



Agenda & Rules Committee

ACTION CALENDAR

November 9, 2021

(Continued from October 26, 2021)

To: Honorable Members of the City Council
From: Agenda & Rules Policy Committee: Mayor Jesse Arreguin and Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Wengraf
Subject: Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) Relating to Officeholder Accounts

RECOMMENDATION

Take one of the following actions:

1. Refer a proposal to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA), BMC Chapter 2.12, and Lobbyist Registration Act, BMC Chapter 2.09, to enact “a reasonable set of limitations and rules” to regulate the maintenance of officeholder accounts, as developed and referred for consideration by the Agenda and Rules Committee; or
2. Refer a proposal to the FCPC amending BERA, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, as originally proposed by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission.

Pursuant to BMC Section 2.12.051.A, BERA may be amended by the “double green light” process. This process requires that the amendment first be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the FCPC and then adopted by a two-thirds vote of the City Council, following a public hearing. This item would submit a proposal to the FCPC for its consideration. If adopted by a two-thirds vote of the FCPC, the item would return to the Council for final adoption.

POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On March 29, 2021, the Agenda & Rules Policy Committee adopted the following action:¹ M/S/C (Wengraf/Arreguin) to send the item to Council with two proposed alternatives: 1) Councilmember Hahn’s proposal to regulate officeholder accounts [with modifications brought forward by Committee members], and 2) the Fair Campaign Practices Commission proposal to prohibit officeholder accounts; and to include the Commission’s analysis of regulating officeholder accounts in the item that goes to the full Council. Vote: All Ayes.

¹ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/City_Council/2021/03_Mar/Documents/03-29%20Minutes%20-%20Agenda%20Committee.pdf

BACKGROUND

On February 4, 2020, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) submitted a recommendation to Council to adopt an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA), BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.² Council took action to refer a discussion on Officeholder Accounts and Council District (D-13) Accounts to the Agenda & Rules Committee, to “consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the FCPC.”³

The Agenda & Rules Committee considered this referral with input from FCPC commissioners. The FCPC and Open Government Commission (OGC)⁴ also submitted subsequent recommendations to Council related to this process, which were included as part of the discussion regarding officeholder and D-13 accounts. The OGC submitted a recommendation that a special temporary joint advisory committee be created consisting of members of the OGC and Council to review the practice of councilmembers making donations to community organizations from their D-13 accounts. This proposal was referred directly to the Agenda & Rules Committee on August 31, 2020. On January 11, 2021, the FCPC and OGC jointly submitted a proposal to the Council clarifying the desire to create a joint subcommittee of FCPC-OGC members and members of the Council to consider both regulation of officeholder accounts as well as D-13 account grant practices and expressing willingness to consider either prohibition or regulation of officeholder accounts. D-13 account grant practices have since been addressed separately by Council.⁵

The Agenda & Rules Committee discussed the question of officeholder accounts at multiple meetings in early 2021 with input from three FCPC-OGC commissioners (Chair Brad Smith, Vice Chair Jedidiah Tsang and Commissioner Patrick O’Donnell). On March 29, 2021, the Agenda & Rules Committee took action to send this item to Council with two proposed alternatives: 1) a proposal to regulate officeholder accounts in a manner based on existing regulation of campaign committees, and 2) the Fair

² https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2020/02_Feb/Documents/2020-02-04_Special_Item_02_Amendments_to_the_Berkeley_pdf.aspx

³ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2020/02_Feb/Documents/02-04_Special_Annotated_Agenda_pdf.aspx

⁴ The OGC is composed of the same membership as the FCPC and the two bodies meet concurrently. The FCPC has jurisdiction over BERA while the OGC has broad authority to make recommendations to Council regarding “open and effective government.” (BMC § 2.06.190.A.2.) Therefore, proposals regarding the prohibition or regulation of officeholder accounts in BERA have been presented by the FCPC, while recommendations regarding D-13 accounts have been offered by the OGC.

⁵ On February 8, 2021, the Agenda & Rules Committee took action to make a positive recommendation to the City Council on part two of the Commission recommendation to prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members. The Council approved this recommendation on March 9, 2021.

Campaign Practices Commission proposal to prohibit officeholder accounts. The Committee's action also required the Commission's analysis of regulating officeholder accounts to be included in the item that goes to the full Council.⁶

Officeholder accounts are currently allowed in the City of Berkeley, subject only to limitations provided in State Law. The Agenda & Rules Committee's proposal to regulate officeholder accounts would establish local rules that mirror and adapt Berkeley's existing, voter-approved regulations for campaign committees, including regulation of donations and reporting requirements, and narrow the uses for which officeholder account funds can be used.

Officeholder accounts are accounts an elected official can open, and raise funds for, to pay for expenses related to the office they hold.⁷ They are not campaign accounts, and cannot be used for campaign purposes. The types of expenses officeholder accounts can be used for include research, conferences, events attended in the performance of government duties, printed newsletters, office supplies, travel related to official duties, and similar expenses. Cities can place limits on officeholder accounts, as Oakland has done.⁸ Under State law, officeholder accounts must be registered as official committees, and adhere to strict public reporting requirements, like campaign accounts. These reporting requirements provide full transparency to the public about sources and uses of funds in officeholder accounts.

The FCPC's recommendation to outlaw officeholder accounts in Berkeley was set aside by the City Council on when it referred on February 4, 2020 to the Agenda & Rules Committee to "consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such [officeholder] accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council."⁹ Some members of the FCPC who participated in the Agenda & Rules Committee discussion continued to advocate for the original proposal to outlaw Officeholder Accounts, so the Committee acted to send both the Council-requested "reasonable set of limitations" and the FCPC's original recommendation back to the Council for consideration.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Regulating the maintenance of officeholder accounts by councilmembers and the Mayor would have a moderate impact on staff time.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Agenda & Rules Policy Committee: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, (510) 981-7100;
Councilmember Sophie Hahn, District 5, 510-682-5905 (cell); and Susan Wengraf,
Councilmember, District 6, (510) 981-7160.

⁶ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/City_Council/2021/03_Mar/Documents/03-29%20Minutes%20-%20Agenda%20Committee.pdf

⁷ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/Regulations/Index/Chapter5/18531.62.pdf>

⁸ <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

⁹ https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2020/02_Feb/Documents/02-04_Special_Annotated_Agenda_pdf.aspx

ATTACHMENTS

1. Officeholder Accounts Proposal As Forwarded to the City Council by the Agenda Committee on March 29, 2021
2. Proposed Ordinance Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act and Lobbyist Registration Act to Regulate Officeholder Committees
3. Fair Campaign Practices Commission Proposal to Prohibit Officeholder Accounts,
https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2021/03_Mar/Documents/03-29_Agenda_Committee_Agenda_Packet.aspx

Officeholder Accounts

As Forwarded to the City Council by the

Agenda Committee on March 29, 2021

This set of terms is presented as a basis to discuss a potential amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (“BERA”) (BMC Ch. 2.12) to regulate the maintenance of officeholder accounts by elected officials in Berkeley. The proposal following elements are proposed for discussion by the Agenda Committee:

General Requirements and Donation Limits

1. **Amend BERA to expressly permit the creation of officeholder accounts** by elected officials in Berkeley
2. Officeholder accounts would **be subject to the same donor requirements as campaign accounts under BERA:**
 - a. May only receive donations from natural persons.
 - b. Per-person donation limit set the same as the contribution limit under BERA (currently \$250; if BERA changes, so would these limits – idea is for them to always be parallel)
 - c. Etc. – All requirements and limitations on who can give, how much, and how donations can be made would be “by reference” to BERA and thus identical over time.
3. Officeholder accounts would be **subject to the same registration and reporting regime as campaign accounts under BERA**. State law currently requires Officeholder Accounts to report using the same forms as campaign accounts; this proposal would also incorporate the reporting requirements of BERA – for example lower thresholds for initial reporting, lower amounts reported, etc.
4. **Cumulative annual donations, not including an officeholder’s own donations to their officeholder account would be capped at fixed amounts**. Suggest the amount be set at the approximate cost of producing and mailing one newsletter to constituents, although use of funds would not be limited to that use (see below). Amount should be indexed.
5. As with campaign accounts, **an officeholder’s own donations to their officeholder account would not be subject to any limits** but would be reported. An officeholder would also still be allowed to spend their own money on officeholder expenses without using an officeholder account. This is a First Amendment issue that can’t be infringed upon.

Complete Separation from Campaign Accounts and Expenditures

1. An officeholder would **not be allowed to simultaneously maintain an officeholder account and a campaign account of any kind:**
 - a. A winning candidate taking office would be required to close their campaign account before opening an officeholder account.

- b. An incumbent officeholder running for re-election or running for any other elected position – local, state, or federal – would be required to close their officeholder account before opening a campaign account.
- 2. An officeholder could not redesignate their officeholder account as a campaign account or use any officeholder funds to pay campaign expenses, ever.
- 3. Officeholder account funds could not be transferred to or from a candidate committee account for any elective office, local, state or federal.
- 4. “Extra” funds in an officeholder account could be used only for a legitimate officeholder expense, refunded to donors on a pro rata basis, or donated to the City’s General Fund.

Impermissible and Permissible Uses of Officeholder Funds

- 5. **Officeholder accounts would not be used for the following** expenditures:
 - a. Expenditures in connection with an election for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office or ballot measure
 - b. Campaign consulting, research, polling, and similar expenditures related to any campaign
 - c. Membership in athletic, social, fraternal, veteran, or religious organizations
 - d. Supplemental compensation for employees for performance of their ordinary duties
 - e. Any expenditure that would violate BERA or state law
- 6. **Officeholder accounts would only be used for the following** expenditures (list likely needs to be honed/expanded – this list reflects narrowing and adaptation of the Oakland ordinance, which is overly broad):
 - f. Office equipment, furnishings, and office supplies
 - g. Officeholder communications not related to a campaign, including but not limited to:
 - i. Mailings, newsletters, and other communications, whether by electronic or traditional media
 - ii. Websites and communications by all media including email, publication, and social media
 - iii. Email and address management
 - iv. Professional/consulting services and/or staff time related to communications.
 - h. Registration, travel, lodging, meals, and related expenses for attending an activity which supports a legislative or governmental purpose, including activities which involve international travel, including but not limited to:
 - i. Conferences, meetings, receptions, sister-city visits, and other events
 - ii. Membership and participation in programs for civic, service, or professional organizations
 - iii. Educational, training, and professional development courses and events

when incurred by the officeholder, their staff, or a community representative of the officeholder (but not a family member or an individual whose organization or who themselves is subject to registration under the City's Lobbyist Ordinance)

- i. Fundraising for the officeholder account.
- j. Consulting, research, surveys, photographic or similar services not related to a campaign.
- k. Expressions of congratulations, appreciation or condolences to constituents or other persons the officeholder communicates/works with in their official capacity.
- l. Salaries or other compensation for consultants/staff working on officeholder activities, including for time spent by regular staff on officeholder activities separate/different from their ordinary duties.
- m. Tax liabilities and other official fees/costs incurred by the officeholder account.
- n. Accounting, legal, and other professional services provided to the officeholder account.
- o. Attorneys' fees and other costs related to administrative procedures, litigation, or other processes arising from the officeholder's activities, duties, or status as an elected officer.

Termination of Account on Leaving Office (+ Not running for any office)

- 1. An officeholder would be **required to terminate their account within 90 days after leaving office.**
- 2. An officeholder **could not make expenditures after their last day in office** except to pay outstanding officeholder debts, repay donations on a pro rata basis, or donate remaining funds to the City's general fund.
- 3. Officeholders running for another office, local, state, or federal, would be required to close their officeholder account before opening a campaign account (see above).

Enforcement

- 1. Violations of the officeholder account rules **would be subject to all enforcement provisions under BERA**, including enforcement by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission ("FCPC").

ORDINANCE NO. -N.S.

AMENDING THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT AND
LOBBYIST REGISTRATION ACT TO REGULATE OFFICEHOLDER
COMMITTEES

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.09.220 is amended to read as follows:

2.09.220 Restrictions on payments and expenses benefiting local public officials.

A. No local government lobbyist or a registered client shall make any payment or incur any expense, including any gift of travel, that directly benefits an elected city officeholder, candidate for elected city office, a designated employee, or a member of the immediate family of one of these individuals, in which the cumulative value of such payments or expenses exceeds \$240 during any calendar year. This \$240 limit may be adjusted every four years by the OGC to account for inflation. The payments and expenses specified in subsections 2.09.220(A)-(D) include gifts, honoraria and any other form of compensation but do not include:

1. gifts of food or refreshment worth \$25 or less per occasion, if the local governmental lobbyist is a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization, the gift of food or refreshment is offered in connection with a public event held by the 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization, and the same gift of food or refreshment is made available to all attendees of the public event;
2. payments or expenses that, within thirty (30) days after receipt, are returned unused or are reimbursed;
3. gifts of food or beverage worth \$25 or less per occasion, if said gift is provided in the home of an individual local governmental lobbyist or individual local governmental lobbyist's registered client when the individual or member of the individual's family is present;
4. a pass or ticket to a fundraising event for a campaign committee or candidate, or for an organization exempt from taxation under Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code;
5. informational material;
6. campaign or officeholder contributions not to exceed the limits imposed by the Berkeley Election Reform Act or state law, as applicable; and
7. salaries, consulting fees or other payments for services rendered or bargained

for. No other exception to, or exclusion from, the definition of gift or honoraria contained in the Political Reform Act of 1974 as amended, and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, shall apply to this section.

