



**To:** Chair Silver and Commissioner Baker  
**From:** Lindsey Nakano, Sr. Legislative Counsel  
**Subject:** **Legislative Update – June 2024**  
**Date:** June 6, 2024

---

Subject: Legislative Update – June 2024.....	1
1. General Update .....	1
2. Upcoming Legislative Deadlines.....	1
3. FPPC Priority Bills .....	2
4. Other Commission-Related Bills .....	7
5. Bills Not Moving Forward.....	21

## 1. General Update

- As of the date of this report, there are 19 active FPPC-related bills, all of which have passed in their house of origin.
- Staff is continuing to reach out to and work with members, interested parties, and stakeholders, and to seek bipartisan support on Commission legislation.

## 2. Upcoming Legislative Deadlines

- June 15 - Budget Bill must be passed by midnight
- June 27 - Last day for a legislative measure to qualify for the Nov. ballot
- July 3 - Last day for policy committees to meet and report bills
  - Summer Recess begins upon adjournment
- Aug. 5 - Legislature Reconvenes from Summer Recess
- Aug. 16 - Last day for fiscal committees to meet and report bills
- Aug. 19-31 - Floor Session only. No committees, other than conference and Rules committees, may meet for any purpose
- Aug. 23 - Last day to amend on the floor
- Aug. 31 - Last day for each house to pass bills
  - Final Recess begins upon adjournment
- Sept. 30 - Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before Sept. 1 and in the Governor’s possession on or after Sept. 1
- Nov. 5 - General Election
- Dec. 2 - 12 Noon convening of the 2025-26 Regular Session for one-day organizational session

### 3. FPPC Priority Bills

#### Updates (as of 5/31/24)

- **Amended:** AB 1170 (Valencia)
- **Set for hearing:** AB 1170 (Valencia), AB 2001 (Gallagher), SB 1027 (Menjivar)

#### Status and Summaries

- **[AB 1170 \(Valencia\) – Electronic Filing of SEIs \(Form 700s\)](#)**

**Status:** Amended 5/28/24; referred to the Senate Elections Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee; set for hearing in the Senate Elections Committee on 6/4/24

**Short Summary:** AB 1170 would (1) require officials whose filing officer is the Commission to file their SEIs (Form 700s) using the Commission's electronic filing system, (2) require redaction of certain information from SEIs posted online by the Commission, and (3) allow for electronic retention of certain paper reports and statements.

#### **Detailed Summary:**

*Electronic filing of SEIs:* Existing law provides that the Commission is the filing officer for statewide elected officers and candidates and other specified public officials. Generally, these public officials file their SEIs with their agency or another person or entity, who retain a copy of the statement and then forward the original statement to the Commission. AB 1170 would instead require public officials for whom the Commission is the filing officer to file their SEIs directly with the Commission using the Commission's electronic filing system.

*Redaction of certain information:* Existing law requires the Commission to redact private information, including signatures, from the data made available on the internet about SEIs filed through the Commission's online filing system. The bill would provide that the information required to be redacted additionally includes the personal residential address and telephone number of the filer.

*Electronic retention of reports and statements:* Existing law requires filing officers to retain certain reports and statements filed by paper for 2 years in paper format before converting those filings to electronic or other specified formats. The bill would authorize filing officers to retain reports and

statements filed by paper in electronic or other specified formats immediately upon receiving those reports or statements.

**FPPC Position:** Support (Sponsor)

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[AB 2001 \(Gallagher\) – Minor Changes to PRA and Cleanup](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly on 4/18/24 (72-0); set for hearing in the Senate Elections Committee on 6/4/24

**Short Summary:** AB 2001 would (1) add new clarifying provisions to the section requiring local government agencies to post paper filings on its website, (2) make conforming amendments to a section that was inadvertently left out of a prior bill, relating to advertisement disclosures, (3) correct a cross-reference that was inadvertently cited incorrectly in a prior bill, (4) delete the definition of a term that is not used in the Act, and (5) make other nonsubstantive corrections.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Clarifying section on online posting of filings by local agencies:* Existing law requires a local government agency to post on its website all of the campaign reports and statements filed with that agency in paper form within 72 hours of the filing deadline. The FPPC's advice staff received questions from local agencies about what their duties were with regard to certain scenarios not specifically addressed in the law. The bill would clarify local government agency duties by (1) requiring late filings to be posted within 72 hours of receipt, (2) providing that local agencies need not post filings erroneously filed with that agency, and (3) apply the online posting requirements to filings received by email or fax.

