STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
1102 Q Street • Suite 3050 • Sacramento, CA 95811 • (916) 322-5660

Second Quarter Update 2026

Conflict of Interest, Revolving Door, and Statement of Economic Interests

Regulations adopted by the Commission

The following are regulatory changes approved by the Commission during the past quarter concerning conflict of interest, revolving door, and statement of economic interests. To receive updates for all regulations before the Commission, please sign up for our mailing list here.

None.

Advice Letters

The following are advice letters issued by the Commission's Legal Division during the past quarter concerning questions about conflicts of interest, revolving door, or statement of economic interests. To receive the monthly report with all advice letters issued, please sign up for our mailing list here.

Conflict of Interest

Heather Baker – A-26-023
The Act prohibits a council member, who is also the President and chief executive of the city's chamber of commerce, from taking part in governmental decisions regarding a digital kiosk program. Under the nexus test, it is reasonably foreseeable that the decisions will have a material financial effect on the councilmember's source of income interest in the chamber of commerce because the decisions will achieve, defeat, aid, or hinder a purpose or goal of the source, and the council member receives or is promised income from the source for achieving the purpose or goal. Additionally, under the nexus test, the Act prohibits the council member from taking part in decisions on a minimum wage ordinance. It is also reasonably foreseeable that the decisions relating to a minimum wage ordinance will have a material financial effect on the councilmember's personal finances. Finally, the council member may participate in decisions relating to a short-term rental ordinance because it is not reasonably foreseeable that those decisions will have a material financial effect on the chamber or the council member's personal finances.

Holly Mitchell – A-26-029
Notwithstanding disqualification due to a real property interest within 1,000 feet of a proposed rail line station entrance, a transportation authority board may segment governmental decisions regarding underground tunnel locations that are not inextricably interrelated to decisions regarding the proposed station entrance. Under Regulation 18706, the board member may take

part in the remaining decisions in which she does not have a disqualifying financial interest provided the board first considers the decisions in which the board member has a disqualifying financial interest and reaches a final decision without the disqualified board member taking part in the decisions, and the remaining decisions do not reopen the prior decisions.

Juan Morán – A-26-035
An official who is the beneficiary of his parents' revocable trust, and receives no distribution from that trust, does not have a financial interest in the property held in the trust for purposes of the Act. Barring any other interest in the decision, the official may take part in decisions regarding a boundary issue and variance for the property without violating the Act's conflict-of-interest provisions.

Zach Heinselman – A-26-015
City councilmember has a disqualifying financial interest in specific plan decision where it applies to a parcel owned by a business "otherwise related to" a business that employs the official. Because the parcel is explicitly involved in the decision, it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect on the councilmember's interest in his employer. The councilmember also has a disqualifying financial interest in decisions regarding an entertainment zone and related depot lawn, which would permit alcohol sales and consumption in designated areas. Because only five businesses are affected by the change in permitted alcohol sales, the entertainment zone decision is an action directed at the otherwise related business entity and the underlying use of its property. Accordingly, it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect on the councilmember's interest in the business. Additionally, the depot lawn decisions are "inextricably interrelated" to the entertainment zone decision because the result of one decision will effectively determine, affirm, nullify, or alter the result of another decision. The mayor pro tem also has a disqualifying financial interest in the decisions. Because the mayor pro tem owns residential property within the specific plan area and within 360 feet from the entertainment zone, the official may not take part in the decisions because the specific plan decisions may alter the development plans or criteria applicable to the property, and the official has not established with clear and convincing evidence that the entertainment zone and related lawn depot decisions would have no measurable impact on his financial interest.

Rebecca Moon – A-26-049
Councilmember whose spouse is employed by a large international business that owns 11 parcels in the specific plan area does not have a disqualifying financial interest in two project decisions that will bring residential apartments with density to two separate sites located within 500 feet of the employer's parcels. The facts do not indicate that either project will have a financial effect on the employer's gross revenue, assets, liabilities or expenses meeting the applicable materiality thresholds. Nor do the facts establish a financial effect on the employer's nearby parcels, where the city previously adopted a specific plan for the area allowing residential development of up to 20,000 units; the parcels are separated from the project sites by streets, parking lots, and/or landscaped areas; and traffic concerns are minimized.

Donna Mooney – A-26-053
Under the Act, Mayor is not prohibited from taking part in governmental decisions regarding a road construction project located 2,980 feet from her residence. For a property interest more than

1,000 feet from the project, it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect on the property only if there is clear and convincing evidence of a substantial effect on the property. However, based on the facts provided, there is no clear and convincing evidence that the Mayor's property will be substantially affected by the project because the project's effects on the traffic around the subdivision are anticipated to be limited to morning commute hours, and the project will not affect the Mayor's access to her residence via the subdivision's existing access points or change the traffic patterns within the subdivision.

