Dear Ms. Hansen,

Here is my reply to the complaint of Ms. Chenalia contained in your email of August 25, 2026. (I will soon have a response to your email of September 2 regarding photos.) Please let me know if you need additional information or if you have any additional questions for me. I hope you had an enjoyable Labor Day holiday.

Complaint #1: The candidate's filing fee was left off the expenditure reports.

Response: The candidate filing fee was timely paid to the Pierce County Auditor. The fact of the expenditure is a matter of public record. The amount of the expenditure is established by law and is not discretionary. The campaign believed that expenditure should be considered a personal expenditure of the candidate that the public would know and not an expenditure of the campaign itself and so it was not reported as an expenditure of the campaign. PDC staff inquired about this and the campaign agreed to file an amended report and timely did so before the filing of this complaint.

Comment: The public would not have been deceived or misled about this campaign expenditure that has been timely corrected. It is no longer an issue.

Complaint #2: Campaign activity conducted for months before the campaign was registered; reports missing or filed late.

Response: When campaign staff questioned the lack of a filing fee disclosure, an amended report was filed as noted in response to Complaint #1. But the PDC software would not allow it to be amended to include the filing fee expenditure that had not been listed in the prior reporting without changing the dates of the original filing. Because of a sudden illness in the candidate’s family, a final decision to proceed to seek election was delayed and so was reporting. All expenditures were from the candidate.

Comment: The public would not have been deceived or misled about this campaign expenditure that was timely corrected and no longer an issue. No public funds were solicited in this time.

Complaint #3: Expenditures for signs reported without the required quantity detail on the original and amended reports.

<u>Response</u>: The date of the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure and the entity to whom the expenditure was made was timely reported in the original filing. The expenditure expressly described the purpose as signs. This sufficiently describes the purpose and extent of the expenditure.

Comment: The expenditure reporting is accurate, reflects the purpose of the expenditure and does not affect the public interest.

Complaint #4: An over-limit contribution that was accepted, never timely refunded, and subsequently removed from the reports without any disclosure of a refund.

<u>Response</u>: It is not clear what “removal” item the complaint is referencing. There was a $2,000 contribution made prior to candidate filing week that was reported as all being for the general election. It could have been reported as one-half for the primary and one-half for the general election (as our opponent did). This is because the filing period had not begun/concluded and a third candidate necessitating a primary election was unknown. In any event this contribution was timely reported. It was not refunded or removed from the reporting. If it was “removed” from the reporting as alleged, that likely would be due to a clerical or software error.