*Conforming changes to advertisement disclosure section:* In existing law, there are two versions of Section 84504.2 in the Government Code- one version is operative now, and the second version supersedes the existing version upon certification of the Cal-Access Replacement System by the Secretary of State. SB 1360 (2022) inadvertently amended only the latter version of Section 84504.2. The intent was to amend both versions. The bill would make the same amendments to the currently operative version of 84504.2.

*Cross-reference correction:* In 2017, the Legislature passed a bill that reorganized various provisions and also changed a citation that was cross-referenced in the bill language. The incorrect citation resulted in a broadened

definition of “campaign expenditures” for purposes of determining what counts against the voluntary expenditure limit. The legislative history suggests that this was an inadvertent error. The bill would correct that citation.

*Other nonsubstantive corrections:* The term “statewide election” is not used in the Political Reform Act, but is defined in Section 82052.5. The proposal would delete the definition as cleanup. The bill would also make other nonsubstantive corrections.

**FPPC Position:** Support (Sponsor)

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[AB 2631 \(Mike Fong\) – Local Ethics Training Program](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (70-0)

**Short Summary:** AB 2631 would require the FPPC to create, maintain, and make available a local agency ethics training course that satisfies certain requirements.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law, passed in 2005, requires local agency officials to receive at least two hours of ethics training every two years, which includes training on the Political Reform Act. After passage of the bill adding this requirement, the FPPC voluntarily created a free online local ethics training course that would satisfy these training requirements.

*Establishes a permanent program:* The bill would codify a requirement that the FPPC, in consultation with the Attorney General, create, maintain, and make available to local agency officials an ethics training course that satisfies these training requirements, thereby making this a permanent program.

**FPPC Position:** Support (Sponsor)

**FPPC Costs:** \$234,000 in the first year and \$227,000 annually thereafter for one position in IT and education software

- **[SB 1027 \(Menjivar\) – Redaction of Bank Account Information on Statements of Organization](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (39-0); referred to the Assembly Elections Committee and the Assembly Judiciary Committee; set for hearing in the Senate Elections Committee on 6/12/24

**Short Summary:** SB 1027 would require the Secretary of State to redact the bank account number and the names of persons authorized to obtain bank account records from a committee’s Statement of Organization before providing the statement to the public. The bill would also authorize a committee to omit that same information from the copy of the statement filed with the local filing officer.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law provides that a person or group of persons that receives \$2,000 or more in contributions in a calendar year is a “committee” under the Act. These types of committees, referred to as recipient committees, must file a Statement of Organization with the SOS and a copy of the statement with the local filing officer, if any, within 10 days of qualifying as a recipient committee. The Statement of Organization includes, among other things, disclosure of the committee’s bank account number and the names of persons authorized to obtain committee bank account records.

*Fraud risk:* Committees and committee representatives have expressed concern that public disclosure of the committee bank account number and the names of the listed persons makes the committee vulnerable to financial fraud.

*Redaction of bank account information:* The bill would require the Secretary of State to redact the bank account number and, subject to a delayed operative date, the names of persons authorized to obtain bank account records from a committee’s Statement of Organization before providing the statement to the public. The bill would also authorize a committee to omit that same information from the copy of the Statement of Organization filed with the local filing officer.

*Delayed operative date:* Due to limitations within the existing Cal-Access campaign reporting system, additional fields cannot be redacted on Cal-Access. Because of this limitation, redaction of the names of persons authorized to obtain bank account records would take effect only after the Cal-Access Replacement System is operational.

