



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

**To:** Chair Remke and Commissioners Audero, Casher, Wasserman, and Wynne  
**From:** Phillip Ung, Legislative and External Affairs Director  
**Subject:** Legislative Update – March 2016  
**Date:** March 7, 2016

---

The Legislature's deadline to introduce legislation was February 19, 2016. The Commission is currently tracking 24 bills and one constitutional amendment. Staff has made or attempted to make contact with all the authors to identify their goals for each bill. It is still relatively early in the Legislature's calendar so many of the bills are still "works in progress" or considered "spot bills," with many to receive substantial amendments between the Commission's March and April meetings.

The next major legislative deadline is April 22, 2016, which is the last day for policy committees to approve fiscal bills introduced in the house of origin. Leading up to that deadline, Commission staff will be working closely with authors' offices and committee consultants to analyze legislation and discuss amendments.

### **Recommended Positions for Legislation (#1-5)**

#### **1. AB 2250 (Ridley-Thomas): Foreign Contributions**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 18, 2015

Last Action: Introduced

Staff Recommendation: ***Support***

#### **Summary:**

The Political Reform Act (Act) prohibits a foreign government or principal, as defined, from making a contribution or expenditure *in connection with a ballot measure* and also prohibits a person or committee from soliciting or accepting a contribution from a foreign government or principal for this purpose. (Section 85320.) This bill would expand the scope of these prohibitions by also prohibiting a foreign government or principal from making a contribution or expenditure, and a person or committee from soliciting or accepting this type of contribution, *in connection with any election in California* (not just ballot measures). While this activity is currently prohibited under federal law, this bill expands the Commission's authority to enforce incidents of foreign contributions or expenditures into California campaigns should the Federal Election Commission (FEC) not act. This bill has an urgency clause so it can be in place in advance of the 2016 general election.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff worked closely with the author's office to develop this language as a result of the MindGeek foreign contributions violation and stipulation approved by the Commission in December 2015. In light of the Enforcement Division's successful efforts in that case, staff believes the Commission should have concurrent authority to take timely action in any case of foreign contribution violations. Staff recommends the Commission support this bill.

**2. AB 2558 (Steinorth): San Bernardino County Enforcement**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

Staff Recommendation: ***Support***

Summary:

Current law, until January 1, 2018, authorizes the Commission, upon mutual agreement between the Commission and the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino, to have primary responsibility for the impartial, effective administration, implementation, and enforcement of a local campaign finance reform ordinance of the County of San Bernardino. (Section 83123.5.) This bill would repeal the January 1, 2018, sunset date, thereby extending the operation of these provisions indefinitely.

Staff Recommendation:

County of San Bernardino staff fully supports this partnership and approached the Commission about removing the sunset date to ensure the mutually-beneficial relationship can continue. Commission staff has been working in partnership with the County to develop a report to be submitted to the Legislature, which will explain the status of the agreement, cost savings to the county, and other information required by the original statute. The report will be submitted to the Legislature in March or April. Commission staff believes this partnership has been constructive and that the sunset date should be repealed. Staff recommends the Commission support this bill.

**3. AB 700 (Gomez): Advertisement disclosure**

*Status: Senate Elections and Constitutional Amendment Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: \$350,000

Introduced: February 25, 2015

Amended: January 14, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Senate Elections and Constitutional Amendment Committee (2/4/16)

Staff Recommendation: ***Oppose unless amended***

Summary:

The Act provides comprehensive regulations for campaign finance disclosure requiring committees that support or oppose ballot measures to use the name or phrase that clearly identifies the economic or other special interest of its donors of \$50,000 or more. If major donors share a common employer, then the employer is disclosed.

The bill would redefine and recast the Act's advertisement disclaimer provisions. The bill prescribes the disclosure statements, location, and format criteria required for television, radio, telephone, and internet advertisements with some exemptions; excludes apparel, sky writing, and certain electronic media. The bill requires on-advertisement disclosure of top contributors as defined. Certain committees are exempt from the top contributor disclosure, including major donors and individuals and entities making independent expenditures.

