



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
428 J Street • Suite 620 • Sacramento, CA 95814-2329
(916) 322-5660 • Fax (916) 322-0886

EXECUTIVE STAFF REPORTS

March 17, 2016 Commission Hearing

Contents

<u>ENFORCEMENT DIVISION</u>	2
<u>LEGAL DIVISION</u>	4
<u>EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND EDUCATION DIVISION</u>	15

I. ENFORCEMENT DIVISION

STAFF: GALENA WEST, CHIEF OF ENFORCEMENT

During the period of February 4, 2016 through March 3, 2016, the Enforcement Division received 115 referrals and complaints as detailed in the chart below.

Type	SWORN	PROACTIVE/INFORMAL	NON-FILER
Number Received	26	46	43
Case Opened	3	1	37
Complaint Rejected	15	26	3
Under Review	8	19	3

Also during this time, the Division closed a total of 180 cases including:

- 63 warning letters,
- 1 advisory letter,
- 24 no action letters,
- 26 as a result of the adoption of stipulations and defaults at the February Commission meeting, and
- 66 committees were administratively terminated.

The Division had 788 cases in various stages of resolution at the time of the February Monthly Report and currently has 679 cases in various stages of resolution, including the 26 cases before the Commission as listed in the March 2016 agenda.

Below is a second chart to continue to track the outcome of the 2,460 \$50 Annual Fee referrals that the Enforcement Division received from the Secretary of State's office on May 1, 2015.

	2013 \$50 ANNUAL FEE: Total Referral – 2,460
Referrals Rejected	625
Administratively Terminated	175
In the Process of Administrative Termination	887
Other Terminations	309
Administrative Fines Issued	172 (+ 1 on the March agenda)
Warning Letters Issued	88
No Action Letters Issued	51
Cases Being Prosecuted	152

II. LEGAL DIVISION

STAFF:

HYLA WAGNER, GENERAL COUNSEL

JOHN WALLACE, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

TRISH MAYER, ASSISTANT CHIEF

HEATHER ROWAN, SENIOR COMMISSION COUNSEL

A. Pending Litigation

Frank J. Burgess v. Fair Political Practices Commission.

Frank J. Burgess filed a writ of mandate in Riverside Superior Court on October 4, 2015, seeking relief from the Commission's decision and order in *In re Frank J. Burgess*, Case No. 12/516. Following an administrative hearing in front of an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Mr. Burgess challenged that decision to the Commission. After oral argument before the Commission on March 19, 2015 and a thorough review of the record, the Commission rejected the ALJ's decision and decided the case based on the record, oral argument, and the parties' supplemental briefing on the "governmental decision" element of the case. The Commission found that Mr. Burgess violated Government Code Section 87100 of the Political Reform Act (the Act)¹ and imposed a \$5,000 fine on July 7, 2015. Mr. Burgess challenges that decision as an excess of the Commission's jurisdiction, an abuse of discretion, and a denial of due process rights. The administrative record has been produced and the parties will brief the matter over the next several months, at which point the court will schedule a hearing.

B. Outreach and Training

- On February 3, 2016 Senior Commission Counsel Sukhi K. Brar conducted a Form 700 webinar for the California Judges Association. Ms. Brar covered Form 700 reporting rules and gift rules under the Act for more than 66 judges.

¹ 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 this source.

- On February 5, 2016, Senior Staff Counsel Brian Lau participated in a panel discussion of “Topical Ethics Issues in Water and Public Works,” at the 2016 Municipal Law Institute Symposium presented by the League of California Cities, McGeorge School of Law Capital Center for Public Law and Policy, the County Counsels’ Association, and the State Bar of California Public Law Section. Approximately 70 people attended.
- On February 16, 2016, Assistant Chief Trish Mayer, in coordination with the External Affairs and Education Division, conducted training to state agency staff responsible for performing administrative duties required under the Act with respect to the Form 700. The training was held at FPPC and was attended by over 30 state agency officials and FPPC staff.

C. Advice

In January 2016, the Legal Division responded to the following requests for advice:

- **Requests for Advice:** Legal Division Political Reform Consultants and attorneys collectively responded to more than 1,147 email and telephone requests for advice.
- **Advice Letters:** The Legal Division received 21 advice letter requests and issued 11 advice letters.
- **Section 1090 Letters:** Legal Division received three advice letter requests concerning Section 1090 and issued three advice letters. This year to date we have received six requests regarding Section 1090 (not including conflict of interest letters that incidentally deal with Section 1090 issues).