**FPPC Position:** Support (Sponsor)

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[SB 1404 \(Glazer\) – Lobbying Audits and Lobbyist Fee](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (28-2); referred to the Assembly Elections Committee

**Short Summary:** SB 1404 would transfer the duty to conduct audits of lobbying entities from FTB to the FPPC. The bill would additionally impose an additional fee on lobbyists in an amount set by the FPPC to offset the cost of the PRA's lobbying audit program.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law on lobbying audits:* Existing law requires the Franchise Tax Board to conduct audits of 25% of lobbying firms and 25% of lobbyist employers every two years. Existing law requires the FPPC to conduct mandatory audits of candidates for specified offices and authorizes the FPPC to conduct discretionary audits of any reports or statements required under the PRA.

*Transfer of audit duty:* The bill would transfer the lobbying audit duty to the FPPC, commencing with the entities selected for audit in February of 2027.

*Excluding entities with no activity and placement agents:* The bill would exclude lobbying firms and lobbyist employers from the audit selection pool if they have less than \$1 in payments or contributions. The bill would also exclude placement agents, and lobbying firms and lobbyist employers that employ only placement agents, from the audit selection pool.

*Additional lobbyist registration fee:* Existing law imposes a \$50 per year fee for each lobbyist reported on the registration statement of a lobbyist employer or lobbying firm. The bill would impose an additional annual fee on lobbyists subject to audit, in an amount up to \$500 as established by the FPPC to offset the costs associated with the lobbying audit program. The fee would be deposited in a new fund and moneys in the fund would be continuously appropriated to the FPPC to conduct the lobbying audit program.

*Additional FPPC duties:* The bill would require the FPPC to:

1. Post audits conducted by the FPPC on the FPPC website for at least 10 years from the conclusion of the audit.
2. Annually report to the Legislature on the number and type of audits completed by the FPPC.
3. Adopt regulations or policies to ensure the operational independence of audit personnel from enforcement operations under the PRA.

**FPPC Position:** Support

**FPPC Costs:** TBD, pending amendments

- Other Commission Proposals:
  - AB 868 (Wilson) – Create a public record of digital campaign ads (2-year bill)
  - Separate placement agent requirements from lobbying requirements
  - Commission study on best practices for digital political advertisements
  - Add additional authority for filing officers to waive the late filing fee
  - Other minor changes and cleanup proposals

#### 4. Other Commission-Related Bills

Updates (as of 5/31/24)

- **Set for hearing:** AB 2041 (Bonta), SB 948 (Limon and Zbur), SB 1170 (Menjivar), and SB 1476 (Blakespear)

#### Status and Summaries

- [AB 2041 \(Bonta\) - Use of Campaign Funds for Security Expenses](#)

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (72-0); set for hearing in the Senate Elections Committee on 6/4/24

**Short Summary:** AB 2041 would authorize a candidate or elected officer to use campaign funds for home or office security electronic security systems for, and for the reasonable costs of providing personal security to, the candidate, elected officer, or their immediate family or staff.

#### **Detailed Summary:**

*Expansion to personal security expenses:* Existing law allows campaign funds to be used for home or office electronic security systems under certain conditions. The bill would expand permitted campaign fund use to also include payments for the reasonable costs of providing personal security. The bill would specifically provide that the bill does not authorize campaign funds to be spent on firearms for these purposes.

*Expansion to family and staff:* Existing law allows campaign funds to be used only for electronic security systems at the home or office of the candidate or elected officer. The bill would allow campaign funds to be used additionally for home or office electronic security systems and personal security expenses for the immediate family or staff of the candidate or elected officer.

*Repeal of verification requirement:* Existing law allows campaign funds to be used for home or office security systems only if (1) the candidate or elected officer has received threats to their physical safety, (2) the threats arise from

their activities, duties or status as a candidate or elected officer, and (3) the threats have been reported to and verified by law enforcement. The bill would repeal the verification requirements described in (1) and (3), and would also authorize use of funds for threats arising from staff's position as staff of the candidate or elected officer.

*Repeal of \$5,000 limit:* Existing law allows up to \$5,000 to be used for electronic security systems. The bill repeals that limit.

