

To: Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs
From: Jonathan Wayne, Executive Director
Date: February 6, 2025
Re: Additional Information for LD 207 – Cash Qualifying Contributions

Thank you for the opportunity to consult with my colleagues and provide the following responses to questions that arose at the public hearing for LD 207.

What portion of qualifying contributions (QCs) are made in cash? Does one party receive more cash QCs than the other? This varies greatly and depends on the fundraising preferences of individual candidates. Some candidates collect most of their QCs online by credit card; some mostly in cash. Our records are not well suited to efficiently calculate an *overall* percentage of QCs made in cash, so we reviewed a sample of QC submissions by 20 candidates from 2024 (roughly 10% of total participants). If you review the "Percentage in Cash" column in the first attachment, you will see that the rate of cash QCs varies by candidate. One could infer that the overall percentage among all candidates is somewhere in the 40-55% range, but that isn't conclusive. This sample suggests that Republican candidates rely more on cash QCs than Democratic candidates, but the difference isn't huge.

Does the Commission want to propose changes to the Receipt and Acknowledgment (R&A) form to better detect fraud? The team here considered changes such as making the current affirmation bigger or changing to bold font or asking for two signatures on the R&A form. Unfortunately, we think it's just difficult to get the average voter to carefully read the affirmation due to human behavior. Thank you for the question but we do not have a change to the R&A form to propose at this time that we think will be an overall improvement. We will continue to monitor the issue. How many times has the Commission detected fraudulent activity because of the cash QC affirmation form? In the mid-2000s, the Commission staff discovered that, regrettably, a small portion of candidates or their supporters are willing to falsely claim they collected \$5 in cash from a contributor when the money, in fact, came from another source. Others may be willing to falsify contributors' signatures. Some of these situations have resulted in criminal prosecutions, as shown in the second attachment.

We have identified some of these problems by looking for patterns and discrepancies in signatures on checks, money orders, and forms. Our ability to detect fraud has been helped by receiving two signed documents for each QC, except for credit card contributions. Since 2020, we no longer receive money orders signed by contributors who provide \$5 in cash. Instead, we receive a cash QC affirmation form. In 2020, 2022, and 2024, the Commission staff detected a total of four cases of fraud because of the cash QC affirmation form.

The cash QC affirmation form increases our confidence that the person identified as the contributor actually gave \$5 in cash. If LD 207 becomes law and the cash QC affirmation form is eliminated, the Commission staff will keep looking for mistakes and fraud as we review QCs. I expect we will continue to have some success, but we will have one less tool at our disposal. Thank you again for the opportunity to describe our procedures.