For purposes of the gift limits imposed by subsections (A)-(C), gifts shall be aggregated set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 18945.1, as it may hereafter be amended.

B. No lobbyist or a lobbyist's registered client shall make any payment to a third-party for the purpose of making any payment or incurring any expense, including any gift of travel, that directly benefits an elected city officeholder, candidate for elected city office, a designated employee, or a member of the immediate family of one of these individuals.

C. No elected city officeholder, candidate for elected city office, or designated employee may accept or solicit any payment or expense, including any gift of travel, from any lobbyist for the individual's personal benefit or for the personal benefit of a member of the immediate family of one of these individuals.

D. No elected city officeholder, candidate for elected city office, or designated employee may accept or solicit any payment or expense, including any gift of travel, from a third-party if the officer knows or has reason to know that the third-party is providing the payment or expense on behalf of a lobbyist.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.100 is amended to read as follows:

Section 2.12.100 Contribution.

A. "Contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates or the qualification for the ballot or voter approval of one or more measures. The term "contribution" includes the purchase of tickets for events such as dinners, luncheons, rallies and similar fund-raising events; a candidate's own money or property used on behalf of his or her candidacy; the granting to a candidate or committee of discounts or rebates not available to the general public; and payments for the services of any person serving on behalf of a candidate or committee, when such payments are not made from contributions the candidate or committee must otherwise report under the terms of this chapter. The term "contribution" further includes any transfer, gift, loan, advance, deposit, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, pledge, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, received directly or indirectly by a

committee from another committee. The term "contribution" shall not include a gift of service or labor, but shall include service or labor for which a payment is made, nor shall the term "contribution" include a gift of the use of personal or real property where the value of such use is not in excess of fifty dollars, nor shall it include food and beverages the value of which for any one event is no more than fifty dollars.

B. In the case of an officeholder committee, "contribution" means a monetary payment to an officeholder committee to be used for expenses associated with holding City office as provided in Article 9 of this Chapter.

Section 3. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.130 is amended to read as follows:

Section 2.12.130 Expenditure.

A. "Expenditure" means a payment, pledge or promise of payment of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, for goods, materials, services or facilities in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates or the qualification for the ballot or adoption of one or more measures. The term "expenditure" includes any transfer, payment, gift, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, contract, agreement or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly by one committee to another committee. "Expenditure" also includes the forgiving of a loan or the repayment of a loan by a third party.

B. In the case of an officeholder committee, "expenditure" means payment of money by an officeholder committee for expenses associated with holding elective office in the City of Berkeley as provided in Article 9 of this Chapter.

Section 4. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

Section 2.12.157 Officeholder committee.

"Officeholder committee" means a committee established by an Elective Officer of the City of Berkeley, as defined in Article V Section 8 of the Charter of the City of Berkeley, to receive contributions and make expenditures associated with holding elective office in the City of Berkeley as provided in Article 9 of this chapter.

Section 5. That Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.545 is amended to read as follows:

Section 2.12.545 Cost of living adjustments.

The Commission shall adjust the dollar amounts specified in Sections 2.12.167, 2.12.500.A.3, 2.12.505.B and 2.12.530.B.3.b and 2.12.602 for cost of living changes pursuant to Section 2.12.075 in January of every odd-numbered year following Council implementation. Such adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest ten dollars (\$10) with respect to Sections 2.12.167, 2.12.500.A.3 and 2.12.530.B.3.b and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) with respect to Sections 2.12.505.B and 2.12.602.

Section 6. That Article 9 of Chapter 2.12 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is added to read as follows

Article 9. Officeholder Committees

Section. 2.12.600 Regulation of officeholder committees.

- A. Elective Officers (the “officeholder” or “officeholders”) shall each be permitted to establish one officeholder committee, as defined in Section 2.12.157.
- B. Nothing in this section shall require an officeholder to open an officeholder committee or, if they have established an officeholder committee, to contribute to their officeholder committee to spend personal funds on their own officeholder expenses.
- C. Expenditures of an officeholder’s personal funds for their own officeholder expenses which are not contributed to an officeholder committee are not reportable under this chapter.

Section 2.12.602 Cumulative contribution limits

- A. For each Elected Officer representing a district within the City of Berkeley, total contributions to an officeholder committee from all contributors other than the officeholder shall not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the aggregate per calendar year.
- B. For citywide Elected Officers, total contributions to an officeholder committee from all contributors other than the officeholder shall not exceed in the aggregate per calendar year an amount equal to four times the maximum allowed for elected officers representing districts, as provided in Section 2.12.602.A

Section 2.12.604 Prohibited officeholder expenditures

An officeholder committee shall not make expenditures for the following purposes:

- A. Expenditures in connection with an election for any city, county, regional, state or federal elective office or in connection with a ballot measure.
- B. Expenditures for campaign consulting, research, polling, photographic or similar services for election to city, county, regional, state or federal elective office.
- C. Membership in any athletic, social, fraternal, veterans or religious organization.
- D. Supplemental compensation for officeholder staff for performance of duties required or expected of the person in the regular course or hours of their employment as a City official or employee.
- E. Any expenditure that would violate any provision of the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12.) or the California Political Reform Act (Cal. Gov. Code § 81000 et seq.), including but not limited to the gift laws pertaining to travel payments, advancements and reimbursements under Government Code section 89506 and provisions related to permissible expenditures which serve legislative or governmental purposes under Government Code sections 89512 through 89519.

Section 2.12.606 Permissible officeholder expenditures

An officeholder committee may make expenditures only for the following purposes:

- A. Expenditures for fundraising for the officeholder committee.
- B. Expenditures for office equipment, furnishings and office supplies used for governmental or legislative purposes.
- C. Expenditures for compensation of staff, consultants, or other persons employed by the officeholder for time spent on officeholder activities, provided that such expenditures are not prohibited by Section 2.12.604.D.
- D. Expenditures for research, surveys, photographic, or similar services, provided such services are only for officeholder purposes.
- E. Expenditures for attendance, travel, lodging, meals and other related expenses which serve a legislative or governmental purpose by the officeholder and members of the officeholder's City staff or others employed by the officeholder to perform duties related to officeholder activities. Such permissible expenditures shall include but not be limited to:
 - 1. Expenditures for attendance at conferences, meetings, receptions, and other events occurring within or outside of the United States, including but not limited to registration or other attendance fees, travel, lodging, food, and

incidentals;

2. Expenditures for membership and participation in programs for civic, service, or professional organizations, if such membership bears a reasonable relationship to a governmental or legislative purpose; and
 3. Expenditures for educational courses or events reasonably related to a governmental or legislative purpose.
- F. Expenditures for constituent and community communications, including but not limited to:
1. Mailings, newsletters and other paper, electronic, or other communications which provide information related to community events, an officeholder's governmental duties, an officeholder's position on a particular matter, or any other matter of public concern or interest;
 2. An officeholder's website and social media;
 3. Email and address list management.
- G. Expenditures for expressions of congratulations, appreciation or condolences sent to constituents, employees, governmental officials, or other persons with whom the officeholder communicates in their official capacity.
- H. Expenditures for payment of tax liabilities incurred as a result of permissible officeholder committee transactions.
- I. Expenditures for accounting, legal, professional, administrative, and similar services provided to the officeholder committee.
- J. Expenditures for attorneys' fees and other costs related to litigation, administrative procedures, or other processes arising directly from the officeholder committee's activities or the officeholder's activities, duties, or status as an elected officer.

Section 2.12.608 Prohibitions on transfer or reallocation of funds

The following restrictions apply to the transfer or reallocation of officeholder funds:

- A. No funds may be contributed, redesignated, or transferred to an officeholder committee from any campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office or ballot measure, or any other political committee.
- B. No funds may be contributed, redesignated, or transferred from an officeholder

committee to any candidate or campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office or ballot measure, or any other political committee.

- C. No officeholder committee may be redesignated as a campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office or ballot measure.
- D. No campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office or ballot measure may be redesignated as an officeholder committee.

Section 2.12.610 Prohibition on simultaneously maintaining officeholder and campaign committees

- A. An officeholder may not simultaneously maintain an officeholder committee and a campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state or federal elective office.
- B. A candidate who is elected to any elective office in Berkeley must terminate their campaign committee before opening an officeholder committee.
- C. An officeholder must terminate any open officeholder committee prior to filing a Statement of Organization or equivalent initial filing for a campaign committee for any city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office.

For officeholders filing a Statement of Organization with the City Clerk to form a campaign committee for a City of Berkeley office, the Clerk shall provide notice of the need to close any open officeholder committee prior to accepting the campaign committee Statement of Organization.

Section 2.12.612 Termination of officeholder committees upon leaving office

- A. An officeholder who does not file a Statement of Organization or equivalent initial filing to seek a subsequent city, county, regional, state, or federal elective office shall terminate their officeholder committee within 90 days of leaving office.
- B. Following the date of leaving office, an officeholder shall not make any new expenditures from their officeholder committee except for the following purposes:
 - 1. Paying for legitimate, outstanding officeholder expenses accrued on or prior to the date of leaving office.
 - 2. Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder committee on a pro rata basis.
 - 3. Donating funds to the City's general fund.

2.12.615 Limits and requirements for contributions and expenditures

- A. The limit on cumulative contributions to an officeholder committee by a person other than the officeholder in a calendar year shall be the same as the limit on contributions to a candidate with respect to a single election under Section 2.12.415. Contributions to a candidate shall not be counted against the limit on contributions to an officeholder committee in the same calendar year.
- B. Officeholder committees shall be subject to the limits on contributions from organizations and entities to candidates and committees under Section 2.12.440.
- C. Nothing in this Article shall limit the amount an officeholder may contribute to their own officeholder committee or spend on officeholder expenses either through or not through an officeholder committee.
- D. All requirements and prohibitions for campaign contributions and expenditures under Sections 2.12.300, 2.12.305, 2.12.310, 2.12.315, and 2.12.320 shall apply to officeholder committees.

2.12.645 Officeholder Committee Treasurer

Each officeholder committee shall appoint a committee treasurer and shall comply with all requirements for campaign committee treasurers under section 2.12.245.

2.12.650 Officeholder expenditure and contribution account – Establishment required – Procedure for use

An officeholder committee treasurer shall establish and manage a checking account. All provisions of Section 2.12.250 regarding the establishment and use of campaign accounts shall also apply to the establishment and use of officeholder committee checking accounts, unless otherwise provided in this Article.

2.12.655 Statement of organization – Committee required to file.

- A. Every officeholder committee shall file with the City Clerk a statement of organization before accepting contributions.
- B. The date on which an officeholder committee is formed by filing a statement of organization shall determine the officeholder committee's obligation to file statements and reports required by this chapter.

2.12.660 Statement of organization – information required

The statement of organization required by Section 2.12.655 shall include:

- A. The name, street address and telephone number of the officeholder committee;
- B. The name of the officeholder;
- C. The full name, street address and telephone number of the treasurer and other principal officers;
- D. The elected office held by the officeholder;
- E. The account number and name of the bank at which the checking account, required by Section 2.12.650, is maintained; if the information required by this section is unavailable at the time of filing the statement of organization, the filer shall promptly submit an amended statement after such information becomes available;
- F. The cash on hand at the time of filing the statement of organization;
- G. Such other information as shall be required by the rules or regulations of the commission consistent with the purposes and provisions of this chapter.

Section 2.12.665 Statement of organization--Change of information--Amendment required.

Whenever there is a change in any of the information contained in the statement of organization, an amendment shall be filed within ten days to reflect the change.

Section 2.12.670 Officeholder statements – filing requirements

- A. Each officeholder committee statement shall be filed in accordance with the filing dates prescribed by state law for campaign committee statements. If state law does not establish the filing dates for campaign statements, the commission shall set the necessary filing dates.

Section 2.12.675 Officeholder statements - Verification

- A. Reports and statements required by this Article shall be subject to the filing requirement of Sections 2.12.025, 2.12.030, 2.12.032, 2.12.033, 2.12.035, 2.12.040, 2.12.045 and 2.12.050.
- B. An officeholder shall verify his or her officeholder statement. The verification shall be in accordance with the provisions of Section 2.12.025 except that it shall state that they have made reasonable inquiry into the truthfulness and completeness of such officeholder statement and that to the best of their knowledge, the treasurer of the officeholder committee used all reasonable diligence in the preparation of the committee's statement. This section does not relieve the treasurer of any officeholder committee from the obligation to verify each officeholder statement filed pursuant to Section 2.12.025.

Section 2.12.680 Officeholder Statement – Information required

Officeholder committee statements required by this article shall include all applicable information required for campaign committee statements by Section 2.12.280.

Section 2.12.685 Enforcement

Violations of this article involving the unlawful use of officeholder committees are subject to the enforcement procedures and penalties in Article 7 of this chapter.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 29, 2021

TO: Mayor Jesse Arreguin and Councilmembers Sophie Hahn and Susan Weingraf, Members of the Council Agenda and Rules Committee

FROM: Brad Smith, Patrick O'Donnell and Jedidiah Tsang, Delegation from the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

SUBJECT: Officeholder Accounts

Two main approaches have been considered regarding local Officeholder Accounts in California. The first, adopted by the City of San Jose, would prohibit these accounts. The second, adopted by the city of Oakland, would permit these accounts but regulate them.