*Return or reimbursement requirement:* Existing law requires the candidate or elected officer to reimburse the campaign fund account for the costs of the security system upon sale of the property where the security equipment is installed, based on the fair market value of the security equipment at the time the property is sold. The bill instead requires either return of, or reimbursement for, the security system equipment and any other items within one year of when the official is no longer in office or the candidate is no longer a candidate for the office for which the security equipment was purchased, or, if applicable, upon sale of the property on which the security equipment is located, whichever occurs sooner. Return or reimbursement would be required for all security equipment and any other tangible items purchased with campaign funds.

*Reporting and recordkeeping:* Existing law requires candidates or elected officers who use campaign funds for electronic security systems to report this expenditure to the Commission and information including when the threat was reported to law enforcement, the contact information of the law enforcement agency, and a description of the threat. The bill would instead require candidates and elected officers to report expenditures and any reimbursement under these provisions on the candidate or elected officer's campaign statements. The bill would also require the candidate or elected officer to maintain certain detailed records.

**FPPC Position:** Support

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[AB 2573 \(M. Fong and Lee\) – Gifts: Services of a Fellow](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (74-0)

**Coauthors:** Assemblymembers Kalra, Low, Muratsuchi, and S. Nguyen

**Short Summary:** AB 2573 would clarify that the services of a policy fellow provided by a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization are not a “gift” to a state elective or appointive officer for purposes of the gift limit.



**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law and advice:* Existing law defines “gift” to mean, in relevant part, “any payment that confers a personal benefit on the recipient, to the extent that consideration of equal or greater value is not received [...]” The FPPC has provided advice that the services of a fellow to a state agency or the Legislative branch are not gifts under the Act, since these services do not confer a personal benefit to any public official.

*Clarification in the law:* The bill would provide that the services of a policy fellow provided by a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization for purposes of assisting with official state agency business are not a “gift” to a state elective or appointive officer for purposes of the gift limit.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[AB 2803 \(Valencia\) – Use of Campaign Funds for Legal Defense: Criminal Convictions](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (71-0); referred to the Senate Elections Committee

**Principal Coauthor:** Senator Umberg

**Coauthor:** Assemblymember Chen

**Short Summary:** AB 2803 would prohibit expenditure of campaign funds for attorney’s fees, other legal defense costs, or any fine, penalty, judgment, or settlement relating to a conviction for a felony or an offense that involves moral turpitude, dishonesty, or fraud.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law; use of campaign funds for legal costs:* Expenditure of campaign funds for attorney’s fees and other legal costs is permitted under certain conditions.

*Existing law; contributions held in trust:* Existing law provides that all contributions deposited into the campaign account shall be deemed to be held in trust for expenses associated with the election of the candidate or for expenses associated with holding office.

*Existing law; political, legislative, or governmental purpose:* Existing law requires expenditures that confer a substantial personal benefit to be directly

related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose. Legal fees and costs are directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose if the litigation (1) is directly related to activities of a committee that are consistent with its primary objectives or (2) arises directly out of a committee's activities or out of a candidate's or elected officer's activities, duties, or status as a candidate or elected officer.

*Prohibition on use of campaign funds associated with certain criminal convictions:* The bill would further restrict campaign funds from being used to pay, or pay reimbursement for, a fine, penalty, judgment, or settlement relating to, or attorney's fees and other costs in connection with, criminal litigation if the litigation results in a conviction of the candidate or elected officer for a felony or an offense that involves moral turpitude, dishonesty, or fraud.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[AB 3239 \(Carrillo\) – Use of Campaign Funds: Emotional Support Animal Airline Travel](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (56-0)

**Short Summary:** AB 3239 would authorize campaign funds to be used pay or reimburse airline travel expenses related to an emotional support animal under certain circumstances.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Under existing law, an expenditure of campaign funds that confers a substantial personal benefit must be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose of the committee. Existing law prohibits campaign funds from being used to pay or reimburse travel expenses except when these expenditures are directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.

*Exception for emotional support animal airline travel costs:* The bill would allow campaign funds to be used to pay or reimburse airline travel expenses related to an emotional support animal belonging to and traveling with an individual whose airline travel may be paid for or reimbursed by campaign funds.

