

T Tanya Mercier added a private note
22 minutes ago (Tue, 18 Mar 2025 at 10:13 AM)

Merged from ticket 168403

Subject: Haircut expenditures by the 2024 Shaun Scott campaign

Description:
Hi Jason,

One of the allegations in the case against Shaun Scott is that he used campaign funds for personal use. Specifically he used funds for haircuts. The reports did indicate four expenditures for haircuts to "Jesus Barbershop," totaling \$333.40. On August 13, 2024, Mr. Scott responded that "Because of television, debate, and other campaign appearances that the candidate would not be subject to were they not running for office, these are reasonably construed as an allowable campaign expense until advised otherwise explicitly by the PDC." At the September 3, 2024, Initial Hearing, I informed Mr. Scott the haircuts were most likely personal and an impermissible use of campaign funds. I told him I was going to see how we have handled this issue in the past but that the expenditures would most likely need to be reimbursed to the campaign. On December 6, 2024, when I spoke with Mr. Scott he indicated the vendor for the haircuts should be Supreme Cuts and not Jesus Barbershop. Mr. Scott was told to amend the reports so the information was accurate. On December 10, 2024, I let Mr. Scott know the haircuts were an impermissible use of campaign funds and would need to be reimbursed to the campaign.

When I search the PDC data analytics site, on the web, I am now not seeing any expenditures to Jesus Barbershop, Supreme Cuts, or anything for haircuts. Did these expenditures somehow get amended to something else? Did Mr. Scott reimburse the campaign?

Thanks,

Tanya

Jason Bennett

Replied Fri270.Mar.8681at.1065PM

To:"PDC Support" <pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov>

External Email

Each of these expenses is below the reporting itemized threshold in the software so I am guessing they are lump-summed into the accumulated expenses per report now. He has not yet reimbursed the campaign for the expenses (I think likely due to the busy nature of session) but he is aware of the need. The total now is \$756 (likely due to the lump sum issue mentioned earlier). I did amend them to include the vendor as "Supreme Cutz." Here is what it looks like in our software:

Supreme Cutz

Business |

Total Expenses: \$756.00

Emails

Addresses

Work

5239 University Way Northeast
Seattle, WA 98105

Transactions

| | Date | Transaction Type | Number | Budget Category | Election | Amount | |
|-----|------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------|---------|---|
| x ✓ | 11/05/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA G-2024 | \$65.00 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 10/08/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA G-2024 | \$60.00 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 09/17/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA G-2024 | \$62.40 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 08/30/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA G-2024 | \$62.40 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 07/25/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$86.40 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 07/12/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$80.00 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 06/26/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$90.00 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 06/09/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$77.00 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 05/17/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$86.40 | ⓘ |
| x ✓ | 04/24/2024 | Expense | | Office Supplies | WA P-2024 | \$86.40 | ⓘ |

The red check marks indicate that the expense has been reconciled to the bank statement. The budget category is an internal tracking code, not what is reported to the PDC.

This is the detail of a particular expense:

Expense

[\[Print\]](#)

☐ Is Memo☐ Is Reversal

Check #

Date*

10/08/2024

Method

ACH

Amount*

\$

60.00

Account*

Checking

Election*

WA G-2024

Reporting Code*

G - Utilities, phone, and other overhead costs

Compliance Note

hair services fee

Budget Category*

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES: Office Supplies

Internal Note

Check Note

Tags

Specify Splits