Matheta Matter Matt				Number	Number of QCs Submitted	nitted	
methyCashCashCashCheckCredit CardInt16Democratic Candidate 135 56% 3% 703 107 107 16Democratic Candidate 137 25% 3% 45% 215 107 2011 Democratic Candidate 238 3% 45% 216 1182 2011 Democratic Candidate 256 41% 86% 1182 275 2011 Democratic Candidate 256 41% 2275 275 2115 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 124 2275 2116 Democratic Candidate 1275 86% 2275 275 2116 Democratic Candidate 1275 86% 2275 275 2116 Democratic Candidate 1276 2275 275 275 2116 Democratic Candidate 2175 275% 2275 275% 2116 Democratic Candidate 2175 275% 2275 2275 2116 Democratic Candidate 2116 233% 233% 233% 233% 2116 Democratic Candidate 2117 220% 223% 223% 2116 Democratic Candidate 2117 220% 220% 220% 2117 Democratic Candidate 2117 220% 220% 220% 2116 Democratic Candidate 2117 220% 220% 220% 2116 Democratic Candidate 210% <				Percentage in			
bemocratic Candidate 185 56% 39 107 16 Democratic Candidate 9 3% 45 215 17 Democratic Candidate 37 19% 65 216 17 Democratic Candidate 268 50% 89 182 251 Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88 225 211 Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88 225 215 Democratic Candidate 2175 88% 212 253 215 Democratic Candidate 175 88% 124 53 215 Democratic Candidate 217 88% 212 53 215 Democratic Candidate 243 24 24 24 216 Democratic Candidate 243 24 24 24 216 Democratic Candidate 243 24 24 24 217 Democratic Candidate 243 24 26 23<	Name	Party	Cash	Cash	Check	Credit Card	Total
16 Democratic Candidate 9 3% 45 215 D110 Democratic Candidate 37 19% 6 148 D110 Democratic Candidate 37 19% 6 148 SD1 Democratic Candidate 268 50% 89 182 Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88 229 Democratic Candidate 75 88% 0 23 Democratic Candidate 75 88% 0 23 Democratic Candidate 75 88% 124 53 Democratic Candidate 74 43% 124 56 At104 Democratic Candidate 74 75 56 At1143 Democratic Candidate 74 75 56 At1143 Democratic Candidate 74 75 56 At1143 Democratic Candidate 74 75 56 At15 Democratic Candidate 74 75 56 45	Matt Rush - SD 2	Democratic Candidate	185	56%	39	107	331
D110 Democratic Candidate 37 19% 6 148 SD1 Democratic Candidate 268 50% 89 182 SD1 Democratic Candidate 254 41% 89 182 Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88% 229 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 00 22 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 124 369 J Democratic Candidate 175 86% 124 369 A1 Democratic Candidate 41% 42% 45% 36% A1 Democratic Candidate 44% 40% 124 369 A1 Democratic Candidate 44% 40% 23 45% A1 Democratic Candidate 44% 40% 23% 23% A1 Democratic Candidate 24% 80% 23% 23% A2 Republican Candidate 21% <td>Nathaniel White - SD 16</td> <td>Democratic Candidate</td> <td>6</td> <td>3%</td> <td>45</td> <td>215</td> <td>269</td>	Nathaniel White - SD 16	Democratic Candidate	6	3%	45	215	269
SD1 Democratic Candidate 268 50% 89 182 Democratic Candidate 54 41% 22 75 Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88% 229 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 0 2 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 0 2 Democratic Candidate 175 86% 124 369 J Democratic Candidate 417 87% 124 369 A1 Democratic Candidate 477 87% 124 369 A1 Democratic Candidate 477 82% 45 45 A1 Democratic Candidate 87% 20% 23 23 A1 Democratic Candidate 87% 23% 23% 23% A1 Democratic Candidate 21% 23% 23% 23% A1 Democratic Candidate 210% 23% 23%	Christina Mitchell - HD 110	Democratic Candidate	37	19%	6	148	191
bernocratic candidate5441%275bernocratic candidate25645%88229bernocratic candidate17586%029bernocratic candidate17586%1253bernocratic candidate4143%12453bernocratic candidate 42 43% 12453bernocratic candidate 42 43% 124 53bernocratic candidate 42 46% 90% 53 bernocratic candidate 477 80% 20 369 attbernocratic candidate 477 80% 20 369 attbernocratic candidate 477 80% 20 369 attbernotidate 477 82% 23 32 attRepublican Candidate 737 236 236 336 bernotidate 1056 29% 26% 233 33 bernotidate 115 68% 216 233 bernotidate 115 68% 216 233 bernotidate 115 68% 216 233 bernotidate 116 23% 236 333 bernotidate 116 29% 216 233 bernotidate 116 29% <td< td=""><td>Vaughn McLaughlin - SD 1</td><td>Democratic Candidate</td><td>268</td><td>50%</td><td>89</td><td>182</td><td>539</td></td<>	Vaughn McLaughlin - SD 1	Democratic Candidate	268	50%	89	182	539