AB 700 received three substantial amendments in a single week in January prior to being approved by the Assembly Appropriations Committee and the Assembly Floor. AB 700 was approved by the Assembly (60 ayes – 15 noes). After several attempts to schedule an earlier meeting, Commission staff met with the author's office and sponsor on March 3, 2016, to express ongoing concerns.

Staff Recommendation:

As currently proposed, the bill makes several substantial changes to the Act, including repealing and replacing the majority of existing campaign advertisement disclaimer provisions with a new, untested framework. The staff's concerns are not directed at the public policy framework proposed by AB 700, i.e., improved disclosure regarding money in politics. But staff has significant concerns about the current language in the bill and how it will be implemented and enforced. Specifically, the comprehensive change proposed by AB 700 is highly detailed in many sections and lacking in detail, overly broad, or subjective in other sections.

For example, proposed Section 84503, subdivision (a), allows the disclaimer of top contributors to be waived "if the content of the advertisement names each of the top contributors as major funding sources of the committee." It is difficult to discern from this language what it means for an advertisement to "name" a top contributor. If read strictly, then the actual name of the donor must be clearly included. If read liberally, then descriptions of the donor, such as workers, public safety officers, business owners, job creators, etc., may be used to escape the detailed disclaimer sought by this legislation while providing very little information to the viewer.

Proposed Section 84504.2 also conflicts with newly adopted legislation that amended Section 84506.5. The author and sponsor state that the proposed Section 84504.2 would only apply if the committee paying for the print advertisement had top contributors as defined by AB 700. All other print advertisements would use Section 84506.5. This instruction is not provided in AB 700. Additionally, the requirements of the proposed Section 84504.2 and enacted Section 84506.5 are clearly different in substance. If not corrected, the resulting print advertisement disclosure framework may cause considerable confusion to the regulated community and potentially be difficult to implement and enforce.

Furthermore, the Commission staff has requested additional information about the author's or sponsor's intent of other sections of AB 700 because the proposed statute leaves much open for interpretation. It is unclear if the ambiguity and outstanding issues could be resolved in time to properly regulate and educate campaigns to the new complex requirements of this legislation by 2018.

Finally, beyond the concerns regarding the specific language, Commission staff is concerned about the timing and overall approach to disclosure in this bill. Staff questions whether this level of detail should be provided in the Act, and specially, at a time when all key stakeholders are deliberating a new statewide computer system that would allow for immediate and improved disclosure of all contributions and expenditures that could significantly modify disclaimers before these restrictions are even enacted (e.g., "Paid for by \_\_\_\_\_ - Top funders at www.Cal-Access"). For these reasons, staff recommends an "oppose unless amended" position, with the goal of the Commission changing its position to "neutral" if the issues are adequately addressed.

#### **4. AB 1200 (Gordon): Lobbying: procurement contracts**

*Status: Assembly Concurrence File*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: \$872,000 (two years), \$760,000 (ongoing)

Introduced: February 27, 2015

Amended: February 10, 2016

Last Action: Passed by Senate (Y:26 N:5 A:9), referred to Assembly for Concurrence in Senate Amendments. (3/3/16)

Staff Recommendation: ***Oppose***

##### Summary:

The Act regulates the activities of lobbyists, lobbying firms, and lobbying employers who attempt to influence legislative and administrative actions. This includes placement agents who attempt to influence investment decisions of CalPERS, CalSTRS, and the UC Retirement Systems. The Act requires lobbying entities to register and file disclosure reports with the Secretary of State.

AB 1200 proposes to establish reporting, disclosure, and other lobbying requirements on persons who attempt to influence government procurement decisions where total estimated costs of the procurement exceed \$250,000. This requirement would only include persons who are contracted to provide such services, not in-house employees.