For the reasons discussed below, the FCPC previously recommended that Officeholder Accounts be prohibited (Exhibit 3). However, the Council decided in February 2020 not to approve the FCPC's recommendation and referred the issue of Officeholder Accounts, along with concomitant issues related to D-13 accounts, to the Council's Agenda and Rules Committee.

The Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions have been studying Officeholder and D-13 Accounts since 2019. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019, the FCPC voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) that would prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The FCPC's recommendation was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (A copy of the Report to Council is attached as Exhibit 3.)

Although the Council did not approve the FCPC's recommendations at that time and is considering alternatives that would allow for regulated Officeholder Accounts, a discussion in which the FCPC is glad to participate, the FCPC continues to believe that the prohibition of such accounts may ultimately be the preferable solution.

Briefly, our reasons for recommending prohibiting Officeholder Accounts are as follows:

1. Donations to an elected official's Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.
2. The City of San Jose has prohibited Officeholder Accounts (Section 12.06.810) since January 2008, providing as a rationale "to prevent the perception by the public that such contributions may give rise to undue or improper influence over elected officials" (Section 12.06.1100).

3. There are a number of permissible expenditures that could be made from Officeholder Accounts, now made from the Councilmember's discretionary council office budget (D-13 account), that put the elected official in a favorable light. Such expenditures include contributions to nonprofit organizations and newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information or an officeholder's position on matters before the Council. We are not arguing these expenditures should be prohibited, only not paid for by funds collected in Officeholder Accounts.

4. As evidenced by contributions to nonprofit organizations from the Councilmember's D-13 accounts, which in total increased from \$50,938 in FY 2017 to \$113,526 in FY2018, enough funds are now available to Councilmembers to cover office expenses. It stretches the imagination to see donations to nonprofit organizations as an "office expense." If not enough funds are available for office expenses, the allocation to the D-13 accounts should be increased by the Council rather than relying on funds solicited from donors for an Officeholder Account.

5. Members of the FCPC are concerned about the amount of staff time required to track paperwork required for the administration of Officeholder Accounts and to assist in the enforcement process.

6. Members of the FCPC have discussed concerns that Councilmembers from wealthier areas of the City will have an easier time of raising funds for Officeholder Accounts.

7. Finally, we note the Officeholder Account has been rarely used in Berkeley, only once in the last several years that we are aware of.

While we look forward to a good, frank discussions and careful consideration of the alternative of permitting and regulating Officeholder Accounts, we respectfully request that Council members continue to consider that a prohibition of these accounts may, in the end, be the preferable approach.

Exhibit 1. Although the FCPC continues to support prohibition, it has prepared a draft version of an ordinance that would allow for regulated Officeholder Accounts. This draft identifies the issues that a regulated approach, if pursued, would need to address.

Exhibit 2. RESOLUTION NO. 67,992-N.S. (City Council Expenditures and Reimbursement Policies), referred to in the proposed language for changes to BERA to regulate Officeholder Accounts.

Exhibit 3. Language for amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts included in the FCPC submission to the City Council of February 4, 2020.

[DRAFT]

[Annotations are in RED. These include ISSUES for discussion and RECOMMENDATIONS of the three FCPC members participating in the joint meetings.]

ORDINANCE NO. -N.S.

AMENDING THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO REGULATE
OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That the Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

Section 2.12.157 Officeholder Account.

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Article 9 of Chapter 2.12 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is added to read as follows

Article 9. Officeholder Accounts

Section. 2.12.600 Regulation of Officeholder Accounts.

A. The Mayor and Council members (the “officeholder” or “office holders”) shall each be permitted to establish one Officeholder Account, as defined in section 2.12.157.

ISSUE: What limitations should be placed on which public officials may be authorized to open Officeholder Accounts? Currently, Berkeley law is silent on this issue, as it is generally with respect to matters relating to Officeholder Accounts. Should the authorization to have Officeholder Accounts be limited to the Mayor and Council members?

State law applies to “elected state officeholder[s],” which includes the Governor, members of the state senate and assembly, and “other statewide elected official[s] other than the Governor.” (Gov. Code sec.85316(b)(1).)

RECOMMENDATION: Amendments to BERA authorizing Officeholder Accounts should be limited to the offices of Mayor and members of the City Council. Extending the authorization more broadly appears to other city officeholders at this time appears to be fiscally unnecessary and would impose significant burdens on the clerk’s office and the FCPC, which would be responsible for compliance with reporting requirements and the enforcement of the laws relating to Officeholder Accounts. If Berkeley’s experience with Officeholder Accounts proves to be positive, BERA could be amended in the future to expand the categories of elected officials authorized to establish Officeholder Accounts.

B. All donations deposited into an Officeholder Account shall be deemed to be held in trust solely for expenses associated with holding the office currently held by the elected city

officer. For the purpose of this section, “donation” means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, in support of the office currently held by an elected official.

ISSUE: This draft uses the term “donation” throughout new section 2.12.600 instead of “contribution.” The use of the term “donation” in the proposed new section of the BERA reflects that funds made for Officeholder Accounts are different from campaign contributions; prevents making all the legal provisions applicable to campaign fund arguably applicable to officeholder donations; and avoids confusion in how the funds for this specific purpose are treated.

RECOMMENDATION: Include the new definition of “donation” in this section and use it – and related terms such as “donor” – consistently throughout, instead of using the term “contribution” in the new section on Officeholder Accounts.

C. Only a natural person who is a resident of the City may make a donation to an Officeholder Account.

ISSUE: To prevent undue influence in election campaigns, BERA currently contains limitations on who may make contributions to such campaigns. Proposed new paragraph C. would provide a similar limitation for donations to Officeholder Accounts. Specifically, like the limitation similar in the Berkeley Elections Reform Act (BERA sec. 2.12.167.), it would limit donations to Officeholder Accounts to natural persons residing in Berkeley.

There is a need for an express provision on this subject to be included in the proposed amendments. As currently written, neither of the BERA limitations relating to campaign contributions would apply by their own terms to donations to Officeholder Accounts nor would a cross-reference work.

The limitation in the Berkeley Election Reform Act to natural person residing in Berkeley is part of the definition of “qualifying contribution” to be eligible for public financing (BERA sec. 2.12.167); and so would not apply to Officeholder Accounts. The limitation in BERA section 2.12.440 prohibits “contributions” by any “proprietorship, firm, partnership, joint venture, syndicate, business trust, company, corporation, including non-profit corporations, or labor union”; but such contributions are prohibited only to “any candidate or committee (supporting or opposing any candidate)” and so would not apply to Officeholder Accounts. Cross-references to these sections would be confusing since by their own terms the referenced sections apply only to campaign contributions, and not to donations to Officeholder Accounts.

RECOMMENDATION: The proposed language that would expressly limit the persons eligible to make donations to “natural persons who are residents of the City of Berkeley” should be adopted. This will avoid undue influence by entities and persons outside Berkeley whose donations might improperly influence officeholders.

D. Donations to an Officeholder Account must be made by a separate check or other separate written instrument. Single donations may not be divided between the Officeholder Account and any candidate committee or other entity.

E. No donor shall make, and no elected officer shall receive from a donor, a donation or donations under this section totaling more than fifty [or two-hundred and fifty] dollars (\$50.00 [or \$250.00]) per person for the calendar year. "Donor" means a natural person who is a resident of the City who makes a donation as defined in paragraph B.

ISSUE: Any regulated scheme for Officeholder Accounts should include a limit on the amount of that each individual is permitted to donate each year. The amount of the individual donations permitted each year is an issue that the Council and the FCPC need to decide, as well as the manner in which this limit is prescribed.

The California state statute on Officeholder Accounts provides explicit limits on the amount that a person is permitted to make for each officeholder per calendar year (e.g., \$3,000 for Senate and Assembly members and \$20,000 for Governor). (Gov. Code sec. 85316(b)(1)(A)-(B).)

The proposed draft amendments to the BERA, above, currently provide for a limit on donations in the range of \$50-\$250; the exact amount is an issue to be determined. Assuming the amount chosen is \$250, this amount could be explicitly placed in the ordinance, as the draft does. Alternatively, the amount might be specified by cross-reference to the maximum campaign amount permitted under BERA (e.g., by a cross-reference stating the amounts of any individual annual donation shall not exceed the amount of a campaign contribution permitted for a single election under BERA section 2.12.415).]

RECOMMENDATION: An explicit amount should be included in the new section of BERA on Officeholder Accounts. This will make the officeholder section—including the exact amount of the donation limit—clear and easy to understand. If in the future the campaign limits under BERA are increased and it makes sense also to increase the amount of the permitted annual individual donations to Officeholder Accounts to a similar (or other) amount, the permissible amount of the donations can be revised at that time.

F. For the office of Mayor, total donations to an Officeholder Account from all donors shall not exceed ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) in the aggregate per calendar year. For each member of the City Council, total donations to an Officeholder Account from all donors shall not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) in the aggregate per calendar year.

ISSUE: Any regulated scheme for Officeholder Accounts should also include a limit on the total amount of donations from all donors that can be contributed to an officeholder each year. The amount of the total "cap" is an issue that the Council and the FCPC need to decide.

RECOMMENDATION: The total aggregate donations permitted to be made to specific officeholders in Berkeley should be proportional to their offices' size, scope, and needs.

G. All donations received for, and expenditures made from, an Officeholder Account during a calendar year shall be reported at least annually on the date or dates prescribed by the FCPC and the report shall be made available to the public promptly thereafter. The FCPC shall adopt or designate a form or forms for the purpose of reporting the information about each elected officer's Officeholder Account. The forms shall be filed electronically. The information on the form or forms shall be verified by the officeholder. The information that shall be included in the Officeholder Account report shall include the following:

1. The name of the officeholder and the office held;
2. The reporting period covered by the report;
3. A description of all receipts and expenditures.
4. The full name of each donor from whom a donation or donations has been received together with their street address, occupation, and the name of their employer, if any, or the principal place of business if they are self-employed; the amount which they donated; the date on which the each donation was received during the period covered by the report; and the cumulative amount that the donor donated. Loans received shall be set forth in a separate schedule and the foregoing information shall be stated with regard to each lender, together with the date and amount of the loan, and if the loan has been repaid, the date of the payment and by whom paid;
5. The full name and street address of each person to whom an expenditure or expenditures have been made, together with the amount of each separate expenditure to each person during the period covered by the report; a description of the purpose for which the expenditure was made; and the full name and street address of the person receiving the expenditure.
6. Under the heading "receipts," the total amount of donations received, and under the heading "expenditures," the total amount of expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative amount of such totals;
7. The balance of cash and cash equivalents, including the amounts in the officeholder bank account, at the beginning and end of each period covered by the report.

ISSUE: The amended BERA provisions on Officeholder Accounts (Section 2.12.600.G.1-7, above), like those for campaign statements (see BERA sec. 2.12.200 A.-K.), would specify the information that must be disclosed. In new section 2.12.600, the provisions have been tailored to address donations, donors, donors' names and addresses, and so forth. Having these requirements specified in the ordinance will provide the legal foundation for the information requested about Officeholder Accounts on statements or forms. Also, having these requirements in the ordinance will make it possible for the City more easily to add or modify the information required on statements.

Subsection G. also provides that the FCPC shall adopt or designate a form or forms for the purpose of reporting the information about each elected officer's Officeholder Account. This would permit, but not require, the City to require officeholders to use California Form 460 or 470 to comply with the reporting requirements. This flexibility is important so that the City will be able to exercise its discretion as to what information needs to be reported about donations to, and expenditures from, Officeholder Accounts.

Finally, this section provides that the commission shall prescribe the time for filing the forms and that the forms shall be verified and filed electronically. These provisions will improve the effectiveness of the reporting on Officeholder Accounts.

RECOMMENDATION: Section G. should be adopted as proposed for the reasons stated above.

H. Expenditures from an Officeholder Account may be made only for lawful officeholder

purposes, and may not be used for any of the purposes prohibited in subsections J. and K. of this section.

ISSUE: This provision clarifies the intent of these amendments—that they authorize “true” Officeholder Accounts whose purpose is strictly limited to lawful officeholder purposes—and are not intended for any other broader purposes. This approach should help officeholders avoid the pitfalls of running afoul of campaign finance laws (as warned against in past opinions by the Berkeley City Attorney).

RECOMMENDATION: Section H. should be adopted as proposed for the reasons stated above.

I. Allowable expenses from an Officeholder Account are limited to expenses for travel, meals, and lodging incurred in connection with the following types of activities:

1. Communicating with representatives of local, regional, state and national governments on City policy positions;
2. Attending educational seminars designed to improve officials’ skill and information levels, provided that a brief report of such seminar shall be made by the Mayor and Council at a subsequent Council meeting;
3. Participating in local, regional, state and national organizations of cities whose activities affect the City’s interests;
4. Recognizing service to the City (for example, thanking a longtime employee with a retirement gift or celebration of normal value and cost);
5. Attending City events; or events sponsored by organizations or entities whose activities affect the City’s interests where the primary purpose of the event is to discuss subjects which relate to City business;
6. Implementing City approved policies; and
7. Meals where the primary purpose of the meal is to conduct City-related business (other than simply meeting constituents) as long as the amount of such meal does not exceed the daily maximum set forth in city, state, and federal standards for when meal reimbursement may be allowed.