Democratic Candidate 256 45% 88% 229 -HD 143Democratic Candidate 175 86% 0 29 -HD 143Democratic Candidate 417 86% 0 29 -HD 143Democratic Candidate 412 88% 124 53 SD 15Democratic Candidate 423 89% 124 365 A1Democratic Candidate 423 89% 124 365 A1Democratic Candidate 427 89% 124 365 Mer - SD 34Republican Candidate 477 82% 90% 87% Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 717 56% 19 230 Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 717 56% 317 106 Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 716 23% 317 236 Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 156% 20% 23% 23% Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 156% 26% 23% 317 Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 150 26% 216% 23% Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 150 25% 10 23% Me - SD 35Republican Candidate 133% 23% 23% 23% Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 150 25% 10 23% Me - SD 35Republican Candidate 133% 23% 23% 23% Me - SD 35Republican Candidate	Kilton Webb - HD 98	Democratic Candidate	54	41%	2	75	131
HD 143Democratic Candidate175 86% 029-HD 143Democratic Candidate4043%153SD 15Democratic Candidate 40 43% 1253SD 15Democratic Candidate 40% 124 56% 45% A1Democratic Candidate 40% 40% 56% 45% A1Democratic Candidate 40% 80% 20% 230 6% Republican Candidate 311 56% 20 87% 6% Republican Candidate 20% 20% 230 230 6% Republican Candidate 20% 20% 20% 20% 6% Republican Candidate 16% 26% 20% 230 6% Republican Candidate 16% 26% 20% 20% 6% Republican Candidate 16% 20% 20% 20% 6% Republican Candidate 151 $6\%\%$ 20% 20% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 21% 22% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 20% 20% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 20% 20% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 21% 22% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 21% 22% 1056 Republican Candidate 12% 22% 21% 22% 1056 <td>Tim Nangle - SD 26</td> <td>Democratic Candidate</td> <td>256</td> <td>45%</td> <td>88</td> <td>229</td> <td>573</td>	Tim Nangle - SD 26	Democratic Candidate	256	45%	88	229	573
-HD 143Democratic Candidate4043%153SD 15Democratic Candidate438%12456A1Democratic Candidate42 40% 124369A1Democratic Candidate 40% 70% 56%369A1Expublican Candidate 417 82% 20% 87Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 311 56% 19 230 Me - SD 34Republican Candidate 311 56% 20 87 Republican Candidate 311 56% 33% 31 106 Republican Candidate 165 82% 33% 31 106 Republican Candidate 1165 59% 23 33 33 Republican Candidate 1165 72% 216 33 33 33 Republican Candidate 1165 72% 106 106 106 Republican Candidate 133 236 236 236 236 Republican Candidate 1139 236 236 236 236 Republican Candidate 1136 236 236 236 236 Republican	David McCrea - HD 3	Democratic Candidate	175	86%	0	29	204
SD 15 Democratic Candidate 43 8% 124 369 41 Democratic Candidate 42 45% 6 45% 6 45% 66 40% 6 45% 66 40% 66 40% 82% 80% 82%	Kathryn Manede Hall - HD 143	Democratic Candidate	40	43%	1	53	94
41Democratic Candidate42 45% 6 45 41 Democratic Candidate 40% 6 40% 6 10 Neublican Candidate 40% 40% 6 82% 80% 10 Republican Candidate 117 82% 230 87 10 Republican Candidate 311 56% 129 230 10 Republican Candidate 116 56% 31 106 10 Republican Candidate 116 26% 23 33% 10 Republican Candidate 116 26% 23 33 10 Republican Candidate 116 56% 23 33 10 Republican Candidate 116 56% 12 23 10 Republican Candidate 116 56% 110 23 10 Republican Candidate 113 72% 110 23 10 Republican Candidate 113 72% 10 105 10 Republican Candidate 113 23% 100 105 10 Republican Candidate 113 23% 102 105 115 Republican Candidate 116 12% 105 105 11149 Republican Candidate 116 100 100 100 11140 Republican Candidate 1100 100 100 100 11140 Republican Candidate 100 100 100 100 <t< td=""><td>Raegan LaRochelle - SD 15</td><td>Democratic Candidate</td><td>43</td><td>8%</td><td>124</td><td></td><td>536</td></t<>	Raegan LaRochelle - SD 15	Democratic Candidate	43	8%	124		536