##### Staff Recommendation:

Although this bill has been amended five times since its introduction, significant concerns raised by Commission staff persist. These include:

- **Cost-benefit.** The proponents and author have not clearly articulated an existing problem that this new law seeks to resolve so it is impossible to evaluate whether the bill adequately addresses a particular issue. Nevertheless, based on prior experience, Commission staff believes that the additional reporting will place a significant burden on the system.

For example, the workload for lobby registration has almost doubled and has become increasingly complex since the enactment of AB 1743 in 2011. That bill requires placement agents – investors seeking to enter into contracts with any state agency to invest state public retirement system assets on behalf of a state public retirement system – to register as lobbyists. In the six years before AB 1743 took effect, an average of 1,250 individuals and 275 employers registered as lobbyists; since then, an average of 2,345 lobbyists and 667 employers have registered for each two-year session. Despite the increased workload and added complexity, there has been no finding of added benefit from the new requirement, and in fact, the original proponents of the bill have voiced concerns about its effectiveness.

Before the definition of lobbying is further expanded to include procurement activities, the objectives of the bill should be clearly articulated in order to measure its effectiveness.

- **Policy v. Contracting.** This would be an expansion of the Commission’s mission laid out in the Act, which has traditionally focused on legislative and administrative lobbying related to the *adoption of public policy*. The Commission is not the right agency to oversee procurement, which is a highly specialized area that is best regulated by the Department of General Services, the Department of Technology and other similar state agencies.
- **In-house v. Contract Lobbyist.** The bill has been narrowed in recent amendments to target only individuals who are “contract lobbyists” who receive compensation from someone *other than their employer* to influence “administrative action that is government procurement.” Conversely, under the bill, if an in-house employee’s principal duties are to influence “administrative action that is government procurement,” they would not be required to register as a lobbyist.

Assuming there is an issue with influencing procurement, it is unclear how perceived abuses would be best curbed by placing additional restrictions on only a portion of the individuals performing the identical activity. Staff believes it will unnecessarily complicate compliance and enforcement to regulate the activities of in-house and contract lobbyist differently.

- **Disclosure.** The bill does not clarify how the proposed lobbying disclosure would be incorporated into existing forms filed electronically with the Secretary of State. Since these forms cannot be modified under the existing statewide computer system (Cal-Access), it is unlikely the bill will result in any increased disclosure or meaningful accountability in this area.

For these reasons, staff recommends the Commission oppose this bill.

## **5. AB 1582 (Travis Allen): Conflicts of interests: post-secondary educational institutions**

*Status: Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: January 5, 2016

Amended: February 18, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee (2/22/16)

Staff Recommendation: ***Oppose***

### Summary:

The Act requires every governmental agency to adopt and promulgate a conflict of interest code to include specific information. Current law, outside the Act, prohibits a faculty member or academic department from demanding anything of value, royalties, or other compensation from sales of course materials that include the instructor's writing or other work.

The bill requires the conflict of interest code of each public college and university to require instructors and employees to disclose any item of value, any royalties, or compensation the employee receives as a result of adopting course materials for coursework or instruction. Although an employee would be required to file a Statement of Economic Interest (Form 700) and report disclose the financial interest, the disclosure would not result in disqualification.

### Staff Recommendation:

An existing Commission conflicts regulation for instructors provides a specific reporting exception that is broader than merely selecting books. (Regulation 18704(d)(5).) Under the regulation, any "teaching decision" is not considered decision-making under the Act. For this reason, teachers and professors generally are not subject to the conflict of interest rules or required to file a Form 700 *unless* they also are administrators with institution wide responsibility. The proposed legislation would override the Commission's current regulatory scheme.