*Definition of emotional support animal:* The bill would cross-reference the definition of "emotional support animal" elsewhere in state law, which defines

the term to mean “an animal that provides emotional, cognitive, or other similar support to an individual with a disability, and that does not need to be trained or certified.”

*Reporting:* The bill would require these costs to be reported on campaign statements the same as other travel costs, and would provide that the payments or reimbursement are considered for the same purpose as the candidate’s or elected officer’s travel.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[SB 948 \(Limon and Zbur\) – Treatment of General Election Contributions](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (37-0); set for hearing in the Assembly Elections Committee on 6/12/24

**Short Summary:** SB 948 would provide that (1) a candidate who raises funds for the general election before the primary election, and who does not file a declaration of candidacy to qualify for a primary election, may transfer these funds to a committee for the same or a different office, and (2) a candidate who wins the election outright in the primary may transfer general election funds to a committee for a subsequent election to the same office, with attribution to specific contributors.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law permits a candidate controlled committee to receive contributions for a general election before the primary election but prohibits those funds from being expended for the primary election. If the candidate is defeated in the primary election, or withdraws from the general election, the candidate must return the funds received for the general election to the contributors.

*Ambiguity in existing law:* Existing law does not explicitly address the scenarios where a candidate withdraws before the primary election or where a candidate wins the election outright in the primary. These issues were the subject of a regulation project presented to the Commission in August 2023 and March 2024.

*Adding explicit authority to transfer general election campaign funds for candidates who withdraw:* This bill would explicitly provide that a candidate who does not file a declaration of candidacy to qualify for a primary election would not be required to refund contributions raised for the general election.

The bill would instead allow those candidates to transfer funds raised for the general election to a committee established for the same or a different office, subject to the attribution rules.

*Adding explicit authority to transfer general election campaign funds for candidates who win the election outright in the primary:* If a candidate wins outright in the primary election, without advancing to the general election, the bill would allow the candidate to (1) transfer remaining primary election funds to a committee for a subsequent election to the same office without attribution, and (2) transfer general election funds to a committee for a subsequent election to the same office with attribution to specific contributors.

*Legislative statement:* The bill states it is declaratory of existing law. As noted, the Legal Division considers existing law ambiguous regarding this specific scenario.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[SB 1111 \(Min\) – Section 1090: Conflicts of Interest in Governmental Contracts: Family Member’s Financial Interests](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (37-0)

**Short Summary:** SB 1111 would require a public officer to disclose if the public officer’s child, parent, or sibling, or the spouse of the child, parent, or sibling, has a financial interest in a government contract made by the officer or by any body or board of which they are a member, if the interest is actually known to the public officer. The body or board must authorize, approve, or ratify the contract in good faith without counting the vote of the public officer with that interest.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law- general rule:* Existing law prohibits Members of the Legislature, and state, county, district, judicial district, and city officers or employees from being financially interested in a contract made by them in their official capacity or by any body or board of which they are members, subject to specified exceptions.

*Existing law- remote interests:* Existing law provides that a public officer shall not be deemed financially interested in contract if the officer only has a remote interest. Existing law identifies certain remote interests, including the interest of a parent in the earnings of his or her minor child for personal

services. In order to be deemed not interested in the relevant contract due to a remote interest, a public officer must disclose the interest, and the body or board must authorize, approve, or ratify the contract in good faith without counting the vote of the public officer with the remote interest.

*New remote interest for the financial interest of certain family members:* The bill would, starting January 1, 2026, add a new remote interest for the financial interests of the public officer's child, parent, or sibling, or the spouse of a child, parent or sibling, if those interests are actually known to the public officer.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** ½ position in the Legal Division

- **[SB 1151 \(Hurtado\) - Registration and Reporting Requirements for Foreign Agents](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (37-0)

**Short Summary:** SB 1151 would make the agent of a foreign principal subject to the same registration and reporting requirements as lobbyists and lobbying firms under the PRA and certain additional requirements.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law under the PRA's lobbying provisions requires an individual or entity that receives compensation for the purpose of influencing legislative or administrative action to register with, and submit periodic reports to, the Secretary of State. The PRA's lobbying disclosure provisions generally require lobbyists, lobbying firms, and lobbyist employers to provide basic identifying information, such as their name, telephone number, business address, and more detailed information, such as a description of the "business activity" in which the lobbyist or their employer is engaged.

