

# To: Sec Reed - these campaigns were a combo of paid & volunteer

1 message

Tim Eyman <[insignia@greekwatch.com](mailto:insignia@greekwatch.com)>

Fri, Feb 2, 2007 at 4:40 PM

To: "Reed, Sam (Web)" <[sreed@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:sreed@secstate.wa.gov)>

Cc: "Excell, Steve" <[sexcell@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:sexcell@secstate.wa.gov)>, "Handy, Nick" <[nhandy@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:nhandy@secstate.wa.gov)>, "Blinn, Katie" <[kblinn@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:kblinn@secstate.wa.gov)>, "Hamlin, Shane" <[shamlin@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:shamlin@secstate.wa.gov)>

January 31, 2007

To: Secretary of State Sam Reed

From: Tim Eyman, Jack Fagan, and Mike Fagan, ph: 425-493-9127, email:

[insignia@greekwatch.com](mailto:insignia@greekwatch.com)

cc: House & Senate members (cc'd to all media outlets & our thousands of supporters throughout the state)

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The following campaigns were 'self-identified' as paid only. Here's the info on each:

- \* In 2004, the teacher's union pushed a referendum to repeal the charter schools legislation passed by the Legislature. The Public Disclosure Commission, on a schedule B report, shows they paid \$211,785 for paid signature gathering. They were not 'all-volunteer.' It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.
- \* In 2004, Gov. Gary Locke and Lisa McFarlane pushed hard to organize the signature drive for Initiative 884. They had tons of supporters in PTA's, teachers' unions, and other organizations. They raised over \$1.2 million to qualify for the ballot and spent just half that on paid signature gathering. They were not a 'paid only' signature drive and they never would have told you it was a paid only campaign. It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.
- \* In 2002, we sponsored Initiative 776. This was our second attempt to 'lock in' \$30 tabs and we gathered 514,000 signatures from an all-volunteer base of supporters a few years earlier. We obviously received a lot of signatures from our volunteers and you'll notice that we spent a relatively small amount of money for paid signature gathering (PDC reported totals). I-776 was NOT 'paid only' signature drive and we would never have told you it was paid only. It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.
- \* In 2003, the Heart of Washington did the signature drive for Initiative 297 and it was widely reported the broad network of supporters they had gathering signatures. When compiling the information attached, I contacted the sponsor of that measure Gerald Pollat, who signed up to testify against HB 1087, and in my phone conversation, he estimated that well over half their signatures came from volunteers. They were not a 'paid only' signature drive and they never would have told you it was a paid only campaign. It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.
- \* In 2003, the BIAW sponsored Initiative 841. The builders have an extraordinary network of supporters who gathered a ton of volunteer signatures to oppose this new, burdensome ergonomics regulation. They were not a 'paid only' signature drive and they never would have told you it was a paid only campaign. It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.
- \* Same goes for the 2002 referendum campaign by the BIAW to repeal the unemployment tax - Referendum 53. The builders and others have a huge network of volunteers. They were not a 'paid only' signature drive and they never would have told you it was a paid only campaign. It was a combination of volunteer and paid people.

Your office has repeatedly provided an inaccurate portrayal of signatures drives in Washington based on inaccurate data.

Signatures gathered by volunteers have a higher rejection rate than those gathered by paid petitioners. Why? Because the people who pay per signature check signatures each week from each person and they don't pay for bad ones. People who gather signatures know they won't be compensated for bad signatures. This screening process is very effective. In contrast, no initiative campaign can screen or pre-validate volunteer signatures prior to submission to the Secretary of State. But the signatures obtained by paid circulators are reviewed, screened, and pre-validated before they are turned in. Paid signature gathering firms are fully aware of the relentless legislative efforts to undermine or end the initiative process. As a result, especially in recent years, they have radically increased their procedures to ensure the highest validity rate possible. They review the signatures of individual circulators to check their individual validity rates on a weekly basis. Corrective action is immediately taken on circulators with bad validity rates -- bad signatures are purged -- validity rates on signatures are extensively tracked throughout the signature drive. Such attention and reviews of petitions are not possible with the signatures gathered from volunteers because the campaigns lack the financial resources to do this additional work.

Attached is a letter from Michael Arno that was entered as public testimony and made part of the public record in the state house at last week's hearing. He has extensive knowledge as to why Oregon's policy has NEARLY DOUBLED the number of invalid signatures. And he also explains why the cost to qualify for the ballot has TRIPLED and why the number of measures qualifying for the ballot has been cut by TWO-THIRDS.

As requested earlier, we ask your two lobbyists to take a few minutes of their time to access the PDC website and verify the attached corrections to your spreadsheet.

And when they do, would you please have them meet one-on-one with legislators and the Governor's staff to notify them that your previous information was inaccurate and to provide them instead with the corrected information?

We are hopeful your office will finally acquiesce and stop misleading legislators with inaccurate information.

Regards, Tim Eyman, Jack Fagan, and Mike Fagan, ph: 425-493-9127, email: [insignia@greekwatch.com](mailto:insignia@greekwatch.com)