D. Advice Letter Summaries

Campaign

Jonathan S. Mintzer

I-15-242

Section 84222 sets forth when a Multipurpose Organization (MPO) becomes a recipient committee. One test is whether the MPO makes contributions or expenditures totaling more than \$50,000 in a period of 12 months or more than \$100,000 in a period of four consecutive calendar years. The effective date of the Legislation was July 1, 2014 and requires contributions and expenditures made prior to July 1, 2014 to be considered in determining whether the MPO qualifies as a committee. The statute also states that if an MPO makes contributions or expenditures in California elections using funds that were not received from donors, there are no donors to disclose for those transactions and these funds are not counted toward the recipient committee threshold. The statute does not mandate a specific accounting method for certifying that funds are non-donor funds. Regulation 18422(f) states that a “multipurpose organization must maintain all records necessary to establish its compliance with Section 84222....” Therefore, it will be

incumbent on the organization to be able to show that contributions or expenditures claimed to be made with non-donor funds were made with such funds.

Conflict of Interest

Jamie Raymond

A-15-216

A city official may participate in the city's decisions supporting or challenging a utility company's application before the Public Utilities Commission to construct a substation and high voltage electric lines in the vicinity of a building and printing business the official owns. Based upon the facts provided, the financial effect of the project would not have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect on the city official's financial interests because the financial effect (whether negative or positive) would not be more than nominal. Therefore, the official does not have a conflict of interest in decisions involving the city's review of the project.

Josh Fryday

A-15-244

The Act's conflict of interest provisions do not prohibit a councilmember from participating in decisions about a proposed recreational sports complex approximately 1,650 feet from his home. While the project could foreseeably affect the councilmember's financial interest in his residence, it is unlikely that the effects on his property interest, if any, would be material.

Bruce Gibson

A-16-012

A county supervisor is appointed to the San Luis Obispo LAFCO. He owns residential property in the community of Cayucos. An application for dissolution of the Cayucos Fire Protection may come before LAFCO in the future. The public official's property falls within the boundary of this district thus he was advised he has a disqualifying conflict of interest pursuant to Regulation 18702.2(a)(2). Additionally, the general public exception did not apply.

Charles Stone

A-16-013

The Belmont City Council is considering the Belmont Village Specific Plan. A Belmont City Councilmember is also an attorney with a solo practice and is considering employment with a law firm to handle slip and fall defense cases for a grocery store chain with a store within the area of the specific plan. The Act would not prohibit the councilmember from participating in the decision on whether to approve the Specific Plan because the decision would not have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect on the grocery store chain.

Vera M. I. Todorov

A-16-020

A planning commissioner is, in her private capacity, the Chief Executive Officer of an IRS 501 (c)(3) non-profit called the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC). SVBC is formed to promote a better community, environment and economy through increased bicycling. SVBC has three main revenue streams: grants/contracts, individual donations, and events. The commissioner does not have a conflict of interest under the Act regarding decisions on applications for entitlements before the planning commission brought by

donors to SVBC so long as these decisions will not have a financial effect on the commissioner or the commissioner's employer.

Conflict of Interest Codes

John Bakker

A-15-246

A consultant hired by the City of Dublin, who serves as the city's planning consultant and also provides services to the city as an on-call engineer is a "public official" under the Act and is participating in governmental decisions in performing the duties of his positions. Accordingly, the consultant's position must be designated in the city's conflict of interest code and the consultant must file statements of economic interests as required by the Act.

Gift Limits

James C. Romo

A-16-031

Directors of the Santa Ana Unified School District (SAUSD) who attend an educational field inspection trip of the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) water facilities and accept free transportation, lodging, and food provided by MWD are receiving gifts not subject to the gift limits of the Act. Since MWD is a public agency and the travel is reasonably related to a governmental purpose and to an issue of state public policy, the exception in Section 89506 would apply. While not subject to limits, the payments will be reportable by the SAUSD Board Members and could form the basis for a conflict of interest where a governmental decision before SAUSD will have a material financial effect on MWD.

