

1 GARY S. WINUK  
Chief of Enforcement  
2 GALENA WEST  
Senior Commission Counsel  
3 **FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**  
428 J Street, Suite 620  
4 Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: (916) 322-5660

5 Attorneys for Complainant  
6  
7

8 BEFORE THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION  
9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10  
11

12 In the Matter of ) FPPC No. 12/032  
13 )  
14 MIKE MORE, ) STIPULATION, DECISION and  
15 ) ORDER  
16 Respondent. )  
17

18 Complainant the Fair Political Practices Commission, and Respondent Mike More agree that this  
19 Stipulation will be submitted for consideration by the Fair Political Practices Commission at its next  
20 regularly scheduled meeting.

21 The parties agree to enter into this Stipulation to resolve all factual and legal issues raised in this  
22 matter and to reach a final disposition without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to  
23 determine the liability of Respondent, pursuant to Section 83116 of the Government Code.

24 Respondent understands, and hereby knowingly and voluntarily waives, any and all procedural  
25 rights set forth in Sections 83115.5, 11503 and 11523 of the Government Code, and in Sections 18361.1  
26 through 18361.9 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations. This includes, but is not limited to,  
27 the right to personally appear at any administrative hearing held in this matter, to be represented by an  
28 attorney at Respondent's own expense, to confront and cross-examine all witnesses testifying at the

1 hearing, to subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial administrative law judge  
2 preside over the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially reviewed. It is further  
3 stipulated and agreed that Respondent Mike More violated the Political Reform Act by failing to report  
4 gifts received in the amount of fifty dollars or more on his annual Statement of Economic Interests, in  
5 violation of Sections 87300 and 87302 of the Government Code (2 counts). All counts are described in  
6 Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.  
7 Exhibit 1 is a true and accurate summary of the facts in this matter.

8 Respondent agrees to the issuance of the Decision and Order, which is attached hereto.  
9 Respondent also agrees to the Commission imposing upon him an administrative penalty in the amount  
10 of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000). A cashier's check from Respondent in said amount, made payable  
11 to the "General Fund of the State of California," is submitted with this Stipulation as full payment of the  
12 administrative penalty, to be held by the State of California until the Commission issues its decision and  
13 order regarding this matter. The parties agree that in the event the Commission refuses to accept this  
14 Stipulation, it shall become null and void, and within fifteen (15) business days after the Commission  
15 meeting at which the Stipulation is rejected, all payments tendered by Respondent in connection with  
16 this Stipulation shall be reimbursed to Respondent. Respondent further stipulates and agrees that in the  
17 event the Commission rejects the Stipulation, and a full evidentiary hearing before the Commission  
18 becomes necessary, neither any member of the Commission, nor the Executive Director, shall be  
19 disqualified because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.  
20

21 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Gary Winuk, Enforcement Chief,  
23 on behalf of the  
24 Fair Political Practices Commission

25  
26 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
27 Mike More, Respondent  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The foregoing Stipulation of the parties “In the Matter of Mike More,” FPPC No. 12/032, including all attached exhibits, is hereby accepted as the final decision and order of the Fair Political Practices Commission, effective upon execution below by the Chair.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Ravel, Chair  
Fair Political Practices Commission

Intentionally left blank

## **EXHIBIT 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Respondent Mike More (“Respondent”) has been the Financial Services Manager for the City of Oxnard since 2000. As a designated employee, Respondent is required to file an annual Statement of Economic Interests (“SEI”) disclosing all income received as required by the Political Reform Act (the “Act”).<sup>1</sup> In this matter, Respondent received gifts exceeding the reporting threshold of \$50 in 2008 and 2009, and failed to report these gifts on his annual SEIs for those years.

For the purposes of this Stipulation, Respondent’s violations of the Act are stated as follows:

**COUNT 1:** During 2008, Respondent Mike More, a designated employee of the City of Oxnard, failed to report gifts from E.J. De La Rosa & Co., Inc. and Ojai Valley Inn, in the amount of fifty dollars or more on his 2008 annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Sections 87300 and 87302 of the Government Code.

**COUNT 2:** During 2009, Respondent Mike More, a designated employee of the City of Oxnard, failed to report gifts from E.J. De La Rosa & Co., Inc., in the amount of fifty dollars or more on his 2009 annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Sections 87300 and 87302 of the Government Code.

### **SUMMARY OF THE LAW**

#### **Duty to File Annual Statement of Economic Interests**

An express purpose of the Act, as set forth in Section 81002, subdivision (c), is to ensure that the assets and income of public officials, that may be materially affected by their official actions, be disclosed, so that conflicts of interests may be avoided. In furtherance of this purpose, Section 87300 requires every agency to adopt and promulgate a Conflict of Interest Code. A Conflict of Interest Code shall have the force of law and any violation of a Conflict of Interest Code by a designated employee shall be deemed a violation of this chapter. (Section 87300.)