J. Expenditures from an Officeholder Account shall not be used for any of the following types of activities:

- 1 The personal portion of any trip, such as where the official is on his/her own vacation activities;
2. Political contributions or attendance at political or charitable events;
3. Family expenses, including partner’s expenses when accompanying the official on agency-related business, as well as children or pet-related expenses;
4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), sporting events (including gym, massage, and or golf related expenses); or other recreational and cultural events;
5. Alcoholic beverages;
6. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic, citations, insurance or gasoline; and
7. Personal losses incurred while on City Business.

RECOMMENDATION: Sections I. and J. should be based on the list of Authorized Activities and Unauthorized Expenses in Sections IIA. and B. of the City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies, Resolution No. 67,992—N.S. (“Policies”). The lists identified in the Policies are thoughtful, carefully prepared lists of which expenses are permissible or impermissible for officeholders under current law. The policies were unanimously adopted

by the Berkeley City Council on May 30, 2017. For the purposes of the proposed ordinance on Officeholder Accounts, the lists in the Policies are more appropriate for adoption than the lists developed by the Oakland City Council that appear to be based largely on state laws relating to on campaign expenditures.

I. Prohibitions:

1. No funds may be contributed or transferred from an Officeholder Account to any candidate or committee, as defined in sections 2.12.085 and 2.12.095 of this chapter, including to any committee in which the officeholder is a candidate. An officeholder may not redesignate his or her Officeholder Account as a committee for a future term of the same office or redesignate his or her Officeholder Account funds to be used as campaign funds by his or her committee for a future term of the same office.

2. No funds may be used from an Officeholder Account to pay any campaign expenses.

3. An officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the Officeholder Account.

ISSUE: These prohibitions make it clear that funds from an Officeholder Account may never be used for any type of campaign purposes. This is consistent with the ordinance's intent that Officeholder Accounts be strictly limited to officeholder purposes. The provision also makes it explicit that these strictly officeholder funds cannot be redesignated as funds for a future campaign.

L. Once an officeholder's term of office ends or she or he leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the former officeholder may use his or her Officeholder Account funds only for the following purposes:

1. Paying for legitimate, outstanding officeholder expenses.

2. Repaying contributions to donors to the Officeholder Accounts.

3. Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious or similar tax-exempt, non-profit organization if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

M. The officeholder shall terminate the Officeholder Account within 90 days of the date that the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The FCPC may for good cause extend the termination date. The disposition of all funds from the closed Officeholder Account, including the identification of all persons and entities that have received funds from the account and the amounts distributed, shall be described on a form prescribed by the FCPC. The officeholder must verify and file the form electronically no later the date prescribed for the termination of the Officeholder Account or an approved extension thereof.

N. All funds from a closed Officeholder Account not properly disposed of within the 90 day period prescribed above, or an approved extension thereof, shall be deposited in the City's General Fund.

ISSUES: Several issues exist with respect to the termination of Officeholder Accounts.

Draft sections 2.12.600 L.-N., above, propose procedures for terminating Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley based, in large part, on the state regulations on terminating Officeholder Accounts and committees (see Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Cal. Code of Reg., sec. 18531.63(g)).

The proposed provisions include the main options for disposing of Officeholder Account funds listed in the regulations (i.e., paying legitimate expenses, returning funds to donors, and making donations to bona fide organizations). However, the provision in the state regulations (sec. 18531.63(g)(2)) allowing for redesignation of Officeholder Accounts as accounts for a future campaign has been omitted because the Berkeley ordinance would authorize only strict Officeholder Accounts, prohibit the use of those accounts for any campaign purposes, and prohibit the redesignation of those accounts for use by campaign committees.

The proposed provisions, though, are incomplete: they do not address what should happen to an Officeholder Account if an incumbent wins re-election? Maybe it would be appropriate, under certain circumstances, for an incumbent who is elected to a new term of office, to redesignate a previous Officeholder Account for use in the officeholder's new term of office (as envisaged in the state regulations (see sec. 18531.63(g)(3)). Alternatively, as suggested at a previous joint meeting, perhaps it might be better for incumbents to terminate their Officeholder Accounts completely by a certain time before an election; and, if successful, they could open up a new Officeholder Account after their re-election.

The issues around the termination of Officeholder Accounts should be discussed by the joint committee and decisions made about what additions or modifications to the proposed ordinance are warranted.

M. Violations of this article involving the unlawful use of Officeholder Accounts are subject to the procedures of, and the penalties in, Article 7 of this chapter.

ISSUE: Are there any other issues on enforcement besides this general provision that need to be addressed?

* * *

OTHER ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED:

Some of the other issues not yet incorporated into the draft, but which merit consideration, include:

1. Establishment of an Officeholder Committee. State law requires an officeholder to create an Officeholder Controlled Committee if the officeholder receives more than \$2,000; and it provides guidance on the procedures for establishing such a committee, the committee's name, and other requirements. (Cal. Code of Reg., sec. 18531.63(c).) The Berkeley ordinance should probably include similar provisions.

2. Return of Excess Contributions/Donations. State law requires that an excess contribution to an officeholder be returned. (Gov. Code sec.85316(b)(3).) The regulations prescribe that the officeholder return the contribution within 14 days. (Cal. Code of Reg., sec. 18531.63(f).) The Berkeley ordinance should probably include similar provisions.

3. Conforming Amendments to BERA. A BERA section on the disposition of excess

campaign funds will probably need to be amended to be consistent with the new section 2.12.600 on Officeholder Accounts (see BERA sec. 2.12.245.C.). There may be other sections to BERA that require similar conforming changes.

RESOLUTION NO. 67,992-N.S.

CITY COUNCIL EXPENDITURE AND REIMBURSEMENT POLICIES

WHEREAS, each fiscal year, the City Council appropriates funds in the Mayor and Councilmember's departmental budgets to cover the costs of Mayor and Council staff and non-personnel expenditures which are reasonable and necessary for the performance of the duties of Mayor and Councilmember; and

WHEREAS, the Council needs to ensure that the expenditures are incurred and paid in conformity with the requirements of the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, AB 1234, adopted in 2005 and codified as Government Code Sections 53232, et. seq., requires that all cities adopt an expense reimbursement policy for Mayor and Council expenses; and

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. to establish the expenditure and reimbursement policy required by state law; and

WHEREAS, on September 10, 2103, the City Council rescinded Resolution No. 63,412-N.S. and replaced it with Resolution No. 66,295-N.S., which revised the expenditure and reimbursement policy required by state law.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant Policy enumerated in Exhibit A is incorporated by reference into the policy for City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution No. 66,295-N.S. and any amendments thereto are hereby rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the policy concerning City Expenditures and Expense Reimbursement for Mayor and Council departments is hereby adopted to read as follows:

CITY EXPENDITURES AND EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT FOR MAYOR AND COUNCIL DEPARTMENTS

I. City Expenditures for Mayor and Council

The Mayor and Council members shall purchase all office supplies, office equipment, furniture, computers, or any other product, good, or service for the actual and necessary expense of their office in the manner normally applicable to all other purchases of goods and services by the City. Such expenses may include membership in organizations of elected officials and the purchase of newspapers and periodicals that provide information needed for the performance of official duties.

II. Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expense of Office

The Mayor and Council members and their staff may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses for the categories of activities set forth below under "Authorized Activities."

A. Authorized Activities.

Travel, meals and lodging incurred in connection with the following types of activities set forth below constitute authorized expenses, as long as the other requirements of this Resolution are fulfilled:

1. Communicating with representatives of local, regional, state and national government on City policy positions;
2. Attending educational seminars designed to improve officials' skill and information levels, provided that a brief report of such seminar shall be made by the Mayor and Council at a subsequent Council meeting;
3. Participating in local, regional, state and national organizations of cities whose activities affect the City's interests;
4. Recognizing service to the City (for example, thanking a longtime employee with a retirement gift or celebration of nominal value and cost);
5. Attending City events; or events sponsored by organizations or entities whose activities affect the City's interests where the primary purpose of the event is to discuss subjects which relate to City business;
6. Implementing City approved policies;
7. Meals where the primary purpose of the meal is to conduct City-related business (other than simply meeting constituents) as long as the amount of such meal does not exceed the daily maximum as set forth in this Resolution and meets applicable federal and state standards as to when meal reimbursement may be allowed; and
8. Expenditures for these purposes approved in advance by a Mayor or Council member and undertaken by that person's staff.

Expenditures for all other activities require prior approval by the City Council and must meet an articulated municipal purpose that must be recited in the report proposing the expenditure and the resolution authorizing the expenditure. Most frequently, prior approval by the City Council is given in items to authorize relinquishment of Council office budget fund to general fund and grant of such funds for charitable events, which would be unauthorized expenses if not pre-approved by Council. The policy for relinquishments and grants from Councilmember office budgets is enumerated in Exhibit A.

B. Unauthorized Expenses

The following personal expenditures incurred by City officials shall not be reimbursed:

1. The personal portion of any trip, such as where the official is on his/her own vacation activities;
2. Political contributions or attendance at political or charitable events;
3. Family expenses, including partner's expenses when accompanying official on agency-related business, as well as children or pet-related expenses;

4. Entertainment expenses, including theater, movies (either in-room or at the theater), sporting events (including gym, massage and/or golf related expenses), or other recreational and cultural events;
5. Alcoholic beverages;
6. Non-mileage personal automobile expenses, including repairs, traffic citations, insurance or gasoline; and
7. Personal losses incurred while on City business.

Any questions regarding the propriety of a particular type of expense should be resolved by the City Council before the expense is incurred.

C. Particular Types of Authorized Expenditures Defined

To conserve City resources and keep expenses within community standards for public officials, expenditures should adhere to the following guidelines. In the event that expenses are incurred which exceed these guidelines, the cost borne or reimbursed by the City will be limited to the costs that fall within the guidelines.

1. **Registration.** Registration fee charged for any authorized convention, conference, seminar or meeting is reimbursable.
2. **Transportation.** The most economical mode and class of transportation reasonably consistent with scheduling needs and cargo space requirements must be used, using the most direct and time-efficient route. Charges for rental-vehicles may be reimbursed under this provision if more than one City official is attending an out of town conference, and it is determined that sharing a rental vehicle is more economical than other forms of transportation. In making such determination, the cost of the rental vehicle, parking and gasoline will be compared to the combined cost of such other forms of transportation. Government and group rates must be used when available.
3. **Airfare.** Airfares that are equal to or less than those available through the California Department of General Services (DGS) Statewide Travel Program offered through the League of California Cities, www.dgs.ca.gov/travel¹, are presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. If DGS rates are not available, reimbursement for airfare must not exceed 110% of either the state DGS rates or the Federal rates published by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) rates, www.gsa.gov², whichever is greater. Any exceptions to these rates must be approved at a public Council meeting before the expense is incurred.

¹ California Department of General Services Statewide Travel Program (DGS): www.dgs.ca.gov/travel

² U.S. General Services Administration (GSA): www.gsa.gov

4. **Automobile.** Automobile mileage is reimbursed at Internal Revenue Service rates presently in effect. These rates are designed to compensate the driver for gasoline, insurance, maintenance, and other expenses associated with operating the vehicle. This amount does not include bridge and road tolls, which are also reimbursable. The Internal Revenue Service rates will not be paid for rental vehicles; only receipted fuel expenses will be reimbursed.
5. **Car Rental.** Rental rates that are equal or less than those published by the California Department of General Services (DGS) Statewide Travel Program available through the League of California Cities shall be considered the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. If DGS rates are not available, reimbursement for car rental must not exceed 110% of either the state DGS rates or the Federal GSA rates, whichever is greater. Any exceptions to these rates must be approved at a public Council meeting before the expense is incurred.
6. **Taxis/Ride Shares/Shuttles.** Taxis, ride shares, or shuttles fares may be reimbursed, including a 15 percent gratuity per fare, when the cost of such fares is equal or less than the cost of car rentals, gasoline and parking combined, or when such transportation is necessary for time-efficiency.
7. ~~7.~~ **Lodging.** Lodging expenses will be reimbursed or paid for when travel on official City business reasonably requires an overnight stay. If such lodging is in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rate published by the conference or activity sponsor, provided that lodging at the group rate is available to the Council member at the time of booking. If lodging at the group rate is not available, or if travel is not in connection with a conference, rates that are equal to or less than those available through the California Department of General Services (DGS) Statewide Travel Program offered through the League of California Cities, are presumed to be the most economical and reasonable for purposes of reimbursement under this policy. If DGS rates are not available, reimbursement for lodging must not exceed 120% of the state DGS rates or 100% of the Federal rates published by the GSA, whichever is greater. Any exceptions to these rates must be approved at a public Council meeting before the expense is incurred. **Meals.** Meal expenses and associated gratuities will be reimbursed at the rate set forth in Administrative Regulation 3.9. "Meals which are served at regular meetings of associations to which the city belongs (i.e. Alameda County Mayors' Conference, league of California Cities, or ABAG) shall be exempt from this policy.
8. **Telephone/Fax/Cellular.** Council members will be reimbursed for actual telephone and fax expenses incurred on City business. Telephone bills should identify which calls were made on City business. For calls made on an official's personal cell phone, the official may obtain reimbursement for business calls based on the following formula: minutes used on public business divided by the total minutes allowed under a monthly plan, plus

long-distances charges for those calls.