Lobbying

Lawrence E. Stone

A-16-001

The Act's lobbying provisions do not require the county assessor or the county to report dues paid by the county for the assessor's membership in the California Assessor's Association because the dues are not "payments to influence legislative or administrative action" pursuant to Regulation 18616(g)(4) and not payments for the county's or a county department's membership to an organization potentially reportable under Section 86116.5.

Section 1090

Amy W. Estrada

I-15-232

A school board member could have conflicts under both Section 1090 and the Act if he makes decisions that directly affect his wife's employment with the school. Conflicts are less likely when a decision involves a class of employees rather than a particular position. A Section 1090 violation does not exist until the school board member takes his elected position.

Christopher J. Diaz**A-15-235**

The Act does not prohibit the Vice Mayor of the Town of Colma from participating in the governmental decision on whether to adopt an ordinance establishing the Peninsula Clean Energy joint powers authority (JPA) as the default electrical energy provider for town consumers, despite the Vice Mayor's ownership of Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) stock in her 401k plan. Because a reasonably prudent person with sufficient information would not find that the decision's effect would contribute to a change in the price of PG&E's publicly traded stock, the decision would not have a material financial effect on the Vice Mayor's financial interest in the PG&E stock. Also, Section 1090 does not prohibit the Vice Mayor from participating in the making of, or the town from entering into, an agreement authorizing the town to join the JPA because the Vice Mayor would not have a financial interest in that agreement.

Michael C. Ghizzoni**A-16-021**

Prior to his employment with the County, Deputy County Counsel Baugh worked for the Walsh Group, terminating his employment on March 6, 2015. On December 14, 2012, the County initiated a \$96.1 million project to construct a new jail facility. On March 17, 2015, the County announced that nine contractors had prequalified to bid on the project, one of which was Walsh Construction. The county asked whether Mr. Baugh would have a conflict of interest under the Act or Section 1090 if he is tasked with advising the team leading the County of Santa Barbara's AB 900 jail project, including advising on bid protests and contract disputes due to Walsh's involvement. Pursuant to Regulation 18700.1(b), Mr. Baugh does not have an interest in his former employer because the income was received by or accrued to Mr. Baugh prior to the time he became a public official, the income was received in the normal course of his previous employment, and there is no expectation of renewed employment. Moreover, Mr. Baugh does not have a financial interest in the decision regarding a former employer for purposes of Section 1090.

E. Upcoming Regulations**April 21, 2016**

- **Conflict of Interest Code Processes (Regulations 18750 et seq.).** Streamline the process to review agencies' conflict of interest codes.

F. Conflict of Interest Codes

The FPPC is the code reviewing body for over 200 state agencies and 600 multi-county agencies. Since the last report the following conflict of interest code adoptions and amendments were approved.

State Agencies:

- Attorney General's Office
- Child Support Services
- Energy Commission

Multi-County Agencies:

- Capitol Valley Regional Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (Capitol Valley SAFE)
- Community Collaborative Charter School Board
- County Medical Services Program
- Friant North Authority
- Golden Sierra Job Training Agency
- Monterey Bay Area Self Insurance Authority
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

G. Probable Cause Decisions

** Please note, a finding of probable cause does not constitute a finding that a violation has actually occurred. The respondents are presumed to be innocent of any violation of the Act unless a violation is proven in a subsequent proceeding.*

The following matters were decided based solely on the papers. The respondents did not request a probable cause hearing.

1. ***In the Matter of Harold Tate, Case No. 14/900.*** On February 2, 2016, probable cause was found to believe Respondent committed the following violation of the Act:

COUNT 1: Harold Tate, a Physician and Surgeon for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation/California Correctional Health Care Services since 2004, failed to file an annual statement of economic interests for 2013 with the California Correctional Health Care Services by April 1, 2014, in violation of Section 87300.

2. ***In the Matter of Armida Torres, Case No. 14/1338.*** On February 2, 2016, probable cause was found to believe Respondent committed the following violation of the Act:

COUNT 1: Armida Torres, the current Chair of the City of Chula Vista's Growth Management Oversight Commission, failed to file an annual statement of economic interests for 2013 with the Chula Vista City Clerk by April 1, 2014, in violation of Section 87300.

