



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

To: Chair Silver and Commissioners Brandt, Ortiz, and Wilson

From: Dave Bainbridge, General Counsel
Brian Lau, Assistant General Counsel

Subject: **Advice Letter Report**

Date: September 25, 2026

The following advice letters have been issued since August 28, 2026, Advice Letter Report. An advice letter included in this report may be noticed for further discussion or consideration at the October 15, 2026, Commission Meeting. Full copies of the FPPC Advice Letters, including those listed below, are available at [the advice search](#).

Campaign

Brandy Maddox – [A-26-094](#)

A nonpartisan community organization publishing an election guide in which all candidates are given the opportunity to appear is not making a contribution to the featured candidates, as this constitutes a “forum” excluded from the definition of contribution pursuant to Regulation 18215(c)(10). Likewise, publication of the election guide on the organization’s newspaper website and a related candidate interview series to run on a community access television station come under the exception to contribution for broadcast commentary under Regulation 18215(c)(8).

Conflict of Interest

John D. Lê – [A-26-083](#)

Based on the facts provided, a mayor may take part in decisions on a mixed use project, where the official owns real property within 500 feet, but separated from the project location by an eight-lane freeway because clear and convincing evidence indicates that the decisions concerning the consideration of an inclusionary housing alternative compliance option, and the granting of emergency vehicle access easement would have no measurable impact on his property.

John D. Lê – [A-26-104](#)

A mayor has a conflict of interest in a decision on an alternative compliance request under the city’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance submitted by the project applicant for a redevelopment project with boundaries located within 500 feet of his residence, despite the fact that the project encompasses multiple separate parcels, some of which are more than 500 feet from his residence. Based on the facts presented, the Act’s segmentation rules would not apply.

Conflict of Interest Code

Jon Ansolabehere – [A-26-089](#)

A county supervisor is not prohibited from participating in decisions to dissolve and reestablish a business improvement district because the decisions will not have a foreseeable material financial effect on his source of income interest in his spouse's nonprofit employer that was awarded a grant by the business improvement district or his personal finances.

Revolving Door

Simon Baker – [I-26-077](#)

The Act may prohibit a former state employee from advising or assisting their employer in advice letter filings in a component of a rulemaking proceeding that involves specific parties, and where the former employee, or staff under the former employee's supervision, previously participated in any decision within the rulemaking proceeding involving the advice letter filings or the specific parties.

Section 1090

Joshua Nelson – [A-26-046](#)

To the extent that preliminary design services for a water project include preparing the bid specifications that would be issued, inviting contractors to bid for the work as either a request for proposals or notice to invite bids, the independent contractors working for the water authority on an existing project would be public officers subject to Section 1090. As a result, Section 1090 would prohibit the independent contractors from entering into the new contract due to their participation in the making of that contract.

Abel Salinas – [A-26-056](#)

The Legislature did not intend for the remote interest exception under Section 1091(b)(2) to apply when a board director of a regional water district resigns from his employer's board of directors; the district would be barred from entering into a contract with the director's employer. Additionally, under Section 1090, the district could not contract with private companies that become clients of the director's consulting business. However, the remote interest exception under Section 1091(b)(13) allows the district to contract with a member agency of the district if that member agency becomes a client of that director's business.

Greg Jones – [A-26-068](#)

Under the Act, a public official who has a financial interest in their employer as a business entity and source of income is prohibited from taking part in governmental decisions involving an application submitted by their employer. Additionally, Section 1090 prohibits the board the official serves on from acting on a grant application submitted by the official's employer.

Richard D. Pio Roda – [A-26-087](#)

Under the Act, a city finance director is prohibited from taking part in decisions involving contracts with a firm where her spouse serves as president and holds an ownership interest in the firm. Under Section 1090, because the public official is a non-board member employee, the city is not prohibited from entering into or continuing contracts with the firm, as long as the director completely abstains from the contract-making process.

Kevin G. Ennis – [A-26-100](#)

Section 1090 generally prohibits a city councilmember from taking part in, and the city from entering into or amending, any contracts between the city and an organization that is represented by a law firm that employs the councilmember. However, the remote interest exception under Section 1091(b)(8) applies to allow the city to enter into, or amend, such contracts so long as the interested councilmember does not take part in the decisions, the councilmember discloses their interest in the contracts to the city, and such interest is noted in the city's official records. Additionally, the councilmember must leave the room during the consideration of any such contract pursuant to the Act's recusal requirements.

Section 85320**Stephen Kaufman – [A-26-098](#)**

Section 85320 does not prohibit a primarily formed ballot measure committee from contracting with a foreign principal to produce political communications in support of a state ballot measure even if the foreign principal incurs initial production expenses as any payments made by the foreign principal to fulfill the terms of the contract with the committee would not be considered expenditures under the Act. We caution that a committee is prohibited from accepting a contribution from a foreign principal, including accepting goods or services from a foreign principal at no charge or at a discount, or failing to satisfy one of the requirements of Regulation 18530.7(b) regarding an extension of credit provided by a foreign principal.