*Registration and reporting requirements:* The bill would require an individual who engages in certain specified activities related to influencing legislative or administrative action at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal to register as an agent of a foreign principal and to file periodic reports with the Secretary of State. Registration and reporting would be in the same manner, with the same frequency, and with the same content as for lobbyists and lobbying firms.

*Additional requirement:* The bill would additionally require a foreign agent to disclose on their registration statement any compensation received, contracted, or otherwise promised to the agent by each foreign principal.

*Training and fee:* The bill would also subject foreign agents to the same ethics training requirements and the same annual fee as lobbyists.

*Commissioner restriction:* The bill would prohibit a foreign agent from being a Commissioner with the FPPC.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** \$377,280 in the first year and \$363,280 annually thereafter for 1 position in the Legal Division and 1 position in the Enforcement Division

- **[SB 1155 \(Hurtado\) - Postgovernment Employment Restriction for Former Heads of State Administrative Agencies](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (39-0); referred to the Assembly Elections Committee

**Short Summary:** SB 1155 would, for a period of one year after leaving office, prohibit an elected state officer or appointed official from lobbying the Legislature or a state administrative agency for compensation.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law; one-year ban:* Existing law prohibits certain officials, for one year after leaving state service, from representing any other person by appearing before or communicating with, for compensation, their former agency in an attempt to influence agency decisions that involve the making of general rules (such as regulations or legislation), or to influence certain proceedings involving a permit, license, contract, or transaction involving the sale or purchase of property or goods.

*Existing law; permanent ban:* Existing law prohibits former state officials from working on proceedings that they participated in while working for the state.

*New one-year ban on lobbying activity:* The bill would prohibit the head of an agency, defined to mean an elected state officer or an appointed official who receives a salary based on their appointment, from engaging in any activity, for compensation, for the purpose of influencing legislative or administrative action by the Legislature or any state administrative agency that would require the individual to register as a lobbyist under the PRA.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[SB 1156 \(Hurtado\) - Financial Disclosures for Groundwater Sustainability Agencies](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (39-0)

**Short Summary:** The bill would require members of the executive team, the board of directors, and other groundwater management decision makers of groundwater sustainability agencies to file their Statements of Economic Interests directly with the FPPC.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law; financial disclosure:* Existing law requires every local government agency to adopt and promulgate a Conflict of Interest Code pursuant to the PRA. Individuals designated in a Conflict of Interest Code must submit annual Statements of Economic Interests (SEI). Additionally, all officials listed in Section 82000 must submit SEIs.

*Direct filing with the FPPC:* The bill would require members of the executive team, the board of directors, and other groundwater management decision makers of groundwater sustainability agencies to submit their annual economic interests disclosures directly with the FPPC.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** \$20,000 - \$40,000 annually for the cost of expanding the filer capacity of the FPPC's electronic filing system

- **[SB 1170 \(Menjivar\) - Use of Campaign Funds for Mental Health Expenses](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (39-0); set for hearing in the Assembly Elections Committee on 6/12/24

**Short Summary:** SB 1170 would authorize expenditure of campaign funds for mental healthcare expenses for non-incumbent candidates under limited circumstances.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law prohibits expenditure of campaign funds for health-related expenses for a candidate, elected officer, or any individual or individuals with authority to approve the expenditure of campaign funds held by a committee, or members of their households.

*Authorizing campaign funds use for mental healthcare expenses:* The bill would authorize campaign funds to be used to pay or reimburse a non-incumbent candidate for reasonable and necessary mental healthcare expenses to address mental health issues that have arisen during the campaign or have been adversely impacted by campaign activities if the candidate does not have health insurance or has been denied coverage for these mental healthcare expenses by their health insurance.

