

## MICHIGAN CREDIT UNION LEAGUE LEGISLATIVE FORUM MICHIGAN CREDIT UNION LEAGUE LEGISLATIVE ACTION FUND MICHIGAN CREDIT UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTION FUND

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

July 12, 2001

Mr. Scott Walker Reports Analyst Reports Analysis Division Federal Election Commission 999 E. Street NW Washington, D C 20463

Dear Mr. Walker:

Michigan Credit Union League Legislative Action Fund; Committee Identification No. Re: C00139279; Reference to Year End Report (11/28/00-12/31/00)

On June 6, 2001, we were notified that a review of the above-referenced report raised questions as to specific contributions and /or expenditures, and the reporting of certain information required by the Federal Election Campaign Act. On June 20, 2001, we filed an amended report with the Federal Election Commission and explained that the errors caused in the calculation of lines 11(a)(i) and 11 (a)(ii), were caused by an error in our computer software program. By letter dated June 28k, 2001, the Reports Analysis Division of the Federal Election Commission informed us that our June 20, 2001, response is incomplete because we have not provided all the requested information.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to clarify our June 20, 2001 response. In this regard, please note that the selected portions from Schedule A of our Year End Report contained the names of various credit unions, as indicated in your June 6, 2001 letter. However, please note that the inclusion of the names of these various entitled on Schedule A was an error caused by our computer software program, which has been corrected. Significantly, all of the contributions (incorrectly referenced on Schedule A of our 2000 Year End Report as having been made by credit unions) were uniterrized contributions from individuals. According to 11 C.F.R. § 102.6, the credit union critics referenced on Schedule A qualify as collecting agents and should not have been identified on our 2000 Year End Repot. Again, we believe that this computer error has been corrected and should not recur in the future.

We apologize for any inconvenience that may have been caused by our computer software program referencing collecting agents as contributors. If you have any questions or require any further information, please contact me.

Sincerely.

ede Kukerseke

was the control of th ments. The second of the second secon ent ja menaj linne filologije. Programan i faktor i kontre en jaziteko is un mederito, jazobij sale in mas en kilo the first and was the

## Federal Election Commission

## ENVELOPE REPLACEMENT PAGE FOR INCOMING DOCUMENTS

The Commission has added this page to the end of this filing to indicate how it was received. Date of Receipt Hand Delivered POSTMARKED First Class Mail POSTMARKED (R/C) V Registered/Certified Mail 7-12-01 No Postmark Postmark Illegible Date of Receipt Received from the House office of Records and Registration Date of Receipt Received from the Senate Office of Public Records Postmarked Other ( Specify): and/or Date of Receipt Electronic Filing

/-	<u> </u>	1/
 DATE 9	REP	ARED