#### **Disclosure Provisions**

Section 82019, subdivision (a), defines “designated employee” to include any member of any agency whose position is “designated in a Conflict of Interest Code because the position entails the making or participation in the making of decisions which may foreseeably have a material effect on any financial interest.” Each Conflict of Interest Code shall require that each

---

<sup>1</sup> The Political Reform Act is contained in Government Code Sections 81000 through 91014. All statutory references are to the Government Code, unless otherwise indicated. The regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission are contained in Sections 18110 through 18997 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations. All regulatory references are to Title 2, Division 6 of the California Code of Regulations, unless otherwise indicated.

designated employee file annual statements, disclosing reportable investments, business positions, interests in real property and sources of income. (Section 87302.) “Income” is defined, in part, as a payment received, including but not limited to any salary, wage, or gift, including any gift of food or beverage. (Section 82030, subd. (a).)

Section 87300 requires that every agency adopt and promulgate a Conflict of Interest Code and that Code shall have the force of law. In addition, any violation of that Code by a designated employee shall be a violation of the Act. Section 87302, subdivision (b), provides that an agency’s Conflict of Interest Code must require each designated employee of the agency to file annual statements of economic interests at a time specified in the agency’s conflict of interest code, disclosing investments, income, business positions, and interests in real property, held or received at anytime during the previous calendar year and that the information required to be disclosed describing these interests is the same as that required by Sections 87206 and 87207. An agency’s Conflict of Interest Code may incorporate Regulation 18730, which contains a model conflict of interest code, by reference.

The City of Oxnard’s Conflict of Interest Code (“Oxnard Code”) incorporates the Regulation 18730 model code by reference and lists the position of “Financial Services Manager” as a designated employee who makes or participates in making governmental decisions which may foreseeably have a material effect on their financial interests. The Oxnard Code lists the Financial Services Manager as a designated employee in Disclosure Category 1. The Oxnard Code states that Disclosure Category 1 requires that the designated employee complete all schedules of his annual SEI to disclose<sup>2</sup>:

“1. All financial interests, sources of income, investments and business positions and business entities located within or subject to the jurisdiction of the City [of Oxnard].

2. Business entities doing business, planning to do business, or having done business during the prior two years within the City [of Oxnard].

3. Any other financial interest, investment, interest in real property, source of income, or business position if the business entity in which the investment or business position is held, the interest in real property, financial interest or source of income may foreseeably be affected materially by any decision made or participated in by the designated person by reason of the City [of Oxnard] position held.”

Section 82028, subdivision (a), provides that a “gift” means any payment that confers a personal benefit on the recipient, to the extent that consideration of equal or greater value is not received. Regulation 18941<sup>3</sup> states that “...a gift is ‘received’ or ‘accepted’ when the recipient knows that he or she has either actual possession of the gift or takes any action exercising direction or control over the gift.” Regulation 18944 states that a gift confers a personal benefit on the official when the official<sup>4</sup> enjoys a direct benefit from the gift, the official uses the gift, or the

---

<sup>2</sup>This disclosure excludes income from pensions for disability or retirement paid by a governmental entity.

<sup>3</sup>All regulations in this document are referenced as they were in effect in the relevant year (2008 – 2009) for that Count.

<sup>4</sup>Section 82048 defines “public official” to include “every member, officer, employee or consultant of a state or local government agency.”

official exercises *discretion and control* over who will use the gift or how to dispose of the gift. In addition, Regulation 18945, subdivision (a), states that a person is the source of a gift if the person either gives the gift directly to the official or the “person makes a payment to a third party and in fact directs and controls the use of the payment to make a gift to one or more clearly identified officials.” Regulation 18945, subdivision (b), states that official may presume that the person delivering or offering the gift is the source of the gift. Regulation 18946 states that the value of the gift is the fair market value as of the date of receipt or promise of the gift.

### **SUMMARY OF THE FACTS**

This matter arose from a referral from the Ventura County District Attorney’s office. Respondent More was the Financial Services Manager for the City of Oxnard at all times relevant to this matter, attaining his current position with the City in 2000. Respondent More failed to disclose E.J. De La Rosa & Co., Inc. (“De La Rosa”), a municipal bond underwriter who does business with the City of Oxnard, on his annual SEIs for 2008 and 2009, after receiving meals for Respondent and his wife and golf from De La Rosa exceeding the \$50 reporting threshold. In 2008, Respondent also failed to disclose a gift of golf received from a luxury resort outside his jurisdiction.

#### **COUNT 1**

#### **Failure to disclose gifts on a Statement of Economic Interests**

Respondent More was a designated employee of the City of Oxnard at all times relevant to this matter. As a designated employee, Respondent was required to file an annual SEI disclosing all income received. Respondent filed his 2008 SEI with the Oxnard City Clerk on April 2, 2009 and disclosed an investment interest in IBM, but did not disclose any gifts received. The chart below identifies the gifts received by Respondent More in 2008:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Gift</b>	<b>Donor</b>	<b>Value</b>
03/19/2008	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$16.43
03/27/2008	Golf	Ojai Valley Inn	\$170.00
03/27/2008	Meal	De La Rosa	\$29.71
05/05/2008	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$15.86
07/15/2008	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$17.61
08/29/2008	Golf	De La Rosa	\$125.00
12/03/2008	Dinner (Respondent & Spouse)	De La Rosa	\$150.00
<b>TOTAL (Ojai Valley Inn):</b>			<b>\$170.00</b>
<b>TOTAL (De La Rosa):</b>			<b>\$354.61</b>

By failing to report \$170.00 in gifts received from Ojai Valley Inn and \$354.61 in gifts from De La Rosa in 2008<sup>5</sup> on his 2008 annual SEI, Respondent violated Sections 87300 and 87302 of the Government Code.