9. **Airport Parking.** Short-term airport parking may not be used for travel exceeding 24-hours.
10. **Other Travel Related Expenses.** Reasonable baggage fees given the duration of the travel will be reimbursed. Expenses for which City officials receive reimbursement from another agency are not reimbursable.
11. **Miscellaneous Office Products.** Notwithstanding the requirement in Section I, occasionally an elected officer or officer's staff may need to make an immediate small out of pocket purchase of office supplies that are normally ordered by the City for which payment is paid directly to the vendor. In accordance with the applicable City Manager Administrative Regulation concerning petty cash refunds, the City may reimburse such purchases.

D. Cash Advance Policy for Airfare and Hotel Only (per A.R. 3.9)

From time to time, it may be necessary for an official to request a cash advance to cover anticipated expenses while traveling or doing business on the City's behalf. Such request for an advance should be submitted to the City Auditor, and copied to the City Manager, ten (10) working days prior to the need for the advance with the following information:

1. The purpose of the expenditure(s);
2. Whether the expenditure is for an authorized activity;
3. The benefit to the residents of the City;
4. The anticipated amount of the expenditure(s) (for example, hotel rates, meal costs, and transportation expenses); and
5. The dates of the expenditure(s).

Any unused advance must be returned to the City within five (5) working days of the official's return, along with an expense report and receipts documenting how the advance was used in compliance with this expense policy.

E. Expense Report Content and Submission Deadline

1. A statement of expense must be completed, signed and submitted to the City Auditor for review and forwarded to the Finance Department for payment. The statement of expense must document that the expense in question met the requirements of this Resolution. For example, if the meeting is with a legislator, the local agency official should explain whose meals were purchased, what issues were discussed and how those relate to the City's adopted legislative positions and priorities.
2. Officials must submit their statement of expense reports to the Auditor's Office within 60 days of an expense being incurred, accompanied by receipts documenting each expense. Itemized restaurant receipts, including number of individuals served, in addition to any credit card receipts, are also part of the necessary documentation. Receipts for gratuities and tolls under \$5 are not required.
3. Inability to provide such documentation in a timely fashion may result in the expense being borne by the official.

ITEM 14
ATTACHMENT 2

EXHIBIT A

F. Audits of Expense Reports

All expenses are subject to verification by the City Auditor of compliance with this policy.

G. Reports

At the following City Council meeting, each official shall briefly report on meetings attended at City expense. If multiple officials attended, a joint report may be made.

H. Compliance with Laws

City officials should keep in mind that some expenditures may be subject to reporting under the Political Reform Act and other laws. All agency expenditures are public records subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act.

I. Violation of This Policy

Use of public resources or falsifying expense reports in violation of this policy may result in any or all of the following:


1. loss of reimbursement privileges;
2. a demand for restitution to the City;
3. the City's reporting the expenses as income to the elected official to state and federal tax authorities;
4. civil penalties of up to \$1,000 per day and three times the value of the resources used; and
5. prosecution for misuse of public resources.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on May 30, 2017 by the following vote:

Ayes: Bartlett, Davila, Droste, Hahn, Harrison, Maio, Wengraf, Worthington and Arreguin.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.


Jesse Arreguin, Mayor

Attest: 
Mark Numalville, City Clerk

Exhibit A

Councilmember Office Budget Relinquishment and Grant PolicyIntroduction – Limitations on the Expenditure of Public Funds

The basic purpose of the City as an entity is to exist and function as a *municipality*. This is also reflected in the Charter, which limits the Council's powers only to those "municipal affairs adequate to a complete system of local government". (Section 38.)

Exercises of this power may not be used solely to further the interests of particular individuals, although they may incidentally benefit private interests:

The exercise of the police power is available only for the purpose of promoting the general welfare, the interests of the public as distinguished from those of individuals or persons. It cannot be used to promote private gain or advantage, except so far as the same may also promote the public interest and welfare, and it is the latter, and not the former, effect which forms the basis of the power and warrants its exercise.

(*Binford v. Boyd* (1918) 178 Cal. 458, 461.)

The Council's basic powers circumscribe its ability to spend public funds. In other words, the Council cannot spend public funds for purposes that are beyond its authority in the first place. Thus the City may only use its funds for municipal purposes. In any given case the crucial inquiry is whether an expenditure serves such a purpose:

The determination of what constitutes a public purpose is primarily a matter for the legislature, and its discretion will not be disturbed by the courts so long as that determination has a reasonable basis.

(*County of Alameda v. Carlson* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 730, 745-746.)

If the courts find that there is a valid public purpose, they next examine whether the government's actions are reasonably related to effectuating this purpose. (*Tip Top Foods, Inc. v. Lyng* (1972) 28 Cal.App.3d 533, 541.) Public appropriations granted to private interests will not be considered unlawful diversions of public funds when the transaction serves the public interest, merely granting an incidental benefit to the private individual. (*Cane v. City and County of San Francisco* (1978) 78 Cal.App.3d 654, 660.)

Criteria for Grants of City Funds from Councilmember Office Budgets

Relinquishments and grants for purposes and recipients that fall within the categories listed in Table 1 may be "pre-approved" each fiscal year by Council resolution.

Table 1.

Recipient	Purpose
The City (<i>e.g.</i> , the Berkeley Public Library, the Berkeley Animal Shelter)	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
BUSD and other public agencies operating in Berkeley	Any purpose already being undertaken, because it already serves a public purpose, assuming the activity is in Berkeley. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.
Entities with which the City is co-sponsoring a public event in Berkeley (<i>e.g.</i> , Earth Day, Solano Stroll).	City co-sponsorship suggests but is not conclusive of public purpose; public purpose would need to be stated, and all such events should be open to the public at no cost. Alternatively, a list of ongoing events that have been determined to serve a public purpose could be developed.
Entities in Berkeley to which the City already contributes funds for municipal purposes (<i>e.g.</i> , affordable housing or social service nonprofits)	To advance the same public purposes for which the entities are funded. This includes both grants and attendance at fundraising events in capacity as the Mayor or a Councilmember.

Proposed relinquishments and grants that do not meet the criteria for pre-approval, but that meet an appropriate municipal purpose, may be approved by resolution with a majority vote of the City Council.



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

PUBLIC HEARING

February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Submitted by: Dean Metzger, Chairperson, Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).

SUMMARY

Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also a goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) were adopted by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) at its regular meeting of November 21, 2019.

Action: M/S/C (Smith/Saver) to adopt the proposed amendments to BERA related to Officeholder Accounts.

Vote: Ayes: Metzger, Ching, Saver, Blome, McLean, Tsang, Smith; Noes: none; Abstain: none; Absent: O'Donnell (excused).

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

BACKGROUND

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission has supported creating the circumstances in which the incumbent and challengers during an election play on as level a playing field as possible and reducing the influence of private campaign contributions. For instance, the Berkeley Fair Elections Act of 2016, which was passed by voters and recommended to Council by the Commission, included the following express purposes:

- Eliminate the danger of actual corruption of Berkeley officials caused by the private financing of campaigns.
- Help reduce the influence of private campaign contributions on Berkeley government.
- Reduce the impact of wealth as a determinant of whether a person becomes a candidate.

(Section 2.12.490(B)-(D).)

A recent inquiry to the Commission Secretary regarding the regulation of Officeholder Accounts resulted in a request from a Commissioner to have discussion of these accounts placed on the May 16, 2019 agenda for possible action. The following motion was made and passed at that meeting:

Motion to request staff work with Commissioner Smith to bring to a future meeting background information and a proposal to eliminate officeholder accounts (M/S/C: O'Donnell/Blome; Ayes: Blome, Ching, McLean, Metzger, O'Donnell, Saver, Smith, Tsui; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Harper (excused)).

Definition of an Officeholder Account

Under state law, an "officeholder account" refers to the funds held in a single bank account at a financial institution in the State of California separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder and that are used for "paying expenses associated with holding public office." Officeholder Account funds cannot be used to pay "campaign expenses." This definition is drawn from state law applicable to statewide elected officials: Government Code section 85316 (Attachment 2), and the accompanying regulation by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) codified at Title 2, Division 6, of the California Code of Regulations, Section 18531.62 (Attachment 3).

Contributions to or expenditures from an Officeholder Account are not subject to BERA's reporting requirements. (The FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to Officeholder Accounts, which is available to view on Berkeley's Public Access Portal.) If, however, a complaint is filed that an Officeholder Account is used for

campaign contributions or to pay “campaign expenses,” BERA can be used to respond to the complaint. The legal arguments for these statements are contained in a memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert, dated December 28, 1999 and a December 9, 1991 memorandum by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, that is attached to the December 28, 1999 memo. (Attachment 4.) Because the BERA provisions relied on in these memoranda have not been amended, and because no other BERA provisions have been added to regulate officeholder accounts, the memoranda’s conclusions remain valid and are still controlling guidance.

Contributions to Officeholder Accounts

Funds raised for Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley are not subject to any limitations, either from the FPPC or BERA. Neither is there a limit on the total amount the Officeholder Account fund may receive in contributions per year. Contributions to an elected official’s Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.

Expenditures from Officeholder Accounts

Except for the restriction that Officeholder Account funds cannot be used for “campaign expenses,” BERA does not restrict how funds from Officeholder Accounts can be used.

There are a number of permissible expenditures from Officeholder Accounts that could put an elected official in a favorable light with voters that are not available to a challenger for that office. A donation to a nonprofit organization, although technically not a “campaign expense,” would be seen favorably by those receiving the funds as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds. An individual running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to make contributions to nonprofit organizations.

As long as political campaigns are not included, newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information, or an officeholder’s position on matters before the Council are a permissible Officeholder Account expenditure. This keeps the incumbent’s name in front of the voter in a way unavailable to a challenger unless they pay for a newsletter and its distribution from their own resources.

Expenditures from Officeholder Account funds for flowers and other expressions of condolences, congratulations, or appreciation, while technically not “campaign expenses,” also increase the probability that the recipient will be favorably predisposed toward the elected official as a candidate for reelection or election to another office. Again, a challenger would have to draw on their own resources to express condolences, congratulations, or appreciation to their potential supporters.

Further, officeholder accounts can be used to pay for a broad range of office expenses, such as meals, travel, parking tickets, or contributions to other candidates or political parties.¹ Eliminating officeholder accounts would reduce reliance on and the influence of private contributions for these expenditures.

Recommendation

To make elections more equitable between challengers and incumbent and for the reasons given above, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission recommends prohibiting Officeholder Accounts.

Berkeley will not be the first to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The San Jose Municipal Code was amended to prohibit officeholder accounts in January 2008. (Chapter 12.06 – ELECTIONS, San Jose, CA Code of Ordinances, p. 10)

Part 8 - OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

12.06.810 - Officeholder account prohibited.

No city officeholder, or any person or committee on behalf of a city officeholder may establish an officeholder account or an account established under the Political Reform Act, California Government Code Section 8100 et seq. as amended, for the solicitation or expenditure of officeholder funds. Nothing in this section shall prohibit an officeholder from spending personal funds on official or related business activities.

The following additions to BERA are proposed:

2.12.157 Officeholder Account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.

¹ Under state law applicable to state elected officials, officeholders may use campaign contributions for “expenses that are associated with holding office.” (Govt. Code, § 89510.) To qualify, expenditures must be “reasonably related to a legislative or governmental purpose.” (*Id.*, § 89512.) “Expenditures which confer a substantial personal benefit shall be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.” (*Ibid.*)

- C. Anyone holding an active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account, in accordance with FPPC guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identified environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposed change to BERA will help to level the playing field between challengers and the incumbent running for elective office.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

A Subcommittee was formed to consider the options of (1) amending the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, (2) amending BERA to mitigate possible advantages incumbents with an Officeholder Accounts have over challengers, or (3) doing nothing with regard to Officeholder Accounts. The four members of the Subcommittee recommended unanimously to the full Commission to amend the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Dean Metzger, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices Commission. 981-6998

Attachments:

- 1: Proposed Ordinance
- 2: Government Code section 85316
- 3: Section 18531.62 (Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts), Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations
- 4: Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert (including attached memorandum signed by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, to the FCPC)

ORDINANCE NO. ##,###-N.S.

OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNT PROHIBITED; AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE
CHAPTER 2.12

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.157 Officeholder account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.441 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.
- C. This provision does not affect a candidate’s ability to establish a legal defense fund or the requirements for such a fund, as set forth in the Political Reform Act or by regulation.
- D. Any active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation


[Home](#)
[Bill Information](#)
[California Law](#)
[Publications](#)
[Other Resources](#)
[My Subscriptions](#)
[My Favorites](#)

 Code:

 Section:


[Up^](#)
[<< Previous](#)
[Next >>](#)
[cross-reference chaptered bills](#)
[PDF](#)
[Add To My Favorites](#)

 Search Phrase:

GOVERNMENT CODE - GOV

TITLE 9. POLITICAL REFORM [81000 - 91014] (Title 9 added June 4, 1974, by initiative Proposition 9.)

