

1 STACEY FULHORST, Executive Director
City of San Diego Ethics Commission
2 1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1530
San Diego, CA 92101
3 Telephone: (619) 533-3476
4 Facsimile: (619) 533-3448

5 Petitioner

6
7 **BEFORE THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO**
8 **ETHICS COMMISSION**

9
10 In re the Matter of:) Case No.: 2012-24
11)
12 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF) **STIPULATION, DECISION, AND**
TEACHERS GUILD LOCAL 1931 SAN) **ORDER**
13 DIEGO AND GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA)
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS)
14 COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL)
EDUCATION,)
15 Respondent.)
_____)

16
17 **STIPULATION**

18 **THE PARTIES STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:**

19 1. Petitioner Stacey Fulhorst is the Executive Director of the City of San Diego Ethics
20 Commission [Ethics Commission]. The Ethics Commission is charged with a duty to administer,
21 implement, and enforce local governmental ethics laws contained in the San Diego Municipal
22 Code [SDMC] relating to, among other things, the provisions of the Election Campaign Control
23 Ordinance [ECCO], SDMC section 27.2901, *et seq.*

24 2. At all times mentioned herein, the American Federation of Teachers Guild Local
25 1931 San Diego and Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College Districts Committee on Political
26 Education was a committee registered with the State of California (Identification No. 901908)
27 and is referred to herein as "Respondent."

28 ///

1 3. This Stipulation will be submitted for consideration by the Ethics Commission at its
2 next scheduled meeting, and the agreements contained herein are contingent upon the approval
3 of the Stipulation and the accompanying Decision and Order by the Ethics Commission.

4 4. This Stipulation resolves all factual and legal issues raised in this matter by the
5 Ethics Commission without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to determine
6 Respondent's liability.

7 5. Respondent understands and knowingly and voluntarily waives any and all
8 procedural rights under the SDMC, including, but not limited to, a determination of probable
9 cause, the issuance and receipt of an administrative complaint, the right to appear personally in
10 any administrative hearing held in this matter, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses
11 testifying at the hearing, the right to subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, and the right to
12 have the Ethics Commission or an impartial hearing officer hear this matter. Respondent agrees
13 to hold the City of San Diego harmless from any and all claims or damages resulting from the
14 Commission's investigation, this stipulated agreement, or any matter reasonably related thereto.
15 Respondent further agrees that the terms of this Stipulation constitute compliance with the
16 provisions of SDMC section 26.0450 in that the Stipulation includes a recitation of facts, a
17 reference to each violation, and an order.

18 6. Respondent acknowledges that this Stipulation is not binding upon any other law
19 enforcement or government agency and does not preclude the Ethics Commission from referring
20 this matter to, cooperating with, or assisting any other law enforcement or government agency
21 with regard to this or any other related matter.

22 7. The parties agree that in the event the Ethics Commission refuses to accept this
23 Stipulation, it shall become null and void. Respondent further agrees that in the event the Ethics
24 Commission rejects the Stipulation and a full evidentiary hearing before the Ethics Commission
25 becomes necessary, no member of the Ethics Commission or its staff shall be disqualified
26 because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **Summary of Law and Facts**

2 8. ECCO defines “committee” as any person or combination of persons who raise
3 \$1,000 or more for the purpose of supporting or opposing a candidate or ballot measure, or make
4 independent expenditures of \$1,000 or more, within a single calendar year. SDMC § 27.2903.

5 9. ECCO mandates that all committees that pay for mass campaign literature (200
6 substantially similar pieces of campaign literature) for the purpose of supporting or opposing a
7 City candidate or measure include the words “paid for by” followed by the name and address of
8 the committee. SDMC § 27.2970. This disclosure must be made in a typeface that is easily
9 legible, contrasts with the background, and is no less than 12 points in size. *Id.*

10 10. Respondent produced and distributed mass campaign literature in the form of six
11 mailers to support the mayoral candidacy of Bob Filner in the June 2012 primary election that
12 did not comply with the “paid for by” disclosure requirements in the City’s campaign laws:

13 (a) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 16, 2012, that was
14 distributed to 181,699 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in
15 8-point type.

16 (b) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 16, 2012, that was
17 distributed to 39,101 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in 6-
18 point type.

19 (c) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 23, 2012, that was
20 distributed to 50,460 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in 6-
21 point type.

22 (d) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 23, 2012, that was
23 distributed to 64,836 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in 6-
24 point type.

25 (e) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 30, 2012, that was
26 distributed to 64,836 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in 6-
27 point type.

28 ///

1 (f) Respondent produced a mailer on approximately May 30, 2012, that was
2 distributed to 89,267 City residents. This mailer included a “paid for by” disclosure printed in 6-
3 point type.

4 **Counts**

5 **Counts 1 through 6 - Violations of SDMC section 27.2970**

6 11. Respondent violated SDMC section 27.2970 by producing and distributing mass
7 campaign literature in the form of six mailers that did not comply with the “paid for by”
8 disclosure requirements in that the disclosure was not printed in the requisite 12-point type size.
9 As discussed above in Paragraph 10, one mailer included the disclosure in 8-point type, and the
10 other five included the disclosure in 6-point type.

11 **Factors in Mitigation**

12 12. Respondent does not have a history of participating in City elections. It previously
13 made expenditures to support or oppose candidates in school board races, and state law requires
14 campaign mailers distributed to support or oppose school board candidates to include a “paid for
15 by” disclosure in no less than a 6-point type.

16 13. Respondent has cooperated fully with the Ethics Commission investigation.

17 **Conclusion**

18 14. Respondent agrees to take necessary and prudent precautions to ensure compliance
19 with all provisions of ECCO in the future.

20 15. Respondent acknowledges that the Ethics Commission may impose increased fines
21 in connection with any future violations of the City’s campaign laws.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