me- SD 34metrageAverage 40% 6 60% 60% 10% 10% me- SD 34Republican Candidate 477 82% 20% 87% 87% me- SD 34Republican Candidate 311 56% 19% 230 87% 6Republican Candidate 311 56% 31% 106 33% 6Republican Candidate 106 23% 31% 106 6Republican Candidate 165 56% 61 33% 0Republican Candidate 1151 68% 41 229 0Republican Candidate 1151 68% 41 229 0Republican Candidate 1139 72% 100 55% 105 10 56Republican Candidate 1130 72% 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 150 63% 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 150 23% 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 150 23% 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 150 23% 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 150 100 100 105 10 56Republican Candidate 100 100 100 100 10 56Republican Candidate 100 100 100 100 10 57Republican Candidate 100 100 100 100 10 56<	Patricia Kidder - HD 141	Democratic Candidate	42	45%	9	45	93
Ime- SD 34 Republican Candidate 477 82% 20 87 ime- SD 34 Republican Candidate 311 56% 19 230 6 Republican Candidate 311 56% 19 230 6 Republican Candidate 68 33% 31 106 7 Republican Candidate 165 59% 55 61 7 Republican Candidate 165 59% 55 61 0 Republican Candidate 151 68% 41 29 0 Republican Candidate 139 72% 10 105 1056 Republican Candidate 133 72% 13 23 1056 Republican Candidate 133 72% 13 23 1056 Republican Candidate 133 133 133 1051 Republican Candidate 150 72% 10 105 1051 Republican Candidate 133 133 133			Average	40%			
me - SD 34Republican Candidate 477 82% 20 87 $Republican Candidate31156\%192306Republican Candidate31156\%311066Republican Candidate20026\%31106Republican Candidate16526\%2333Republican Candidate16559\%56\%61Republican Candidate16559\%61290Republican Candidate16572\%61290Republican Candidate13972\%10291056Republican Candidate13972\%10291056Republican Candidate13972\%10291056Republican Candidate13972\%10291056Republican Candidate13029\%10510510515Republican Candidate15092\%1031331151Republican Candidate15092\%1031331151Republican Candidate10292\%1051051151Republican Candidate1021001031031151Republican Candidate1001001001001151Republican Candidate1001001001001151Republican Candidate<$							
(6) (2) <th< td=""><td>Bradley Scott Ducharme - SD 34</td><td>Republican Candidate</td><td>477</td><td>82%</td><td>20</td><td>87</td><td>584</td></th<>	Bradley Scott Ducharme - SD 34	Republican Candidate	477	82%	20	87	584
6 Republican Candidate 68 33% 31 106 Republican Candidate Republican Candidate 20 26% 23 33 Republican Candidate Nepublican Candidate 165 59% 55 61 33 Republican Candidate Nepublican Candidate 151 68% 41 29 33 Republican Candidate Nepublican Candidate 133 72% 14 29 29 Republican Candidate Nepublican Candidate Nepublican Candidate 133 105 <	Leo Kenney - SD 8	Republican Candidate	311	56%	19	230	560
Metrican Candidate 20 26% 23 33 Republican Candidate 165 69% 55 61 Republican Candidate 151 68% 41 29 Republican Candidate 133 72% 14 29 Republican Candidate 133 72% 11 29 Republican Candidate 133 72% 11 54 Republican Candidate 150 73% 10 105 SD 15 Republican Candidate 150 133 133 HD 149 Republican Candidate 22% 63 133 HD 149 Republican Candidate 26 28 133 HD 149 Republican Candidate 26 28 133	Marianne Moore - SD 6	Republican Candidate	68	33%	31	106	205
Metrican Candidate 165 61 61 Republican Candidate 151 68% 51 61 Republican Candidate 151 68% 41 29 Republican Candidate 139 72% 11 29 HD 56 Republican Candidate 139 72% 10 54 SD 15 Republican Candidate 150 43% 105 105 SD 15 Republican Candidate 150 43% 63 133 -HD 149 Republican Candidate 292% 63 133 133 -HD 149 Republican Candidate 26% 63 133 133 -HD 149 Republican Candidate 26% 63 133 133	Kathy Javner - HD 29	Republican Candidate	20	26%	23	33	76
Republican Candidate 151 68% 41 29 0 Republican Candidate 139 72% 1 54 HD 56 Republican Candidate 5% 10 54 SD 15 Republican Candidate 150 43% 63 105 HD 149 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 8 HD 149 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 8	Trey Stewart - SD 2	Republican Candidate	165	59%	55	61	281
Republican Candidate 139 72% 1 54 Republican Candidate 6 5% 10 105 Republican Candidate 150 43% 63 133 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8	Scott Cyrway - SD 16	Republican Candidate	151	68%	41	29	221
Republican Candidate 6 5% 10 105 Republican Candidate 150 43% 63 133 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 Average 54% 54% 133 133	Mark Zimmer - HD 150	Republican Candidate	139	72%	1	54	194
Republican Candidate 150 43% 63 133 Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 Average 54% 54% 7 7	Randall Greewood - HD 56	Republican Candidate	9	5%	10	105	121
Republican Candidate 92 92% 0 8 Average 54% 0	Richard Bradstreet - SD 15	Republican Candidate	150	43%	63	133	346
	Kelly Davis-Rouillard - HD 149	Republican Candidate	92	92%	0	8	100
			Average	54%			