CHAPTER 5. Limitations on Contributions [85100 - 85802] (Chapter 5 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)

ARTICLE 3. Contribution Limitations [85300 - 85321]

(Article 3 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)

85316. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a contribution for an election may be accepted by a candidate for elective state office after the date of the election only to the extent that the contribution does not exceed net debts outstanding from the election, and the contribution does not otherwise exceed the applicable contribution limit for that election.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an elected state officer may accept contributions after the date of the election for the purpose of paying expenses associated with holding the office provided that the contributions are not expended for any contribution to any state or local committee. Contributions received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deposited into a bank account established solely for the purposes specified in this subdivision.

(1) No person shall make, and no elected state officer shall receive from a person, a contribution pursuant to this subdivision totaling more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Three thousand dollars (\$3,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in the case of the Governor.

(2) No elected state officer shall receive contributions pursuant to paragraph (1) that, in the aggregate, total more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) in the case of the Governor.

(3) Any contribution received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be a contribution to that candidate for election to any state office that he or she may seek during the term of office to which he or she is currently elected, including, but not limited to, reelection to the office he or she currently holds, and shall be subject to any applicable contribution limit provided in this title. If a contribution received pursuant to this subdivision exceeds the allowable contribution limit for the office sought, the candidate shall return the amount exceeding the limit to the contributor on a basis to be determined by the Commission. None of the expenditures made by elected state officers pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to the voluntary expenditure limitations in Section 85400.

(4) The commission shall adjust the calendar year contribution limitations and aggregate contribution limitations set forth in this subdivision in January of every odd-numbered year to reflect any increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index. Those adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest one hundred dollars (\$100).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 149. Effective January 1, 2008. Note: This section was added by Stats. 2000, Ch. 102, and approved in Prop. 34 on Nov. 7, 2000.)

(Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations.)

§ 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts.

(a) Application and Definitions. For purposes of Section 85316(b) and this regulation, the following definitions apply:

- (1) "Officeholder" means an elected state officer.
- (2) "Officeholder controlled committee" means a committee formed pursuant to subdivision (c) of this regulation.
- (3) "Officeholder account" means the bank account established at a financial institution located in the State of California pursuant to Section 85316(b).
- (4) "Officeholder funds" means money in the officeholder account.

(b) Establishing the Officeholder Account: For purposes of Section 85316(b), an officeholder shall maintain officeholder funds in a single bank account separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder.

(c) Establishing the Officeholder Controlled Committee, Reporting and Recordkeeping:

(1) Formation: The officeholder shall establish a controlled committee by filing a statement of organization pursuant to Section 84101 if the officeholder receives \$2,000 or more in officeholder contributions in a calendar year.

(2) Committee Name: The controlled committee name shall include the officeholder's last name, the office held, the year the officeholder was elected to the current term of office, and the words "Officeholder Account." The statement of organization shall include the name, account number, and address of the financial institution where the committee established the officeholder account.

(3) Filing Requirements: The controlled committee shall file campaign statements and reports pursuant to Chapters 4 and 5, except Sections 85200 and 85201, of Title 9 of the Government Code at the same times and in the same places as it otherwise would be required to do for any other controlled committee formed by the officeholder for election to state office.

(4) Required Recordkeeping and Audits. The officeholder and treasurer shall be subject to recordkeeping requirements under Section 84104. The officeholder account and officeholder controlled committee shall be subject to audits under Chapter 10 of Title 9 of the Government Code. Any audit of the officeholder, or any of his or her controlled committees, under Section 90001 shall include all officeholder accounts and officeholder controlled committees maintained by the officeholder during the audit period as described in Regulation 18996(a)(1).

(d) Prohibitions:

(1) Officeholder funds may not be contributed or transferred to another state or local committee, including any other controlled committee of the officeholder, except as permitted in subdivisions (g) (2) and (g)(3).

(2) Officeholders may not use officeholder funds to pay "campaign expenses" as defined in Regulation 18525(a).

(3) The officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account, except as permitted in subdivision (g)(2) and (g)(3).

(e) Contributions to the Officeholder Account:

(1)(A) Required Notices: In addition to the requirements of Regulation 18523.1, a written solicitation for contributions to the officeholder account shall include the following: "For purposes of the Political Reform Act's contribution limits, a contribution to an officeholder

account is also considered to be a contribution to all campaign committees for future elective state office the officeholder seeks during his or her current term of office.

(B) In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A) above, an officeholder who files a statement of intention to be a candidate for any elective state office during the officeholder's term of office shall provide notice of this filing to every person that has made a contribution to his or her officeholder account. The notice shall contain the language in subparagraph (A) and be transmitted or mailed within 10 days of filing the statement of intention to be a candidate.

(2) Cumulation: A contribution to the officeholder account shall also be deemed a contribution to the officeholder's controlled committee for election to elective state office for the purposes of Section 85316(b)(3) only under all of the following circumstances:

(A) The contributor makes the contribution between the day the election was held for the term of office for which the officeholder account was established and the end of that term of office;

(B) The officeholder maintains the controlled committee, established for a future term of elective state office, at any time during the period covered in subparagraph (A).

(3) Cumulation and Primary and General Elections: A person's contributions to the officeholder account, when combined with contributions from the same person for a primary and general election to the elective state office may not exceed the contribution limits applicable to the primary and general election.

(4) Multiple Officeholder Accounts: When an officeholder maintains more than one officeholder account in the same calendar year, he or she may not receive the following contributions to any of those accounts during that calendar year:

(A) Contributions from a single contributor that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount the contributor could give to the officeholder account having the highest per person contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(1).

(B) Contributions from all contributors that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount in total contributions the officeholder could receive in the officeholder account having the highest aggregate contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(2).

(f) Contributions Over the Limits:

(1) An officeholder shall return to the contributor the portion of any contribution to his or her officeholder account that exceeds the limits of Section 85301, 85302 (after cumulation) or 85316 (either alone or after cumulation) by the earlier of 14 days of receipt or 14 days of the date the officeholder files a statement of intention to be a candidate for elective state office pursuant to Section 85200.

(2) A contributor to the officeholder account does not violate the contribution limits applying to the officeholder's election to a future elective state office as otherwise provided under Section 85316(b)(3) if, when he or she makes the contribution, the officeholder has not filed a statement of organization to establish a controlled committee for election to a future elective state office.

(g) Terminating Officeholder Accounts and Committees.

(1) The officeholder may not accept contributions after the officeholder's term of office ends or the date he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier.

(2) The officeholder may redesignate the officeholder account as an officeholder controlled committee for a future term of the same office by amending the statement of

organization for the committee to reflect the redesignation for the future term of office prior to the date the officer's term of office ends.

(3) An officeholder may redesignate officeholder funds in the redesignated officeholder account as officeholder funds for the new term of office, subject to the limitations in subdivision (e)(4).

(4) Once the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the officeholder may only use his or her officeholder funds for the following purposes:

- (A) Paying outstanding officeholder expenses.
- (B) Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder account.
- (C) Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

(D) Paying for professional services reasonably required by the officeholder controlled committee to assist in the performance of its administrative functions.

(5) The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder controlled committee within 90 days of the date the officer's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Executive Director may for good cause extend the termination date or permit the candidate to reopen the account.

Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 84104, 85316 and 90000-90007, Government Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 7-3-2007; operative 8-2-2007. Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2007, No. 27). For prior history, see Register 2007, No. 26.
2. Change without regulatory effect amending section filed 3-22-2016; operative 4-21-2016 pursuant to 2 CCR 18312(e). Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2016, No. 13).



Office of the
City Attorney

DATE: December 28, 1999

TO: BARBARA GILBERT,
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

FROM: MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

SUBJECT: APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Reynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.¹ For similar reasons, the BERA does not

¹ However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.

Barbara Gilbert

Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts

December 28, 1999

Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.² Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinion Index: ILE 1. and IILG.

CCM

PAUSERS\BEL2\offhldr.mem.doc

² Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the prohibition of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, February 4, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City’s website at www.CityofBerkeley.info as of **January 30, 2020**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.

Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley City Council are public record and will become part of the City’s electronic records, which are accessible through the City’s website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the City Clerk. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk at 981-6900 or clerk@cityofberkeley.info for further information.

Published: January 24, 2020 – The Berkeley Voice
Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City’s website, on January 30, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Numainville, City Clerk



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Date: September 17, 2020

To: Fair Campaign Practices Commission and Open Government Commission

From: Commissioner Patrick O'Donnell

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) to Regulate Officeholder Accounts and Proposed Changes to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.)

---

This memorandum to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) and the Open Government Commission (OGC) substitutes for the one previously posted, mailed to members of the FCPC, and appearing as Item 7 on the agenda of the FCPC. The key difference is that this memorandum addresses not only officeholder accounts, but also proposed changes to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (so-called D-13 Accounts). These two proposals are closely linked and should be considered together. Because the proposal relating to officeholder accounts falls under the jurisdiction of the FCPC and that relating to D-13 accounts falls under the jurisdiction of the OGC, the FCPC and OGC should act jointly in considering the proposed changes to BERA and the Reimbursement Policies.

The memorandum also makes the following recommendation:

Form a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

The preceding recommendations are consistent with previous discussions and the annual workplans of the FCPC and the OGC.

To implement the recommendations in this memorandum, a revised report to the Council is attached.

At this stage, the Council has referred both the issues relating to officeholder accounts and those relating to D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee had an initial discussion of these topics. It agreed that the Council Committee would work collaboratively with the FCPC and OGC on matters relating to officeholder accounts and D-13 accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

Consistent with the prior actions of the Council and the FCPC/OGC, I propose that the Commissions recommend the establishment of a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts, and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

PUBLIC HEARING  
XXXXX XX, XXXX

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Submitted by: Samuel Harvey, Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) and Change to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.)

RECOMMENDATION

Form a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Officeholder accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA. However, under existing law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and may trigger various local and state legal requirements.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from Councilmember’s discretionary council budgets (D-13 accounts) are allowed by the authority of City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.).

Action:

Vote:

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the “double green light” process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Changes to the City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) can be made by a majority vote of the Council.

## BACKGROUND

### *Officeholder Accounts*

During 2019, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) discussed whether there is a need to amend the law relating to these accounts. These accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA, but under current law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and trigger various local and state legal requirements. A 1999 legal opinion from the City Attorney stated: “[t]he mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable laws.”

In the course of its review of the issue of officeholder accounts, the FPPC considered three options: (1) leaving the law on officeholder accounts unchanged; (2) prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely (an approach used by the City of San Jose), or (3) authorizing officeholder accounts but limiting their use and imposing various restrictions and requirements on them (an approach used by the City of Oakland).

The Commission referred the issue of officeholder accounts to a subcommittee, which met several times in the fall of 2019 and considered the options. The subcommittee unanimously recommended prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019 the Commission voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the BERA that would prohibit officeholder accounts.

The Commission’s proposal was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (Report to the Council, with Attachments, is attached.) The FCPC report summarized its proposal: “Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also the goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.” (Report, page 1.)

At the February 4, 2020 meeting, the Council had a lengthy discussion about their D-13 accounts and the lack of discretionary funds that members have to spend. They also decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit officeholder accounts. The City Council referred the issues relating to officeholder and D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

***Proposed Changes to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies***

At the April 23, 2020 meeting of the Open Government Committee (OGC), a motion to direct staff to develop a proposal recommending Council change City policy to remove councilmember names from donations to nonprofit organizations from D-13 accounts was approved unanimously.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from the Councilmember's discretionary council budget (D-13 accounts) puts that elected official in a favorable light with Berkeley citizens at no cost to the Councilmember, an option not available to a challenger for that office. A look at the Consent Calendar of City Council Meeting Agendas will often contain one or more items from one or more Councilmembers making a donation to a nonprofit organization "from the discretionary council budget" of the Councilmember. This line item ("Services and Materials") from the General Fund was increased from \$50,938 in FY 2017 to \$113,526 in FY 2018 (approximately \$40,000 for the Mayor, the balance evenly divided among the Councilmembers; see Attachment 1 – Council Office Budget Summaries). While not technically a "campaign contribution," those individuals in the organization as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds would certainly see it favorably. A person running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to match a Councilmember's contribution from public funds and without the public notice of the contribution the Councilmember receives.

In addition to favoring incumbents, the use of public moneys for contributions to nonprofit organizations from the discretionary council budgets of individual Council members is arguably improper and certainly bad optics. The commissioners of the OGC have no argument with contributions being made to nonprofit organizations from the City of Berkeley, but believe they should be made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley, not from individual Council members. Perhaps a nonprofit fund could be set up from which the donations could be made from recommendations made to one of the Council's Policy Commissions. This would free funds for other purposes now being directed to nonprofit organizations from individual Councilmember's D-13 accounts.