Greg Gillot – A-26-059
Generally, the Act prohibits county supervisor from taking part in decisions that have an effect on a tribe's casino property when the supervisor has a mining claim on land located within 500 feet of the casino property unless there is clear and convincing evidence to establish that the decisions would not have any measurable impact on the supervisor's mining claim.

Adam B. Eliason – A-26-061
The members of a housing trust board, who approve the trust's investment policies, are public officials who manage public investments and, as such, must now file Statements of Economic Interests directly and electronically with the FPPC. Based on the facts provided, the trust manager and the trust treasurer do not meet this definition because they do not have independent authority over investment strategy or allocation of trust money.

Ashley Stottlemeyer – A-26-063
Committees may use a filing schedule that combines the semi-annual campaign statement with the second pre-election statement for the August 4, 2026, special election for Sutter County. The combined statement will be due on July 23, 2026, covering the period June 21, 2026, through July 18, 2026.

Revolving Door

Craig Scholer – A-26-013
A former deputy director of a subsidiary state agency is not prohibited under the one-year ban from appearing before or communicating for compensation with officials from their former parent agency and its various boards, departments, and offices, other than the official's former subsidiary agency itself, because the subsidiary agency controls its own budget, its personnel management is independent of the parent agency, and it has independent operational controls.

Section 1090

Kaitlyn Schwendeman – A-25-169
A school district board trustee, who is also an uncompensated board member of a nonprofit organization developing affordable housing, does not have a financial interest under the Act in district decisions regarding a potential workforce-affordable housing project involving the nonprofit organization. Similarly, as an uncompensated officer of the nonprofit, the trustee has a noninterest under Section 1090 in an exclusive negotiating agreement between the district and the nonprofit, provided one of the nonprofit's primary purposes supports the functions of the district. Thus, the district may act on the agreement, and the trustee can take part in the agreement, so long as the trustee discloses his interest at the time the agreement is considered.

Heather Baker – I-25-170
Generally, where a city council member is employed as the president and CEO of the city's chamber of commerce, the official may not participate in any manner in a decision that explicitly involves the Chamber, or where it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect on the chamber as a source of income to the official under the standards in Regulation 18702.3, including the "nexus" test. Where the official has a disqualifying financial interest under the Act, the official may not use their official position to influence a decision, including appearing in front of the city council or city staff. The official will also be prohibited under Section 1090 from taking part in any manner in a contract decision involving the chamber.

Alej Contreras – A-26-025
For a state employee who is an uncompensated volunteer for a nonprofit organization, the Act does not prohibit the employee from taking part in governmental decisions to grant funds to the organization because the employee does not have a financial interest in the organization. With respect to Section 1090, the employee has a noninterest in the contract with the organization under Section 1091.5(a)(7). As long as the employee's interest in the organization is disclosed to the state agency at the time of the first consideration of the contract, and the employee's interest is noted in the state agency's official records, Section 1090 does not prohibit the employee from taking part in the contract with the organization.

Kevin Briggs – A-26-009
Under the Act, a county supervisor has a disqualifying financial interest and may not take part in county decisions to hire, or pay for services from, her spouse's refrigerator and freezer repair service business. The business is explicitly involved in the decisions, and it is reasonably foreseeable that the decisions will have a material financial effect on the business. Under Section 1090, the county is not prohibited from retaining the repair services where the county purchasing agent and assistant purchasing agents have independent statutory authority to hire for services within their purchasing authority, and the county auditor has authority to pay without Board action. However, other state laws outside the Commission's authority may otherwise prohibit payment for these services.

Timothy J. Carmel – I-26-011
Under the Act, a sanitation district board member is not generally prohibited from taking part in decisions regarding the county in which he is employed merely because he receives a government salary from the county, which is not "income" as defined in the Act. Under Section 1090, the board member is generally prohibited from making or participating in the making of a contract in which he has a financial interest, unless an exception applies.

Nira F. Doherty – A-26-032
Section 1090 does not prohibit a city manager from contracting on behalf of the city with a nonprofit organization that employed a city council member, as long as the city council members completely refrained from taking part in the contract, because the city manager was an independent officer who had the authority to enter into such contracts under the city's local ordinance.