Criminal Violations | Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices

	Agencies Online S	Services <u>Help</u> Search Ma	aine.gov			Select Language
					0	Contact Us Site map
					Search Office	SEARCH
Home	About Us	Candidates	Committees	Lobbyists	Public Officials	
Other Pol	itical Activity	Laws & Rules				
<u>Home</u> \rightarrow Canc	$lidates \rightarrow Criminal Viola$	ations				

Candidates

Filing Campaign Finance Reports

Record Keeping

Maine Clean Election Act

Disclosure Statements

Criminal Violations

Criminal Violations

The Maine Ethics Commission investigates potential violations of the Maine Clean Election Act (MCEA) program. These matters resulted in criminal prosecutions since the program began in 2000.

Peter Throumoulos, York Sup. Ct. CR-06-163 was found guilty following a jury trial to three counts of Aggravated Forgery (Class B), one count Theft by Deception (Class B) and one count Attempted Theft by Deception (Class C). Throumolous, a candidate for the State Senate, had forged 150 signatures on R&A forms to obtain \$18,000 in public campaign funds in 2004 and then forged 150 signatures on R&A forms and money orders in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the same amount in 2006. (He claimed that overzealous college students had in fact collected the questionable signatures.) He was sentenced to four years, all but 60 days suspended and three years of probation.

William Walcott, And. Sup. Ct. CR-07-1238, pled guilty to two counts of Violation of the MCEA (Class E), three counts of False Reports under the MCEA (Class C) and ten counts of Theft by Deception (Class D). Walcott had failed to return \$2,933 of unspent campaign funds from the 2006 campaign cycle and produced fabricated records purporting to show that he had in fact used the funds for campaign purposes. Further investigation revealed that he had diverted an additional \$3,294 of public campaign funds to his personal use during the 2004 campaign cycle. He was sentenced under a plea agreement to six months in jail for the ten theft counts of theft and to a suspended sentence of five months on the Class E MCEA violations (made up of consecutive terms of one month for each the five Class E crimes). The court also imposed two years of administrative release, with the requirement that Walcott pay restitution of \$3,294 (he had previously reimbursed the \$2,933).

Debra Reagan, York Sup. Ct. CR-08-1757, pled guilty to Misuse of Entrusted Property (Class D) and was sentenced to 30 days in jail. Reagan had deposited all \$4,874 in public campaign funds into her personal bank account during the 2006 campaign cycle and used all but \$356 of the money on her mortgage and personal expenses.

Bruce Ladd, York Sup. Ct. CR-08-1756, pled guilty to Aggravated Forgery (Class B) and was sentenced to 30 days in jail. Ladd had forged seven voter signatures on the R&A forms in his application to qualify for public funding as a House candidate in April 2008.

David R. Burns, York Sup. Ct. CR-12-276, pled guilty to three counts of Forgery (Class D) and three counts of Theft (Class D). He was sentenced to six months in jail and one year of administrative release with the requirement that he pay \$2,384 in restitution. Burns had commingled \$9,066 in public campaign funds with his personal funds in 2010 and produced false documents purporting to show that the funds had been used for campaign purposes.

Michael Hein, Ken. Sup. Ct. CR-12-444, pled guilty to one count of Willful Violation of the MCEA and was sentenced to seven days in jail. In his application for public campaign funds as a candidate for House District 57 (Augusta), Hein had falsely represented that he had received \$5 qualifying contributions from 13 voters.

Victor DiGregorio, YRKCD-CR-16-3020, pled guilty to six counts of unsworn falsification and was sentenced to 10 days in jail, to be served in the alternate sentencing program. At least 18 of the voters

Criminal Violations | Maine Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices

purportedly signing the R&A forms and money orders had not in fact made a \$5 qualifying contribution. DiGregorio had signed each of the forms as circulator.

Former Rep. Clinton E. Collamore, Sr., LNCD-CR-2023-17 Collamore pled guilty to 12 counts of unsworn falsification in connection with a pattern of falsification and forgery in his submissions of MCEA documentary paperwork to the Ethics Commission for House District 45 (Waldoboro). Collamore admitted to forging scores of contributor signatures on Receipt and Acknowledgment forms, Cash Contribution receipts, and money orders. The evidence did not suggest, however, that Collamore failed to obtain qualifying contributions related to any of the impacted contributors. Collamore was sentenced to 72 hours in jail, to be served in a first-offender alternative sentencing program, and 100 hours of community service on June 12, 2023. Collamore resigned from the Legislature and returned all MCEA funds.

Matthew F. Toth, YRKCD-CR-2022-00816, pled guilty to two counts of unsworn falsification and was sentenced to 10 days in jail, to be served in the alternative sentencing program on September 29, 2023, in connection with forgery for his submissions of MCEA documentary paperwork for House District 143 (Sanford) in 2022.

Credit	Information	Related links
	Site Policies	Maine Secretary of State
	Accessibility	Federal Election Commissior
Copyright © 2019	Document Viewers	Maine Legislature
All rights reserved.	Maine.gov	Maine Law
	Ethics Commission Home	Voter Information
	Sitemap	Subscribe to email notices