The bill would require disclosure of the item of value, royalties, or compensation at the time the instructor influences or decides to use specific coursework. This activity-based disclosure runs against the Act's current conflicts of interest process that requires disclosure on an annual basis, or upon taking or leaving office. Additionally, the disclosure would not result in disqualification from influencing or making the decision. This would be a carve-out of the Act where these filers would still be allowed to participate despite having an identified conflict. Staff has significant concerns with requiring such disclosure, but nonetheless stating it is not a conflict of interest. That would be extremely unusual and potentially very confusing for the public. For these reasons, staff recommends the Commission oppose this bill.

## **Monitor the Following Legislation (#6-20)**

### **6. AB 1697 (Bonilla): Disclosure of contributions**

*Status: Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: January 21, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

#### **Summary:**

Candidates for state elective office and committees in support or opposition to a ballot measure who raise or spend \$25,000 or more are required to file 24-hour reports disclosing the receipt of \$1,000 or more during the 90-day election cycle. During all other times of the year, these entities are required to file a report with the Secretary of State within 10 business days of any contribution of \$5,000 or more.

This bill adds independent expenditure committees to the list of those required to file 24-hour reports within the 90-day election cycle. Additionally, the proposal would require that during all other times of the year a report be filed with the Secretary of State within 5 days of any contribution of \$1,000 or more.

Staff has met with the author's office to discuss the legislation and expressed concern about the effect activity-based disclosure and this legislation may have on the regulated community.

### **7. AB 2002 (Stone): Lobbying: California Coastal Commission**

*Status: Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 16, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee (2/29/16)

#### **Summary:**

The Political Reform Act defines and regulates administrative actions and requires lobbying registration, disclosure and compliance from those who qualify. This bill would further define administrative action to include the Coastal Commission's quasi-judicial proceedings (such as issuing permits). The bill also further exempts certain individuals who receive compensation to influence an administrative action if the person limits the activity to no more than one per calendar year or is a local government agency employee acting in the scope of employment.

The language of AB 2002 was taken from SB 929 (Kehoe, 2005), a bill that did not pass its house of introduction. Commission staff has discussed the bill with the author's office. At this time, the current language appears to be placeholder language. The concern expressed by the author's office is that the Coastal Commission allows ex parte communications with its commissioners on quasi-judicial, non-enforcement proceedings. These quasi-judicial proceedings to issue permits make up the vast majority of the Coastal Commission's activities.

The Act does not currently include quasi-judicial proceedings within its definition of administrative actions. The Coastal Commission is exempted in the Public Resources Code from the ex parte rules promulgated by the Administrative Procedures Act. This is not a unique exemption as 14 other agencies have some form of exemption from the APA's ex parte rules.

#### **8. AB 2070 (Harper): Local Enforcement for Orange County**

*Status: Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 17, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee (2/29/16)

##### Summary:

Current law authorizes the Commission, upon mutual agreement between the Commission and the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Bernardino, to have primary responsibility for the impartial, effective administration, implementation, and enforcement of a local campaign finance reform ordinance of the County of San Bernardino. This bill would authorize the Commission and the Board of Supervisors of the County of Orange to also enter into such an agreement. The bill contains an urgency clause. The FPPC would also be required to submit a report to the Legislature, in consultation with the County, on or before January 1, 2019.

According to the author, Orange County passed Measure E in 2014 which began the process of adopting campaign finance ordinances within the county and authorized the county to enter into mutual agreement with the FPPC. In order to enter into mutual agreement, the Legislature must approve legislation authorizing the activity. Depending on when the bill is chaptered, the urgency clause may be a concern if the county intends to have a contract prior to the conclusion of the 2016 election.

#### **9. AB 2284 (Patterson): Use of surplus funds**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

##### Summary:

This bill would prohibit a State Senator or Member of the Assembly who decides to resign from office before the expiration of his or her term from subsequently using campaign funds held in trust for any purpose other than paying outstanding campaign debts or reasonable expenses. The bill would amend the list of specified purposes allowable for the use of surplus campaign funds to include the payment of expenses to hold a special election to fill the vacancy created by the Member's resignation and would require the former Member to pay from his or her surplus campaign funds such election-related expenses, to the extent he or she has funds available to do so.