Joshua Nelson – A-26-045
Section 1090 prohibits a member of the district's board of directors from taking part in a contract with a snow removal business in which the member receives annual payments for the sale of equipment used in the business. In addition, because alternative sources are available to provide those services to the district, the rule of necessity does not apply to allow the district to enter into a contract with that snow removal business.

Olivia Clark – I-26-048
Under the Act, to the extent that a board member has a financial interest in a government entity, the board member is only disqualified from taking part in decisions under Regulation 18703(e)(7) if the decisions result in a unique effect on the board member. Generally, Section 1090 prohibits a board member, as well as the board, from entering into a contract in which a board member has a financial interest unless an exception applies. The Commission has determined that independent contractors for a government entity are within the scope of the exceptions provided for in Sections 1091(b)(13) and 1091.5(a)(9). As a result, Section 1090 generally does not prohibit a contract between two government entities in which an official serves as a board member for one entity and is employed by the other as an independent contractor.

Statement of Economic Interest

Michael Groch – A-26-036
A judge who is a beneficiary of their parent's spousal trust does not have a reportable economic interest in the trust because the official does not presently receive income and does not have an irrevocable future right to receive income or principal from the trust. Based on the facts provided, the judge does not have an irrevocable future right to income or principal because powers exist to invade the trust principal, and these powers are not limited by an ascertainable standard relating to the health, education, support, or maintenance of the beneficiaries. Additionally, the official's mother has the power under the trust to further designate who will receive trust assets.

Commission Opinions

None.

Enforcement Matters

The following are summaries of significant enforcement actions approved by the Commission in the past quarter involving violations of the Act's conflicts of interest, revolving door, or statement of economic interests. To receive a monthly report of all enforcement actions, please sign up for our mailing list here.

Revolving Door

In the Matter of Antonia Jimenez; FPPC No. 22/673. Staff: Alex Rose, Senior Commission Counsel and Roone Petersen, Special Investigator. Antonia Jimenez was the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services Director. Jimenez violated the Act by making and/or participating in making a governmental decision on or about January 20, 2022, regarding a pitch proposal between the County of Los Angeles and Accenture, a company that was a prospective employer to Jimenez, in violation of Government Code Section 87407 (1 count). **Fine: $3,000.**

Statement of Economic Interests Late Filer/Reporter

In the Matter of Ariel Kelley; FPPC No. 24/1012. Staff: Jaleena Evans, Commission Counsel. The respondent is represented by Gary Winuk of Kaufman Legal Group. Ariel Kelley is a City Councilmember for the City of Healdsburg and a Commissioner for the California Coastal Commission. Kelley failed to timely file an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests for her position with the California Coastal Commission, in violation of Government Code Section 87202 (1 count), failed to timely report income on the 2021 Annual Statement of Economic Interests for the City Council, in violation of Government Code Section 87207 (1 count), and failed to timely report stocks on the 2023 and 2024 Annual Statements of Economic Interests for the City Council, in violation of Government Code Section 87206 (2 counts). **Fine: $1,600 (Tiers One and Two).**

In the Matter of Casey McKeon; FPPC No. 26/206. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel and Paul Rasey, Special Investigator. Casey McKeon, City Council Member of Huntington Beach, failed to timely report two gifts on an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code section 87202 (2 counts). **Fine: $700 (Tiers One and Two).**

In the Matter of Erik Peterson; FPPC No. 23/652. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel and Special Investigator Paul Rasey. Erik Peterson, Member of the City Council of Huntington Beach, failed to timely report a gift on a Leaving Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87204 (1 count). **Fine: $600 (Tier Two).**

In the Matter of Pat Burns; FPPC No. 26/205. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel and Special Investigator Paul Rasey. Pat Burns, Candidate for City Council of Huntington Beach, failed to report two gifts on an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code section 87202 (2 counts). **Fine: $700 (Tiers One and Two).**

In the Matter of Michael Gates; FPPC No. 26/208. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel and Paul Rasey, Special Investigator. Michael Gates, City Attorney for Huntington Beach, failed to timely report a gift on a 2023 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 Count). **Fine: $600 (Tier Two).**

