are the two new initiatives? As a reminder? Protect girls' sports by keeping biological boys outta girls' sports. And then to try, once again to reinstate the parental bill of rights. So parents know what's happening with their kids at school for any common sense person. Those are very reasonable initiatives, but not for the Democratic Party."
 - b. "For instance, in Vancouver, Washington, there was a manager of a Fred Meyer who just took it upon themselves to say, I don't like this, these initiatives. So I'm gonna set up a big line of carts around the table."
 - c. "If you try to destroy, steal in any way, make it so that a signature that someone puts on an initiative will not count. And that's happening left and right with near a consequence. [...] A black male walked up asking or acting like he was gonna sign and instead he scribbled out. And I had to blur it a little bit 'cause I don't want to docks all the good common sense citizens who signed these initiatives." (image of signed petition)
 - d. "There was another incident that happened. [...] 'A young male, like somewhere between 19 and 25 years old,' This is the description of the signature gatherer, 'grabbed multiple sheets, fully completed sheets of signatures for these initiatives, ran into the bushes and ran away.'"
 - e. "And I, I gotta say, I was gonna reach out to some of the high school athletes who we've had on the show [...] and say, Hey, do you guys wanna do a signature gathering event for these two? Let's Go Washington's initiatives, especially the one that protects girls' sports. [...] And I'm sure they would love to, but I don't know if in good conscience I can do that. 'cause I don't know that we can protect them. I wouldn't put it past adults on the left to go out and scream and harass or even assault teenage girls. I mean, would any of you, would any of you be willing to send out your teenage daughter to collect signatures for one of these

initiatives? [...] I know these young girls and we'll still talk to 'em, but I know they so badly want to bring about change. And this initiative finally gives them an opportunity to do that. How sad and sick is that if I did a signature gathering event for this today, I would hire security for it. I would hire armed security to be out collecting signatures for two common sense initiatives that I think most Washingtonians would support.”

- f. Take your kids outta public school immediately. I know it's not that easy. But one of the things that if you have to keep your child there that you must do [...] is signing the initiative to restore parental rights, calling every friend you have that has a child in the public schools and having them sign it...”
- g. Reading aloud Facebook comments: “ Um, Joe Doe on Facebook, ‘what are the initiatives called? Can I go online or does it have to be in person?’ So a couple things. So go to, is it LetsGoWA.com. [...] You can find locations to sign them. I think you can even request they be sent to you.”

Twitter

Estimated value of \$500 to \$2,500 per post for 56 posts: **\$28,000 - \$140,000**

1. [2/4](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
2. [2/3](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
3. [2/3](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
4. [1/31](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
5. [1/19](#) - *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
6. [1/17](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
7. [1/11](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
8. [1/9](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
9. [1/2](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
10. [12/22](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
11. [12/21](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
12. [12/17](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
13. [12/15](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
14. [12/12](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
15. [12/12](#) - *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
16. [12/3](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
17. [12/3](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
18. [11/30](#) - *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
19. [11/30](#) - *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
20. [11/25](#) - *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
21. [11/24](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
22. [11/24](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
23. [11/24](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
24. [11/24](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
25. [11/24](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
26. [11/23](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*

27. [11/22](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
28. [11/21](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
29. [11/20](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
30. [11/17](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
31. [10/15](#) - Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington
32. [10/11](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
33. [10/11](#) - Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington
34. [10/7](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
35. [10/7](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
36. [10/6](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
37. [10/6](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
38. [10/6](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
39. [10/5](#) Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
40. [10/4](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
41. [10/4](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
42. [10/3](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
43. [10/3](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
44. [10/3](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
45. [10/3](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
46. [10/2](#) - Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington
47. [10/2](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
48. [10/1](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
49. [10/1](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
50. [10/1](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
51. [9/24](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
52. [9/24](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
53. [9/23](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
54. [9/23](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
55. [9/23](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638
56. [9/23](#) - Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638

Facebook:

Estimated value of \$1,000 to \$5,000 per post for each of 44 posts: **\$44,000 to \$220,000**

1. [2/22](#) Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
2. [2/11](#) - Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
3. [2/16](#) - Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
4. [2/8](#)- Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
5. [2/7](#)- Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
6. [2/5](#) - Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
7. [2/5](#) - Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
8. [2/4](#)- Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
9. [2/4](#) Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638
10. [2/4](#): Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638

11. [2/3](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
12. [2/2](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
13. [2/1](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
14. [1/29](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
15. [1/22](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
16. [1/19](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
17. [1/17](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
18. [1/16](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
19. [1/12](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
20. [1/9](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
21. [1/2](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
22. [12/26](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
23. [12/22](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
24. [12/22](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
25. [12/21](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
26. [12/19](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
27. [12/15](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
28. [12/13](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
29. [12/12](#)- *Attacking opponents of 26-001 and 26-638 and/or Let's Go Washington*
30. [12/12](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
31. [12/9](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
32. [12/9](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
33. [12/7](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638t*
34. [12/7](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
35. [12/7](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
36. [12/5](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
37. [12/3](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
38. [12/3](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
39. [12/3](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
40. [12/1](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
41. [12/1](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
42. [11/27](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
43. [11/25](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
44. [11/25](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*

Instagram:

Estimated value at \$800 to \$2,500 per post for each of 23 posts: **\$18,400 to \$57,500**

1. [2/22](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
2. [2/4](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
3. [2/4](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
4. [2/3](#) *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
5. [1/29](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*
6. [1/2](#) - *Explicitly or implicitly appealing for voter support for 26-001 and 26-638*

7. [12/15](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
8. [12/7](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
9. [12/7](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
10. [11/28](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
11. [11/27](#)-*Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
12. [11/25](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
13. [11/22](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
14. [11/20](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
15. [11/17](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
16. [11/2](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
17. [10/5](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
18. [10/4](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
19. [10/4](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
20. [10/3](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
21. [9/28](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
22. [9/27](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*
23. [9/17](#)- *Explicitly or implicitly promoting signature gathering for 26-001 and 26-638*