



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
1102 Q Street • Suite 3050 • Sacramento, CA 95811

January 23, 2024

Martin Koczanowicz, City Attorney
o/b/o City of Ridgecrest
Email: mkoczanowicz@awattorneys.com

Advisory Letter Re: FPPC No. 2022-00719; City of Ridgecrest

Dear City of Ridgecrest:

The Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission (the “Commission”) enforces the provisions of the Political Reform Act (the “Act”).¹ This letter is in response to a complaint regarding whether the City of Ridgecrest sent prohibited campaign-related mailings at public expense. The Enforcement Division completed its investigation and decided to close its file on these matters without prosecution.

The Act prohibits sending a newsletter or other mass mailing at public expense.² Specifically, mass mailing is prohibited if (1) the item is a tangible item; (2) the item expressly advocates the qualification, passage, or defeat of a clearly identified measure, or unambiguously urges a particular result in an election; (3) public moneys are paid to distribute the item, or to prepare the item, for more than \$50, with the intent of sending the item; and (4) more than 200 substantially similar items are sent during the course of an election.³ This prohibition limits the public subsidy of political campaigns, which would grant an unfair advantage to governmental bodies that desire to use public resources in pursuit of favorable election results.

¹ The Political Reform Act is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014, and all statutory references are to this code. The regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission are contained in sections 18104 through 18998 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, and all regulatory references are to this source.

² Section 89001.

³ Regulation 18901.1, subd. (a).

An item unambiguously urges a particular result in an election in one of two ways: (1) when it clearly is campaign material or campaign activity because it is related to an election and it is an item such as bumper stickers, billboards, door-to-door canvassing, posters, advertising “floats,” or mass media advertising;⁴ or (2) when the style, tenor, and timing of the communication can be reasonably characterized as campaign material and not a fair presentation of facts serving only an informational purpose.⁵

A payment of public moneys by a local governmental agency made in connection with a communication, whether it is a mass mailing or not, that expressly advocates passage of a ballot measure, or that taken as a whole and in context, unambiguously urges a particular result in an election is an independent expenditure.⁶ Any person or combination of persons who, in a calendar year, makes independent expenditures totaling \$1,000 or more qualifies as an independent expenditure committee.⁷ An independent expenditure committee must file semi-annual campaign statements each year for the period ending June 30 and December 31 if it made independent expenditures during the 6-month period prior to those dates.⁸ Further, an independent expenditure committee must report its late independent expenditures within 24 hours of the time they are made to the appropriate filing officers.⁹

Our review and investigation found that there was no physical mailer. The City’s website did not contain express words of advocacy. However, the website was almost argumentative, but informational in tone. Thus, while the website did not meet the standard of unambiguously urging a particular result in an election, it was close. For example, the website included many statements and imagery that illustrated, stated, and expanded upon the positive impacts of Measure P, generally only presenting the potential positive impacts.

Further, statements on the website contained polling data that promised Measure P could provide the funding for all the residents top priorities. However, these statements were not sufficiently inflammatory and argumentative to conclude that the website constituted campaign activity rather than informational material. Additionally, Measure P successfully passed in the November 2022 General Election.

The City of Ridgecrest paid Godbe Research \$29,200 for the polling data used on the website. It should be noted, the City of Ridgecrest later made an attempt to highlight negative impacts of the sales tax increase on the website. However, the Enforcement Division cannot conclude that the alleged non-existent mailings or the website in question violated the Act’s prohibition against campaign mailers at public expense. Therefore, we are closing this matter with this advisory letter.

Although we are closing our file, please be advised of the provisions in the Act and regulations regarding campaign-related communications. If you need additional guidance, you may contact the Commission’s Advice team by sending an email to advice@fppc.ca.gov. There is also information pertaining to campaign-related communications and advertisement disclosure requirements available on the Commission’s website, www.fppc.ca.gov and www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/campaign-rules/campaign-related-communications-at-public-expense.html.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at arose@fppc.ca.gov or (279) 237-3752.

Sincerely,

Alex J Rose

Alex J. Rose

Commission Counsel, Enforcement Division

⁴ Regulation 18901.1, subd. (c)(1).

⁵ Regulation 18901.1, subd. (c)(2).

⁶ Section 82031; Regulation 18420.1, subd. (a).

⁷ Section 82013, subd. (b).

⁸ Section 84200, subd. (b).

⁹ Section 84204.