In the Matter of Alex Ferguson; FPPC No. 26/188. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Alex Ferguson, a Planning Commissioner for the City of Pacifica, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Ashley Banta; FPPC No. 26/091. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Ashley Banta, a Planning Commissioner for the City of Vacaville, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Briana Weisinger; FPPC No. 26/136. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Briana Weisinger, an Associate Regional Director of the Small Business Development Center Network for the Southwestern Community College District, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87300 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Emma Orozco; FPPC No. 25/762. Staff: Theresa Gilbertson, Supervising Attorney and Joselyne Soto, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Emma Orozco, as Planning Commissioner for the City of Calipatria failed to timely file a 2023 Annual SEI, in violation of Government Code Sections 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Ilan Sigura; FPPC No. 26/099. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Ilan Sigura, a Planning Commissioner for the City of Sunnyvale, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Jazmine Hernandez; FPPC No. 25/1050. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Jazmine Hernandez, a Planning Commissioner for the City of Stockton, failed to timely file an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87202 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Marco Durazo; FPPC No. 26/182. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Marco Durazo, a Planning Commissioner for the City of San Bruno, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Namquan Nguyen; FPPC No. 26/147. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Namquan Nguyen, a City Council Member for the City of Westminster, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Raj Salwan; FPPC No. 24/1280. Staff: Franceska Gonzalez, Commission Counsel. Raj Salwan, Fremont City Councilmember and Alameda County Transportation Commission Board Member, failed to timely disclose a financial interest on the 2023 Annual

Statement of Economic Interests in violation of Government Code Section 87206 (1 count), and a Candidate Statement of Economic Interests for the November 5, 2024 General Election, in violation of Government Code Section 87207 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Gracey Van Der Mark; FPPC No. 26/207. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel and Special Investigator Paul Rasey. Gracey Van Der Mark, as a member of the City Council in Huntington Beach, failed to timely report a gift on an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code section 87207 (1 Count). **Fine: $100 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Phillip Wiley; FPPC No. 24/734. Staff: Kristin Goulet, Commission Counsel. Phillip Wiley, in his former position as Recreation Director for the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, failed to timely file the Assuming Office and 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 Annual Statements of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87300 (5 counts). **Fine: $3,000 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Aditya Joshi; FPPC No. 25/855. Staff: Theresa Gilbertson, Supervising Attorney and Joselyne Soto, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Aditya Joshi, as a Consultant for Technology Services and Solutions for the County of Santa Clara, failed to timely file the 2022 and 2023 Annual Statements of Economic Interests and a Leaving Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87300 (3 counts). **Fine: 600 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Elise Brentnall; FPPC No. 25/1004. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Shaina Elkin, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Elise Brentnall, a Planning Commissioner for the City of San Juan Bautista, failed to timely file an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87202 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Gurtarpreet Kaur; FPPC No. 26/226. Staff: Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement and Amber Rodriguez, Associate Governmental Program Analyst. Gurtarpreet Kaur, a Planning Commissioner for the City of Bakersfield, failed to timely file a 2024 Annual Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87203 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

In the Matter of Robert Hall; FPPC No. 25/1111. Staff: Christine Shantz, Commission Counsel. Robert Hall, as a Governing Board Member of the Weed Union Elementary School District, failed to timely file an Assuming Office Statement of Economic Interests, in violation of Government Code Section 87300 (1 count). **Fine: $200 (Tier One).**

Legislation

SB 401 (Hurtado) – PRA Filing Deadline Extensions in Emergency Situations

Short Summary: SB 401 would authorize the commission to extend filing deadlines in the PRA for individuals impacted by a state or local emergency.

Detailed Summary:

Existing law: The PRA imposes deadlines for filing various reports and statements under the PRA, including statements of economic interests, lobbying reports, behested payment reports, and campaign reports and statements.

New authority: SB 401 would authorize the Commission to extend any filing deadline under the PRA for individuals that live in an area impacted by an emergency proclaimed by the Governor or a local governing body pursuant to specified authority, if the emergency situation is reasonably likely to affect the individual's ability to timely file.

Maximum extension: SB 401 would provide that any filing extension granted by the commission may be no more than 60 days from the original filing deadline.

Does not apply to campaign filings near the election: The authority to grant an extension would not apply to filing deadlines for campaign statements or reports during the 90 days before an election.

SB 1389 (Dahle) – Form 700 Late Fee Waiver Authority

Short Summary: SB 1389 would expand the authority for discretionary waiver of the Form 700 late fee in circumstances where the late filing was not willful.

Detailed Summary:

Existing law: Existing law permits filing officers to waive the $10/day late fee for late Statements of Economic Interests (Form 700s) if the late filing was not willful and enforcement of the liability will not further the purposes of the PRA. Waiver is limited to within 30 days of the original deadline of the Form 700.

Extension of waiver period: SB 1389 would extend the duration of this waiver authority to permit waiver of a late Form 700 up to 30 days after a referral for the late or missing filing is filed with the commission.

Clarification: The bill clarifies language relating to how the maximum late fee is calculated.