- 3. *In the Matter of Tina Baca del Rio, Friends of Tina Baca del Rio, and Tina Baca del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013, Case No. 12/832.*** On February 10, 2016, probable cause was found to believe Respondents committed the following violations of the Act:

Campaign Filing and Disclosure

- COUNT 1: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to timely file a semi-annual campaign statement for the reporting period January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011, which was due by August 1, 2011, and failed to properly disclose required contributions and expenditures on that campaign statement, in violation of Sections 84200(a), and 84211(a)-(j).
- COUNT 2: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to timely file a semi-annual campaign statement for the reporting period July 1, 2011, through December 31, 2011, which was due by January 31, 2012, and failed to properly disclose required contributions and expenditures on that campaign statement, in violation of Section 84200(a), and 84211(a)-(j).
- COUNT 3: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 failed to timely file a pre-election campaign statement for the reporting period January 20, 2013, through February 16, 2013, which was due by February 21, 2013, and failed to properly disclose required contributions and expenditures on that campaign statement, in violation of Sections 84200.5(c), 84200.8(b), and 84211(a)-(j).
- COUNT 4: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 failed to timely file a semi-annual campaign statement for the reporting period February 17, 2013, through June 30, 2013, which was due by July 31, 2013, and failed to properly disclose required contributions and expenditures on that campaign statement, in violation of Sections 84200(a), and 84211(a)-(j).

Late Contribution Reports

- COUNT 5: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on January 4, 2013, from Justman Packaging & Display, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 6: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose two \$1,000 contributions received on January 20, 2013, from Steve Craig and SPM Enterprises LLC, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 7: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on January 22,

2013, from CalMet Services, Inc., within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.

- COUNT 8: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose two \$1,000 contributions received on January 23, 2013, from Jasmine Mgrdichian Living Trust and George Tumanjan and Irene Tumanjan Trust, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 9: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose two \$1,000 contributions received on January 24, 2013, from Haig Papian, Jr. and Gary W. Hamper, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 10: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on January 28, 2013, from Nationwide Environmental Services, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 11: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose two \$1,000 contributions received on January 30, 2013, from Commerce Hyundai and Lysa Grigorian, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 12: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on February 7, 2013, from Tom Malkasian, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 13: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on February 8, 2013, from Jeanette Harris, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 14: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timley disclose two \$1,000 contributions received on February 12, 2013, from R. Beard Trust Personal Acct and Lakecrest Business Center, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 15: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on February 15, 2013, from BNSF Railway Company, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.

- COUNT 16: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on February 20, 2013, from Trimming Land Co., within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 17: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose a \$1,000 contribution received on February 21, 2013, from Sterling Meats, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.
- COUNT 18: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Del Rio Commerce City Council 2013 failed to file a 24 hour report to timely disclose four \$1,000 contributions received on March 4, 2013, from Brian Dror, Tabitha Dror, David Iskowitz, and Julie Sager, within the 90 day period prior to the March 5, 2013 election, in violation of Section 84203.

Annual Fee Violation

- COUNT 19: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 failed to pay the 2013 Annual Fee to the Secretary of State's Office by the February 15, 2013 due date, in violation of Section 84101.5.
- COUNT 20: Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 failed to pay the 2014 Annual Fee to the Secretary of State's Office by the January 15, 2014 due date, in violation of Section 84101.5.

Personal Use

- COUNT 21: During the reporting period of January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011, Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio transferred a total of \$5,400 into her personal bank account in seven separate transactions, which conferred a substantial personal benefit for purposes not directly related to a political, legislative or governmental purpose, in violation of Section 89512.
- COUNT 22: During the reporting period of July 1, 2011, through December 31, 2011, Respondents Tina Baca Del Rio and Friends of Tina Baca Del Rio transferred a total of \$2,734.09 into her personal bank account in seven separate transactions, which conferred a substantial personal benefit for purposes not directly related to a political, legislative or governmental purpose, in violation of Section 89512.
- COUNT 23: On October 7, 2014, Respondent Tina Baca Del Rio caused Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 committee to make expenditures of campaign funds, totaling approximately \$441.97, which conferred a substantial personal benefit on Respondent Tina Baca Del Rio, for purposes not directly related to a political, legislative or governmental purpose, in violation of Section 89512.