According to the author, when legislators resign prior to finishing their term, special elections cost counties funds needed for the programs. The author's intent is to require legislators who resign prior to the expiration of their term to offset or pay for the entire cost of the special election and any remaining funds can only be used for charitable contributions.

#### **10. AB 2318 (Low): FPPC Enforcement of use of public resources**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 18, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

##### Summary:

Current law prohibits the use of public funds for campaign activities. Current law prohibits a nonprofit organization or an officer, employee, or agent of a nonprofit organization from using, or permitting another to use public resources received from a local agency for campaign activity, as defined, and not authorized by law. This bill would authorize the Commission to bring a civil action or to commence an administrative action for violation of these provisions.

Commission staff has met with the author and sponsor of AB 2318. Commission staff recommended these sections of the Government Code be moved into the Political Reform Act to streamline the statutes and allow the FPPC to interpret, regulate, and enforce. If the provisions are not moved into the Act, the FPPC can enforce, but will be severely limited.

#### **11. AB 2523 (Mullin): Contribution Limits: Local Elections**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

##### Summary:

The Act contains contribution limits for state office and statewide offices. The Act specifies nothing in the law prevents the legislature or local agency from adopting additional requirements, and nothing in the Act nullifies contribution limitations or prohibitions in local jurisdictions. All ordinances or other provisions adopted by local governments must be filed with the Commission. The bill currently contains intent language to enact limitations on campaigns for local elections.

The author's office has indicated the bill is currently spot bill for language that would require local jurisdictions to adopt contributions limits or conform to the state's contributions limits. Details of the proposal are sparse, but Commission staff has established communication with the author's staff to discuss any proposals being developed.

## **12. AB 2628 (Levine): Contribution Limits: Local Elections**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

### Summary:

The Act imposes certain restrictions on post-governmental employment of specified public officials of state and local agencies. This bill would prohibit an elected or appointed officer of a state or local agency, for a period of one year after leaving office, from maintaining employment with or being a compensated consultant of any other board, commission, or other body on which the officer served as a member while holding the elective or appointed office.

According to the author, the current language is placeholder for future amendments to address concerns about former appointed officials becoming consultants. Commission staff will continue to communicate with the author's office to get more information as the bill is developed.

## **13. AB 2823 (Gatto): Statement of Economic Interests**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

### Summary:

The bill is a spot bill. According to the author, the intent is to revive AB 10 (Gatto, 2015) which was vetoed by Governor Brown in October 2015. AB 10 increased the thresholds at which a public official has a disqualifying financial interest in sources of income from \$500 to \$1,000, in investments in business entities from \$2,000 to \$5,000, and in interests in real property from \$2,000 to \$10,000. AB 10 conformed adjustments to the thresholds at which income, investments, and interests in real property must be disclosed on a public official's statement of economic interests. It also revised the dollar amounts associated with the value ranges for reporting the value of economic interests. And required certain public officials to disclose information on the official's statement of economic interests relating to governmental decisions for which the public official had a disqualifying financial interest, as specified.

The Governor's veto message: "The Political Reform Act already requires public officials to disclose their income, investments and business activities with enough particularity so that conflicts of interest can be identified. This bill adds yet more complexity to existing reporting requirements without commensurate benefit, and I am not convinced that this bill will provide more useful information to the public."

Commission staff will remain in communication with the author's office to discover what changes will be made in the revived effort.

#### **14. AB 2840 (Lopez): Prohibition on Non-profit Travel**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

##### Summary:

This bill would prohibit a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization from providing to a Member of the Legislature, and a Member of the Legislature from accepting, any payments, advances, or reimbursements for travel, as defined. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

According to the author: “Unfortunately special interest groups have hidden behind non-profits they have created in order to take legislators away to luxurious destinations to educate them on the issues facing Californians. Simple disclosure of such trips still allows for such groups to have greater influence with elected officials.”

