

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
House Communications Standards Commission
1541a Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-6157
(202) 225-9337

February 23, 2022

The Honorable Kat Cammack
Ranking Member
1626 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Ranking Member Cammack,

Thank you for your February 22, 2022 letter stating your conclusion that further review is warranted regarding the complaint filed by Americans for Public Trust (Complainant) against Representative Val Demings (Respondent). Under Rule 7(1) of the Communication Standards Commission's procedures, the Respondent will be notified of your opinion.

Your letter also requests additional information from the Respondent. Under Rule 7(2), only "the Commission may request additional information from either the complainant or respondent." Accordingly, neither you, as Ranking Member, nor I, as Chair, have the unilateral authority to request additional information from either party. In light of your request, I am immediately initiating a vote by the Commission, to be taken by written poll, regarding whether additional information should be requested.

Given the straightforward facts in this matter, and longstanding Commission precedents, I do not believe that further inquiry is warranted and I will be voting in the negative.

The facts of this case are straightforward. The Respondent contracted with a mail vendor to distribute a mailing using official resources. The vendor—by its own admission—engaged in a process to update mailing lists that resulted in the mailer being sent to at least one recipient who lives outside of the Respondent's congressional district.

The vendor, in a signed letter, has taken full responsibility for the error and confirmed the Respondent's assertion that neither she nor her staff were aware of the practice that led to the error. The vendor has reimbursed the U.S. Treasury for the postage.

These facts fit squarely within long held and repeatedly applied Commission precedents. In four cases—all with Republican respondents and decided under Republican majorities—there was a Commission finding of no violation.¹ I see no reason why we should abandon Commission precedent in this matter.

Accordingly, in light of prior Commission rulings, I do not find it necessary to request additional information of the Respondent, and I will be voting “no” on the question presented. I encourage my Commission colleagues to do the same.

Sincerely,



Mary Gay Scanlon
House Communications Standards Commission

¹ *Knaus v. Tancredo* (2002); *Holcomb v. Barton* (2004); *McCarthy v. Sodrel* (2005); *Stevens v. Mack* (2012).