COUNT 24: On October 20, 2014, Respondent Tina Baca Del Rio caused Tina Baca Del Rio for Commerce City Council 2013 committee to make expenditures of campaign funds, totaling approximately \$960.16, which conferred a substantial personal benefit on Respondent Tina Baca Del Rio, for purposes not directly related to a political, legislative or governmental purpose, in violation of Section 89512.

4. *In the Matter of Claire Gottsdanker, Case No. 15/1162.* On February 23, 2016, probable cause was found to believe Respondent committed the following violation of the Act:

COUNT 1: As member of the Montecito Board of Architectural Review, Claire Gottsdanker failed to timely file her 2014 annual statement of economic interests, in violation of Sections 87300 and 87302(b).

5. *In the Matter of Marnie Sheehan Carter, Case No. 14/1346.* On February 29, 2016, probable cause was found to believe Respondent committed the following violations of the Act:

COUNT 1: Respondent Marie Sheehan Carter failed to file an Annual SEI in 2014, in violation of Sections 87300 and 87302.

COUNT 2: Carter failed to file a Leaving Office SEI within thirty days of leaving her position on the community services commission in September 2014, in violation of Sections 87300 and 87302.

The following matter was decided after a probable cause conference:

6. *In the Matter of James B. Roybal and James B. Roybal for Board of Directors Central Basin Municipal Water District 1, Case No. 14/49.* On February 4, 2016, after a Probable Cause Conference, probable cause was found to believe Respondents committed the following violations of the Act:

COUNT 1: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's pre-election campaign statement for the period ending on May 19, 2012, a contribution of \$200 from Henrietta Correa Salazar received on or about April 20, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).

COUNT 2: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's pre-election campaign statement for the period ending on May 19, 2012, a contribution of \$250 from Marcy Gloria Grajeda received on or about May 1, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).

COUNT 3: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's pre-election campaign statement for the period ending on May 19, 2012, a contribution of \$500 from Edward Sarkissian, Jr. received on or about May 1, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).

- COUNT 4: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's pre-election campaign statement for the period ending on May 19, 2012, a contribution of \$150 from Betsy Chang received on or about May 1, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 5: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's pre-election campaign statement for the period ending on May 19, 2012, a contribution of \$100 from Victor Caballero received on or about May 1, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 6: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on June 30, 2012, a contribution of \$400 from James and/or Michele Ciampa received on or about May 29, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 7: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$250 from Golden State Advocacy received on or about July 30, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 8: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$250 from Romejan, Inc. received on or about July 30, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 9: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$100 from Antonio Mendoza received on or about July 30, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 10: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$500 from Southwest Management Consultants received on or about July 30, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 11: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$250 from Davenport Management, Inc. received on or about July 30, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).
- COUNT 12: Roybal and the Committee failed to disclose on the Committee's semi-annual campaign statement for the period ending on December 31, 2012, a contribution of \$400 from Model City Democratic Club received on or about September 28, 2012, in violation of Section 84211(a), (c) and (f).

III. EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND EDUCATION DIVISION

STAFF: TARA STOCK, MANAGER

Phone Advice Requests

The External Affairs and Education Division responded to 798 requests for advice via phone in February.

Forms, Manuals and Other Materials

The division is continuing the process of updating the campaign manuals to incorporate recent legislative and regulatory changes. In addition, the lobbying forms are being changed to include the regulation amendments pertaining to “other payments to influence” made by lobbying entities adopted by the Commission at its January hearing.

Presentations, Workshops, and Webinars

Consultant Deborah Hanephin, along with Staff Services Analyst Tina Nezrab, held a similar workshop at the FPPC for local agency staff. Consultant Alex Castillo made a presentation to judges and research attorneys required to file SEIs at the Orange County Superior Court. Alex and Consultant John Kim made a presentation in Alameda County to staff responsible for performing the administrative duties on SEIs.

Consultants Deborah Hanephin and Cynthia Fisher conducted two live webinars for staff responsible for performing the administrative duties on campaign statements and one live webinar for SEI filers. This was the first webinar the FPPC has conducted for SEI filers. Approximately 150 individuals registered for these three webinars.

The division is now gearing up for five live workshops and three live webinars in March. Workshop and webinar dates have been posted on the FPPC website’s “Training and Outreach” page.