*Limited time period:* Expenditures for mental healthcare expenses would be permitted from the date upon which a candidate committee is established to the date that the election results are certified.

*Reporting:* The bill would require these expenditures to be reported on campaign statements and would require the disclosures to note the underlying campaign-related circumstances or events that gave rise to the need for mental health expenses.

*Mental healthcare expenses defined:* Under the bill, “mental healthcare expenses” refers to expenses for services including therapy, psychological, or psychiatric counseling services, provided in a group or private setting, either virtually or in person, by a professional licensed by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences, or an associate accruing the hours for such a license, to address mental health issues.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** TBD, pending amendments

- **[SB 1476 \(Blakespear\) - State Bar of California](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (37-0); referred to the Assembly Elections Committee and the Assembly Judiciary Committee; set for hearing in the Assembly Elections Committee on 6/12/24

**Coauthor:** Senator Umberg

**Short Summary:** SB 1476 would clarify that the State Bar of California is required to adopt a Conflict of Interest Code and its designated employees are required to submit Statements of Economic Interests.

**Detailed Summary:**



*Existing law:* Existing law in the Business and Professions Code provides that state law that restricts or prescribes a mode of procedure for the exercise of powers of state public bodies or state agencies is not applicable to the State Bar, unless the Legislature expressly so declares.

*Existing law; PRA:* Existing law in the PRA references the State Bar of California in four sections, including one section that provides for who the code reviewing body is for the State Bar. Existing law in the PRA implies, but does not explicitly state, that the State Bar of California must adopt a conflict of interest code and that its designated employees must submit Statements of Economic Interests (SEI).

*Existing law; public official:* Existing law in the PRA excludes a member of the Board of Governors and designated employees of the State Bar of California from the definition of “public official,” thus excluding these individuals from the prohibition on participating in government decisions in which the public official has a financial interest and related provisions.

*Clarifies which provisions apply to the State Bar:* The bill would explicitly require the State Bar of California to maintain Conflict of Interest Codes for its board of trustees and designated employees that meet the requirements for Conflict of Interest Codes in the PRA. The bill would authorize the Commission to enforce these provisions.

*Additional clarification needed:* Additional clarification is needed regarding whether the intent is to subject State Bar officials to all of the conflicts provisions in the PRA, or only the Conflict of Interest Code and SEI provisions.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

### **Three Bills Amending Section 84308 (Contributions to Agency Officers)**

- **[AB 2911 \(McKinnor\) – Contributions to Agency Officers: Disqualification: Contribution Limit Increase](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Assembly (63-0); referred to the Senate Elections Committee

**Short Summary:** AB 2911 increases the contribution limit from \$250 to \$1,500 for purposes of Section 84308, which governs contribution limits to agency officers from parties or participants in agency proceedings.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law requires disqualification and recusal of certain agency officers who received contributions of \$250 or more from parties or participants in certain agency proceedings within specific time periods, and requires disclosure on the record of the proceeding of those contributions.

*Increase to contribution limit:* AB 2911 increases the contribution limit from \$250 to \$1,500, allowing parties, participants, and agents to contribute up to \$1,500 to officers in the proceeding without triggering disqualification or disclosure on the record.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **[SB 1181 \(Glazer\) - Contributions to Agency Officers: Disqualification: Additional Notice](#)**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (37-0)

**Short Summary:** SB 1181 would require the agenda for certain public proceedings to include a specified notice regarding limits on contributions from a party to an agency officer and party disclosure requirements.

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law prohibits certain contributions of more than \$250 to an officer of an agency by any party, participant, or party or participant's agent in a proceeding while a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use is pending before the agency and for 12 months following the date a final decision is rendered in the proceeding. Existing law requires disclosure on the record of the proceeding of certain contributions of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months to an officer from a party or participant, or party's agent.