**Proposed Action:**

At this stage, the Council has referred both the issues relating to officeholder accounts and those relating to D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee agreed to work collaboratively with the FCPC and OGC on matters relating to officeholder



accounts and D-13 accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

Consistent with the prior actions of the Council and the FCPC/OGC, the Commissions recommend the establishment of a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to:

(1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts, and

(2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The “double green light” process requires that the FCPC adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote, and that the City Council hold a public hearing and also adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote. Evidence to date suggests there are differences of perspective regarding this matter between the City Council and the FCPC regarding the D-13 accounts. It would seem to be a rational step to discuss and come to agreement and possibly compromise prior to the “double green light” process.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None.

#### CITY MANAGER

#### CONTACT PERSON

Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions,  
(510) 981-6998

Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open  
Government Commissions, (510) 981-6998



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

Date: September 17, 2020

To: Fair Campaign Practices Commission

From: Commissioner Patrick O'Donnell

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to regulate officeholder accounts

---

In 2019, the FCPC approved an amendment to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (“BERA”) prohibiting officeholder accounts. That proposal was submitted to Council. However, some councilmembers have expressed opposition to an outright ban on officeholder accounts and a preference for developing regulations for those accounts. This report contains a new alternative proposal to regulate – rather than prohibit – officeholder accounts. At its July 16, 2020 meeting, the Commission voted to direct Commissioner O’Donnell to return at the Commission’s September 17, 2020 meeting with a version of the proposal drafted as an amendment to BERA that can be voted on and presented to Council.

## Background

During 2019, the Commission discussed whether there is a need to amend the law relating to the use of officeholder accounts. These accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA. But under current law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and may trigger various local and state legal requirements. A 1999 legal opinion from the City Attorney stated: “[t]he mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable laws.” (Report, page 14.)

In the course of its review of the issue of officeholder accounts, the Commission considered three options: (1) leaving the law on officeholder accounts unchanged; (2) prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely (an approach used by the City of San Jose), or

(3) authorizing officeholder accounts but limiting their use and imposing various restrictions and requirements on them (an approach used by the City of Oakland).

The Commission referred the issue of officeholder accounts to a subcommittee, which met in the fall of 2019 and considered the options. The subcommittee unanimously recommended prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019 the Commission voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the BERA that would prohibit officeholder accounts.

The Commission's proposal was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (Report to the Council, with Attachments, is attached.) The FCPC report summarized its proposal: "Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also the goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016." (Report, page 1.) At the February 4 meeting, the Council had a lengthy discussion about their D13 accounts and the lack of discretionary funds that members have to spend. They also decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit officeholder Accounts. (See Memorandum to FCPC dated February 12, 2020, a copy of which is attached.)

The City Council, however, referred both the issues relating to D13 accounts and those relating to officeholder accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee had an initial discussion of these topics. At that meeting, it was agreed that the Council Committee would work collaboratively with the FCPC on matters relating to D13 accounts and officeholder accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

### **Alternative Proposal for Legislation on Officeholder Accounts**

Given the Council's opposition to accepting an outright prohibition of officeholder accounts, the FCPC should at least explore some alternatives, including the option of amending the BERA to allow for officeholder accounts that would be subject to limitations, as the City of Oakland has done. The subcommittee which examined officeholder accounts briefly discussed this option but, given that there was unanimous support for prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely, it never developed a detailed proposal for this kind of alternative. However, now that the FCPC/OGC will be in conversation with the council about the options going forward, it seems to make good sense to examine in more detail what the alternative might look like.

For discussion purposes, a draft proposal to amend the BERA is attached (Attachment 1). It is based generally on the Oakland ordinance but differs in important ways from that statute. The basic concept behind this alternative is to allow officeholders to have *true* officeholder accounts, but to insure that the funds in these accounts are

used *strictly* for officeholder purposes and may not be used for political campaigns or other non-officeholder purposes. The proposal would also include limitations on the amount each donor may contribute and the total amount of donations to each officeholder account permitted annually. The amendments would require disclosures of the sources and amounts of all donations and expenditures. And they would specify how officeholder accounts are to be terminated.

Although not as fully effective as the complete prohibition of officeholder accounts previously recommended by the FCPC, this approach would allow officeholders to create regulated accounts for proper officeholder purposes. At the same time, these true officeholder accounts would be subject to public scrutiny and express limitations that would prevent serious abuses. Finally, the strict prohibitions in the proposed legislation against using any funds from officeholder accounts for campaign purposes would greatly simplify the management and oversight of these accounts. Current state law, which permits certain officeholder funds to be redesignated for campaign purposes under certain circumstances and subject to various disclosure and notice requirements, creates a nightmare of administrative and reporting requirements. It has made it difficult for officeholders to comply with the law and has established traps for the unwary. Thus, it is hardly surprising that most candidates elected to public office do not even attempt to set up officeholder accounts.

In the end, it may well be that the alternative presented here—or any other—may be unable to carry the day. Because of the double-green light requirements of BERA, no proposal may be able to garner the 2/3 votes of both the Council and Commission required to change the law. But for the purposes of collaborating with the Council on ways of improving the officeholder account process, the Commission should review the attached proposal which offers at least one possible scenario for addressing the problems and pitfalls involved with officeholder accounts.

Prior to approving this item, the Commission will need to make a determination regarding the dollar amounts for limits on donations to officeholder accounts. These amounts are highlighted in the attached Proposal in Section 2.12.600.E & F.

**Attachments:**

1. New draft proposed amendments to BERA to allow for officeholder accounts, to limit such accounts to being used strictly for officeholder purposes, and to subject these accounts to various other limitations and disclosure requirements (“Proposal”)
2. Report to the City Council from the Fair Campaign Practices Commission entitled “Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts: Amending BMC Chapter 2.12” (for Public Hearing on February 4, 2020) (with Attachments) (“Report”)
3. Memorandum from Dean Metzger, Chair, to FCPC dated February 12, 2020 (with Attachments) (“Memorandum”)



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

PUBLIC HEARING  
XXXXX XX, XXXX

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Brad Smith, Chair, Open Government Commission  
Submitted by: Samuel Harvey, Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to regulate officeholder accounts.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

These recommended amendments to the Berkeley Lobbyist Registration Act were approved by the Open Government Commission at its regular meeting of XXXXX XX, XXXX.

**Action:**

**Vote:**

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the “double green light” process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

BACKGROUND

In 2019, the FCPC approved an amendment to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (“BERA”) prohibiting officeholder accounts. That proposal was submitted to Council. However, some councilmembers have expressed opposition to an outright ban on officeholder accounts and a preference for developing regulations for those accounts. This report contains a new alternative proposal to regulate – rather than prohibit – officeholder accounts.

During 2019, the Commission discussed whether there is a need to amend the law relating to the use of officeholder accounts. These accounts are not expressly regulated

by BERA. But under current law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and may trigger various local and state legal requirements. A 1999 legal opinion from the City Attorney stated: “[t]he mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable laws.” (Report, page 14.)

In the course of its review of the issue of officeholder accounts, the Commission considered three options: (1) leaving the law on officeholder accounts unchanged; (2) prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely (an approach used by the City of San Jose), or (3) authorizing officeholder accounts but limiting their use and imposing various restrictions and requirements on them (an approach used by the City of Oakland).

The Commission referred the issue of officeholder accounts to a subcommittee, which met in the fall of 2019 and considered the options. The subcommittee unanimously recommended prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019 the Commission voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the BERA that would prohibit officeholder accounts.

The Commission’s proposal was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (Report to the Council, with Attachments, is attached.) The FCPC report summarized its proposal: “Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also the goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.” (Report, page 1.) At the February 4 meeting, the Council had a lengthy discussion about their D13 accounts and the lack of discretionary funds that members have to spend. They also decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit officeholder Accounts. (See Memorandum to FCPC dated February 12, 2020, a copy of which is attached.)

The City Council, however, referred both the issues relating to D13 accounts and those relating to officeholder accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee had an initial discussion of these topics. At that meeting, it was agreed that the Council Committee would work collaboratively with the FCPC on matters relating to D13 accounts and officeholder accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

### **Alternative Proposal for Legislation on Officeholder Accounts**

At its September 17, 2020 meeting, the FCPC passed the attached proposal to amend the BERA (Attachment 1). It is based generally on the Oakland ordinance but differs in important ways from that statute. The basic concept behind this alternative is to allow officeholders to have *true* officeholder accounts, but to insure that the funds in these accounts are used *strictly* for officeholder purposes and may not be used for political

campaigns or other non-officeholder purposes. The proposal also includes limitations on the amount each donor may contribute and the total amount of donations to each officeholder account permitted annually. The amendments would require disclosures of the sources and amounts of all donations and expenditures, and specify how officeholder accounts are to be terminated.

This approach would allow officeholders to create regulated accounts for proper officeholder purposes. At the same time, these true officeholder accounts would be subject to public scrutiny and express limitations that would prevent serious abuses. Finally, the strict prohibitions in the proposed legislation against using any funds from officeholder accounts for campaign purposes would greatly simplify the management and oversight of these accounts. Current state law, which permits certain officeholder funds to be redesignated for campaign purposes under certain circumstances and subject to various disclosure and notice requirements, creates a nightmare of administrative and reporting requirements. It has made it difficult for officeholders to comply with the law and has established traps for the unwary. Thus, it is hardly surprising that most candidates elected to public office do not even attempt to set up officeholder accounts.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposal is offered as an alternative to the proposed ban on officeholder accounts previously submitted to Council by the FCPC. This proposal would regulate – rather than prohibit – officeholder accounts.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None.

#### CITY MANAGER

#### CONTACT PERSON

Brad Smith, Chair, Open Government Commission, (510) 981-6998

Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary, Open Government Commission (510) 981-6998

#### Attachments:

1. Proposed ordinance amending BERA to allow and regulate officeholder accounts
2. Report to the City Council from the Fair Campaign Practices Commission entitled “Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts: Amending BMC Chapter 2.12” (for Public Hearing on February 4, 2020) (with Attachments) (“Report”)
3. Memorandum from Dean Metzger, Chair, to FCPC dated February 12, 2020 (with Attachments) (“Memorandum”)

ORDINANCE NO. -N.S.

AMENDING THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO REGULATE  
OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That the Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

**Section 2.12.157 Officeholder account.**

“Officeholder account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Article 9 of Chapter 2.12 of the Berkeley Municipal Code is added to read as follows

**Article 9. Officeholder Accounts****Section. 2.12.600 Regulation of officeholder accounts.**

A. The mayor and council members (the “officeholder” or “office holders”) shall each be permitted to establish one officeholder account, as defined in section 2.12.157.

B. All donations deposited into an officeholder account shall be deemed to be held in trust solely for expenses associated with holding the office currently held by the elected city officer. For the purpose of this section, “donation” means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, in support of the office currently held by an elected official.

C. Only a natural person who is a resident of the City may make a donation to an officeholder account.

D. Donations to an officeholder account must be made by a separate check or other separate written instrument. Single donations may not be divided between the officeholder account and any candidate committee or other entity.

E. No donor shall make, and no elected officer shall receive from a donor, a donation or donations under this section totaling more than fifty [or two-hundred and fifty] dollars (\$50.00 [or \$250.00]) per person for the calendar year. “Donor” means a natural person who is a resident of the City who makes a donation as defined in paragraph B.

F. For the office of mayor, total donations to an officeholder account from all donors shall not exceed ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) in the aggregate per calendar year. For each member of the city council, total donations to an officeholder account from all donors shall not exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) in the aggregate per calendar year.



G. All donations received for, and expenditures made from, an officeholder account during a calendar year shall be reported at least annually on the date or dates prescribed by the commission and the report shall be made available to the public promptly thereafter. The commission shall adopt or designate a form or forms for the purpose of reporting the information about each elected officer's officeholder account. The forms shall be filed electronically. The information on the form or forms shall be verified by the officeholder. The information that shall be included in the officeholder account report shall include the following:

1. The name of the officeholder and the office held;
2. The reporting period covered by the report;
3. A description of all receipts and expenditures.
4. The full name of each donor from whom a donation or donations has been received together with his or her street address, occupation, and the name of his or her employer, if any, or the principal place of business if he or she is self-employed; the amount which he or she donated; the date on which the each donation was received during the period covered by the report; and the cumulative amount that the donor donated. Loans received shall be set forth in a separate schedule and the foregoing information shall be stated with regard to each lender, together with the date and amount of the loan, and if the loan has been repaid, the date of the payment and by whom paid;
5. The full name and street address of each person to whom an expenditure or expenditures have been made, together with the amount of each separate expenditure to each person during the period covered by the report; a description of the purpose for which the expenditure was made; and the full name and street address of the person receiving the expenditure.
6. Under the heading "receipts," the total amount of donations received, and under the heading "expenditures," the total amount of expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative amount of such totals;
7. The balance of cash and cash equivalents, including the amounts in the officeholder bank account, at the beginning and end of each period covered by the report.

H. Expenditures from an officeholder account may be made only for-lawful officeholder purposes, and may not be used for any of the purposes prohibited in subsections J. and K. of this section.