The Commission staff is currently in the process of receiving budget appropriation to implement SB 21 (Hill, 2015) that would require disclosure of non-profit travel by elected officials, as specified.

#### **15. ACA 9 (Gomez): Post-governmental Employment: Legislative Vacancies**

*Status: Assembly Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

##### Summary:

This constitutional amendment would revise the post-governmental employment restrictions of the Legislature to begin when the legislator resigns to one year after the date the legislator’s term was scheduled to expire.

The bill does not amend the Political Reform Act directly, but may require conforming changes to the Act if approved by the voters.

#### **16. SB 1011 (Mendoza): Public Officers: Contracts: Financial Interests**

*Status: Senate Governance and Finance Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Minor and absorbable

Introduced: February 11, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Senate Governance and Finance Committee (2/25/16)

Summary:

Would, on and after January 1, 2018, include within the definition of remote interest that of a public officer in the financial interest of that public officer's child, parent, sibling, or the spouse of the child, parent, or sibling, in a contract made by that public officer, except a public officer's financial interests do not include any financial interest of those other persons unless the interest is actually known to the public officer, and that public officer knowingly or willfully fails to disclose those interests. The FPPC is charged with enforcing Government Code 1090.

SB 1011 is a revived version of SB 330 (Mendoza, 2015) with a narrowed definition of the public officer's family member.

**17. SB 1107 (Allen): Public Moneys Definition**

*Status: Senate Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 17, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Senate Rules Committee (2/25/16)

Summary:

The act defines "public moneys" by reference to its definition in the Penal Code. This bill would expressly set forth that definition within the act.

Commission staff has received information that this bill may be a vehicle for repealing the Political Reform Act's ban on public financing. Staff has reached out to the author's office for more information. No confirmation had been made at the time of this writing.

**18. SB 1251 (Moorlach): State Financial Obligations: Ballot Pamphlet**

*Status: Introduced*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 18, 2016

Last Action: Introduced (2/25/16)

Summary:

This bill would amend the Political Reform Act's provisions related to the state ballot pamphlet to require the publication to include state financial obligations, as specified.

The Political Reform Act contains several provisions related to the State Ballot Pamphlet. The changes to the Political Reform Act sections appear to be conforming changes with those made in the Election Code.

**19. SB 1349 (Hertzberg): Cal-Access**

*Status: Senate Rules Committee*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Referred to Senate Rules Committee (2/25/16)

Summary:

Would require the Secretary of State to develop a system to identify filers of independent expenditure committee campaign statements and major donor committee campaign statements that would allow members of the public to search the Secretary of State's database by filer to identify all expenditures or contributions made by that filer. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Commission staff has been working closely with the Secretary of State and in communication other external stakeholders to develop bill language related to the modernization of Cal-Access, the state's campaign and lobbying disclosure system. This bill will be further amended in the future with more specifics about the system.

**20. SB 1467 (Bates): Contribution Limits on Candidate-Controlled Ballot Measure Committees**

*Status: Introduced*

FPPC Position: None currently

Fiscal Estimate: Not yet requested

Introduced: February 19, 2016

Last Action: Introduced

Summary:

This bill would prohibit a person from making to a committee controlled by a candidate for elective office that is primarily formed to support or oppose one or more ballot measures, and prohibit such a committee from receiving, a contribution in excess of the contribution limit for elective state offices, as specified.

The Commission staff has met with the author's staff to discuss the intent of the bill, case law, and current regulations on how candidate-controlled ballot measure committees are permitted to spend funds.

**Spot bills not expected to affect the Political Reform Act**

Bill authors have indicated to Commission staff that the following bills are placeholders for other legislation not related to the Political Reform Act.

**21. AB 2044 (Harper): Committee Thresholds**

**22. AB 2594 (Gordon): Campaign Committees**

**23. AB 2623 (Gordon): Controlled Committees**

**24. SB 921 (Anderson): Campaign Statements**

**25. SB 976 (Vidak): Campaign Statements**