*Adds an agenda notice requirement:* The bill would require the agenda for a proceeding that is a public meeting to include a notice describing the above provisions. The bill also includes language for that notice.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** Minor and absorbable

- **SB 1243 (Dodd) – Contributions to Agency Officers: Disqualification: Narrowing the Scope of Section 84308**

**Status:** Passed in the Senate (30-2); referred to the Assembly Elections Committee

**Short Summary:** SB 1243 would, for purposes of the disqualification provisions for agency officers, (1) narrow the definition of “participant,” (2) exempt proceedings involving the periodic review of development agreements from the types of proceedings subject to the section, (3) narrow the definition of when a proceeding is “pending,” (4) shorten the date range for prohibited contributions, (5) increase the contribution threshold, (6) lengthen the cure period, (7) prohibit contributions from agents to agency officers during a specified time period, (8) provide that any contributions from agents shall not be aggregated with those of a party or participant, and (9) broaden the definition of “agent.”

**Detailed Summary:**

*Existing law:* Existing law prohibits certain contributions of more than \$250 to an officer of an agency by any party, participant, or party or participant’s agent in a proceeding while a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use is pending before the agency and for 12 months following the date a final decision is rendered. Existing law requires disclosure on the record of the proceeding of certain contributions of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months to an officer from a party or participant, or party’s agent. Existing law disqualifies an officer from participating in a decision in a proceeding if the officer has willfully or knowingly received a contribution of more than \$250 from a party or a party’s agent, or a participant or a participant’s agent. Existing law allows an officer to cure certain violations of these provisions by returning a contribution, or the portion of the contribution of in excess of \$250, within 14 days of accepting, soliciting, or receiving the contribution, whichever comes latest.

*Limits Who is a Participant:* The bill would provide that a person is not a “participant” if their financial interest in the decision results solely from an increase or decrease in membership dues.

*Exempts the Periodic Review of Development Agreements:* The bill would exempt “the periodic review of development agreements” from the definition of “license, permit, or other entitlement for use” such that a proceeding on the periodic review of development agreements would not trigger the requirements and restrictions of this section.

*Narrows the Definition of “Pending”:* Existing regulations define when a proceeding is “pending” for an officer to mean either (1) that the decision is before the officer for their consideration, including if the item has been placed on the agenda, or (2) the officer knows or has reason to know the proceeding is before the jurisdiction of the agency and it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will come before the officer. The bill adds a definition of “pending” to statute that is narrower than the regulatory definition, such that a proceeding is pending for an officer only if/when the item is placed on the agenda for discussion or decision by the agency.

*Shortens the Prohibited Contribution Date Range:* The bill would shorten the date range after the final decision during which an officer of an agency is prohibited from accepting, soliciting or directing a contribution from 12 to 9 months after the final decision.

*Raises the Contribution Threshold:* The bill would change the contribution threshold that triggers disqualification from \$250 to \$1,000.

*Lengthens the Cure Period:* The bill would lengthen the cure period during which an officer may cure an unintentional violation, from 14 to 30 days of accepting, soliciting, or directing the contribution.

*Prohibition on Contributions from Agents:* The bill would prohibit the agent of a party or participant from making a contribution to an officer during the proceeding and for 9 months following the date of the final decision.

*Limits the Aggregation Rules:* The bill would provide that, in determining whether a contribution has exceeded one thousand dollars (\$1,000), the contributions of an agent shall not be aggregated with contributions from a party or participant.

*Broadens the Definition of “Agent”:* The bill adds a definition of “agent” such that an agent is a person who (1) represents a party or participant in a proceeding for compensation or (2) otherwise communicates with the agency for purposes of influencing the proceeding on behalf of a party or participant. Because, in the latter instance, the definition includes a person who is potentially not compensated, the bill’s definition is broader than the definition in regulation.

**FPPC Position:** No position

**FPPC Costs:** ½ position in the Legal Division

## **5. Bills Not Moving Forward**

- [AB 2611](#) (Wallis) – PRA Spot Bill
- [AB 2654](#) (V. Fong) – Nondisclosure Agreements
- [AB 2990](#) (Low) – FPPC Enforcement Actions: Time Limits
- [AB 3008](#) (Ramos and Garcia) – Compensation from Tribal Governments
- [SB 1422](#) (Allen) – Disclosure of Payments for Elected Official Travel