**COUNT 2**  
**Failure to disclose gifts on a Statement of Economic Interests**

Respondent More was a designated employee of the City of Oxnard at all times relevant to this matter. As a designated employee, Respondent was required to file an annual Statement of Economic Interests disclosing all income received. Respondent filed his 2009 SEI with the Oxnard City Clerk on February 23, 2010 and disclosed “No reportable interests on any schedule.” The chart below identifies the gifts received by Respondent More in 2009:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Gift</b>	<b>Donor</b>	<b>Value</b>
01/13/2009	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$14.81
11/04/2009	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$5.68
11/18/2009	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$16.31
12/14/2009	Lunch	De La Rosa	\$54.72
12/14/2009	Dinner	De La Rosa	\$101.52
<b>TOTAL (De La Rosa):</b>			<b>\$193.04</b>

By failing to report \$193.04 in gifts received from De La Rosa in 2009 on his 2009 annual SEI, Respondent violated Sections 87300 and 87302 of the Government Code.

**CONCLUSION**

This matter consists of two counts, which carries a maximum possible administrative penalty of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000).

In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular violation of the Act, the Enforcement Division considers the typical treatment of a violation in the overall statutory scheme of the Act, with an emphasis on serving the purposes and intent of the Act. Additionally, the Enforcement Division considers the facts and circumstances of the violation in context of the factors set forth in Regulation 18361.5, subdivision (d)(1)-(6): 1) the seriousness of the violations; 2) the presence or lack of intent to deceive the voting public; 3) whether the violation was deliberate, negligent, or inadvertent; 4) whether the Respondent demonstrated good faith in consulting with Commission staff; 5) whether there was a pattern of violations; and 6) whether the Respondent, upon learning of a reporting violation, voluntarily filed amendments to provide full disclosure.

---

<sup>5</sup> For 2008, the applicable gift limit from a single source was \$390.

**SEI Non-Disclosure:** Penalties for SEI non-disclosure violations range widely depending on the circumstances of each case. Disclosure of economic interests is important to provide transparency and prevent conflicts of interest. Failure to report all required information on an SEI is a serious violation of the Act because it deprives the public of important information about a public official's economic interests and it has the potential to conceal conflicts of interest.

Regarding the failure to disclose gifts received over the \$50 reporting threshold on SEIs, the typical penalty amounts have varied depending on the circumstances of the case. Recent prior penalties concerning SEI disclosure violations include:

- *In re Bryan MacDonald*, FPPC No. 12/028 (Approved December 13, 2012). Bryan MacDonald, as a member of the Oxnard City Council, failed to disclose gifts received from a developer who does business in the city on his 2009 SEI. No evidence was found to show that the gifts were intentionally omitted from his SEI. Further, he stated that he was unaware of the requirement to disclose the gifts. The gifts were also over the applicable limit. The approved stipulated settlement was \$1,000 for the violation of failing to disclose income on an SEI and \$2,000 for the violation of the gift limit provisions of the Act.
- *In re Andres Herrera*, FPPC No. 12/027 (Approved December 13, 2012). Andres Herrera, as a member of the Oxnard City Council, failed to disclose gifts received from a developer who does business in the city on his 2007, 2008, and 2009 SEIs and failed to disclose gifts received from a municipal bond underwriter who does business with the city on his 2008 SEI. The Commission approved a \$1,000 per violation regarding the non-disclosure of the gifts. Respondent Herrera stated that he was unaware of the reporting requirements and no evidence was found that the gifts were intentionally omitted. The gifts were also over the applicable gift limits for which a \$2,000 penalty per violation was approved. In addition, the gifts in excess of the limits caused Respondent to have a conflict of interest when voting to approve a development project involving the source of the gifts over the limits and received a fine of \$3,500 for this violation.

In this matter, Respondent More did not disclose gifts received from a bond underwriter who regularly does business with his jurisdiction and a gift of golf from a luxury resort. Respondent has no prior history of violating the Act. No evidence was found to show that the gifts were intentionally omitted from his SEI, which he amended when requested to do so. He stated that he was unaware of the requirement to disclose the gifts. Further, Respondent believed that city officials who were also in attendance were paying for many of these meals with their city credit cards. Based on the above prior cases and the information provided in this case, imposition of a \$1,000 penalty for each count is recommended for a total of \$2,000 for these two violations.

### **PROPOSED PENALTY**

After consideration of the factors of Regulation 18361.5, including whether the behavior in question was inadvertent, negligent or deliberate and the Respondent's pattern of behavior, as well as consideration of penalties in prior enforcement actions, the imposition of a penalty of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) is recommended.

Intentionally left blank