I. Allowable expenditures from an officeholder account include the following:

1. Expenditures for fundraising (including solicitations by mail) for the officeholder account;
2. Expenditures for office equipment, furnishings and office supplies;

3. Expenditures for office rent;

4. Expenditures for salaries of part-time or full-time staff employed by the officeholder for officeholder activities;

5. Expenditures for consulting, research, polling, photographic or similar services except for campaign expenditures for any city, county, regional, state or federal elective office;

6. Expenditures for conferences, meetings, receptions, and events attended in the performance of government duties by (1) the officeholder (2) a member of the officeholder's staff; or (3) such other person designated by the officeholder who is authorized to perform such government duties;

7. Expenditures for travel, including lodging, meals and other related disbursements, incurred in the performance of governmental duties by (1) the officeholder, (2) a member of the officeholder's staff, (3) or such other person designated by the officeholder who is authorized to perform such government duties;

8. Expenditures for memberships to civic, service or professional organizations, if such membership bears a reasonable relationship to a governmental, legislative or political purpose;

9. Expenditures for an educational course or educational seminar if the course or seminar maintains or improves skills which are employed by the officeholder or a member of the officeholder's staff in the performance of his or her governmental responsibilities;

10. Expenditures for mailing to persons within the city which provide information related to city-sponsored events, an official's governmental duties or an official's position on a particular matter pending before the Council or Mayor;

11. Expenditures for expressions of congratulations, appreciation or condolences sent to constituents, employees, governmental officials, or other persons with whom the officeholder communicates in his or her official capacity;

12. Expenditures for payment of tax liabilities incurred as a result of authorized officeholder expense fund transactions; and

13. Expenditures for accounting, professional and administrative services provided to the officeholder account.

J. Officeholder expense funds shall not be used for the following:

1. Expenditures in connection with a future election for any city, county, regional, state or federal elective office or in connection with a ballot measure;

2. Expenditures for campaign consulting, research, polling, photographic or similar services for election to city, county, regional, state or federal elective office;

3. Membership in any athletic, social, fraternal, veteran or religious organization;

4. Supplemental compensation for employees for performance of an act which would be required or expected of the person in the regular course or hours of his or her duties as a city official or employee;

5. Any expenditure that would violate the provisions the California State Political Reform Act, including Government Code Sections 89506 and 89512 through 89519, and any provisions of the BERA.

K. Prohibitions:

1. No funds may be contributed or transferred from an officeholder account to any candidate or committee, as defined in sections 2.12.085 and 2.12.095 of this chapter, including to any committee in which the officeholder is a candidate. An officeholder may not redesignate his or her officeholder account as a committee for a future term of the same office or redesignate his or her officeholder funds to be used as campaign funds by his or her committee for a future term of the same office.

2. No funds may be used from an officeholder account to pay any campaign expenses.

3. An officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account.

L. Once an officeholder's term of office ends or she or he leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the former officeholder may use his or her officeholder funds only for the following purposes:

1. Paying for legitimate, outstanding officeholder expenses.

2. Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder accounts.

3. Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious or similar tax-exempt, non-profit organization if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

M. The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder account within 90 days of the date that the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Commission may for good cause extend the termination date. The disposition of all funds from the closed officeholder account, including the identification of all persons and entities that have received funds from the account and the amounts distributed, shall be described on a form prescribed by the Commission. The officeholder must verify and file the form electronically no later the date prescribed for the termination of the officeholder account or an approved extension thereof.

N. All funds from a closed officeholder account not properly disposed of within the 90 day period prescribed above, or an approved extension thereof, shall be deposited in the City's general fund.

O. Violations of this article involving the unlawful use of officeholder accounts are subject to the procedures of, and the penalties in, Article 7 of this chapter.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT**

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the regulation of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, [date of hearing] at [6:00 p.m.] in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City’s website at [www.CityofBerkeley.info](http://www.CityofBerkeley.info) as of **[date of agenda posting]**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.

Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley City Council are public record and will become part of the City’s electronic records, which are accessible through the City’s website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the City Clerk. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk at 981-6900 or [clerk@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:clerk@cityofberkeley.info) for further information.


**Published:** [Publication Date in Newspaper]

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.051

~~~~~

I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City’s website, on [Enter Date].

Mark Numainville, City Clerk



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

PUBLIC HEARING
February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
 From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
 Submitted by: Dean Metzger, Chairperson, Fair Campaign Practices Commission
 Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit
 Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).

SUMMARY

Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also a goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) were adopted by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) at its regular meeting of November 21, 2019.

Action: M/S/C (Smith/Saver) to adopt the proposed amendments to BERA related to Officeholder Accounts.

Vote: Ayes: Metzger, Ching, Saver, Blome, McLean, Tsang, Smith; Noes: none; Abstain: none; Absent: O'Donnell (excused).

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act
to prohibit Officeholder AccountsPUBLIC HEARING
February 4, 2020BACKGROUND

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission has supported creating the circumstances in which the incumbent and challengers during an election play on as level a playing field as possible and reducing the influence of private campaign contributions. For instance, the Berkeley Fair Elections Act of 2016, which was passed by voters and recommended to Council by the Commission, included the following express purposes:

- Eliminate the danger of actual corruption of Berkeley officials caused by the private financing of campaigns.
- Help reduce the influence of private campaign contributions on Berkeley government.
- Reduce the impact of wealth as a determinant of whether a person becomes a candidate.

(Section 2.12.490(B)-(D).)

A recent inquiry to the Commission Secretary regarding the regulation of Officeholder Accounts resulted in a request from a Commissioner to have discussion of these accounts placed on the May 16, 2019 agenda for possible action. The following motion was made and passed at that meeting:

Motion to request staff work with Commissioner Smith to bring to a future meeting background information and a proposal to eliminate officeholder accounts (M/S/C: O'Donnell/Blome; Ayes: Blome, Ching, McLean, Metzger, O'Donnell, Saver, Smith, Tsui; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Harper (excused)).

Definition of an Officeholder Account

Under state law, an "officeholder account" refers to the funds held in a single bank account at a financial institution in the State of California separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder and that are used for "paying expenses associated with holding public office." Officeholder Account funds cannot be used to pay "campaign expenses." This definition is drawn from state law applicable to statewide elected officials: Government Code section 85316 (Attachment 2), and the accompanying regulation by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) codified at Title 2, Division 6, of the California Code of Regulations, Section 18531.62 (Attachment 3).

Contributions to or expenditures from an Officeholder Account are not subject to BERA's reporting requirements. (The FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to Officeholder Accounts, which is available to view on Berkeley's Public Access Portal.) If, however, a complaint is filed that an Officeholder Account is used for

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act
to prohibit Officeholder AccountsPUBLIC HEARING
February 4, 2020

campaign contributions or to pay "campaign expenses," BERA can be used to respond to the complaint. The legal arguments for these statements are contained in a memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert, dated December 28, 1999 and a December 9, 1991 memorandum by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, that is attached to the December 28, 1999 memo. (Attachment 4.) Because the BERA provisions relied on in these memoranda have not been amended, and because no other BERA provisions have been added to regulate officeholder accounts, the memoranda's conclusions remain valid and are still controlling guidance.

Contributions to Officeholder Accounts

Funds raised for Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley are not subject to any limitations, either from the FPPC or BERA. Neither is there a limit on the total amount the Officeholder Account fund may receive in contributions per year. Contributions to an elected official's Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.

Expenditures from Officeholder Accounts

Except for the restriction that Officeholder Account funds cannot be used for "campaign expenses," BERA does not restrict how funds from Officeholder Accounts can be used.

There are a number of permissible expenditures from Officeholder Accounts that could put an elected official in a favorable light with voters that are not available to a challenger for that office. A donation to a nonprofit organization, although technically not a "campaign expense," would be seen favorably by those receiving the funds as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds. An individual running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to make contributions to nonprofit organizations.

As long as political campaigns are not included, newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information, or an officeholder's position on matters before the Council are a permissible Officeholder Account expenditure. This keeps the incumbent's name in front of the voter in a way unavailable to a challenger unless they pay for a newsletter and its distribution from their own resources.

Expenditures from Officeholder Account funds for flowers and other expressions of condolences, congratulations, or appreciation, while technically not "campaign expenses," also increase the probability that the recipient will be favorably predisposed toward the elected official as a candidate for reelection or election to another office. Again, a challenger would have to draw on their own resources to express condolences, congratulations, or appreciation to their potential supporters.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING
February 4, 2020

Further, officeholder accounts can be used to pay for a broad range of office expenses, such as meals, travel, parking tickets, or contributions to other candidates or political parties.¹ Eliminating officeholder accounts would reduce reliance on and the influence of private contributions for these expenditures.

Recommendation

To make elections more equitable between challengers and incumbent and for the reasons given above, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission recommends prohibiting Officeholder Accounts.

Berkeley will not be the first to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The San Jose Municipal Code was amended to prohibit officeholder accounts in January 2008. (Chapter 12.06 – ELECTIONS, San Jose, CA Code of Ordinances, p. 10)

Part 8 - OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

12.06.810 - Officeholder account prohibited.

No city officeholder, or any person or committee on behalf of a city officeholder may establish an officeholder account or an account established under the Political Reform Act, California Government Code Section 8100 et seq. as amended, for the solicitation or expenditure of officeholder funds. Nothing in this section shall prohibit an officeholder from spending personal funds on official or related business activities.

The following additions to BERA are proposed:

2.12.157 Officeholder Account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.

¹Under state law applicable to state elected officials, officeholders may use campaign contributions for “expenses that are associated with holding office.” (Govt. Code, § 89510.) To qualify, expenditures must be “reasonably related to a legislative or governmental purpose.” (*Id.*, § 89512.) “Expenditures which confer a substantial personal benefit shall be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.” (*Ibid.*)

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING
January 21, 2020

- C. Anyone holding an active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account, in accordance with FPPC guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identified environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposed change to BERA will help to level the playing field between challengers and the incumbent running for elective office.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

A Subcommittee was formed to consider the options of (1) amending the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, (2) amending BERA to mitigate possible advantages incumbents with an Officeholder Accounts have over challengers, or (3) doing nothing with regard to Officeholder Accounts. The four members of the Subcommittee recommended unanimously to the full Commission to amend the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Dean Metzger, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices Commission. 981-6998

Attachments:

- 1: Proposed Ordinance
- 2: Government Code section 85316
- 3: Section 18531.62 (Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts), Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations
- 4: Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert (including attached memorandum signed by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, to the FCPC)

ORDINANCE NO. ##,###-N.S.

OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNT PROHIBITED; AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE
CHAPTER 2.12

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.157 Officeholder account

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.441 is added to read as follows:

BMC 2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.
- C. This provision does not affect a candidate’s ability to establish a legal defense fund or the requirements for such a fund, as set forth in the Political Reform Act or by regulation.
- D. Any active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation

10/8/2019

Page 7 of 16



California

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

Home

Bill Information

California Law

Publications

Other Resources

My Subscriptions

My Favorites

Code: Section: 
[Up^](#) [<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)
[cross-reference chaptered bills](#)
[PDF](#) | [Add To My Favorites](#)
Search Phrase: **GOVERNMENT CODE - GOV****TITLE 9. POLITICAL REFORM [81000 - 91014]** (Title 9 added June 4, 1974, by initiative Proposition 9.)**CHAPTER 5. Limitations on Contributions [85100 - 85802]** (Chapter 5 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)**ARTICLE 3. Contribution Limitations [85300 - 85321]** (Article 3 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73.)

85316. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a contribution for an election may be accepted by a candidate for elective state office after the date of the election only to the extent that the contribution does not exceed net debts outstanding from the election, and the contribution does not otherwise exceed the applicable contribution limit for that election.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an elected state officer may accept contributions after the date of the election for the purpose of paying expenses associated with holding the office provided that the contributions are not expended for any contribution to any state or local committee. Contributions received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deposited into a bank account established solely for the purposes specified in this subdivision.

(1) No person shall make, and no elected state officer shall receive from a person, a contribution pursuant to this subdivision totaling more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Three thousand dollars (\$3,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in the case of the Governor.

(2) No elected state officer shall receive contributions pursuant to paragraph (1) that, in the aggregate, total more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) in the case of the Governor.

(3) Any contribution received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be a contribution to that candidate for election to any state office that he or she may seek during the term of office to which he or she is currently elected, including, but not limited to, reelection to the office he or she currently holds, and shall be subject to any applicable contribution limit provided in this title. If a contribution received pursuant to this subdivision exceeds the allowable contribution limit for the office sought, the candidate shall return the amount exceeding the limit to the contributor on a basis to be determined by the Commission. None of the expenditures made by elected state officers pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to the voluntary expenditure limitations in Section 85400.

(4) The commission shall adjust the calendar year contribution limitations and aggregate contribution limitations set forth in this subdivision in January of every odd-numbered year to reflect any increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index. Those adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest one hundred dollars (\$100).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 149. Effective January 1, 2008. Note: This section was added by Stats. 2000, Ch. 102, and approved in Prop. 34 on Nov. 7, 2000.)

(Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations.)

§ 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts.

(a) Application and Definitions. For purposes of Section 85316(b) and this regulation, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Officeholder" means an elected state officer.

(2) "Officeholder controlled committee" means a committee formed pursuant to subdivision (c) of this regulation.

(3) "Officeholder account" means the bank account established at a financial institution located in the State of California pursuant to Section 85316(b).

(4) "Officeholder funds" means money in the officeholder account.

(b) Establishing the Officeholder Account: For purposes of Section 85316(b), an officeholder shall maintain officeholder funds in a single bank account separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder.

(c) Establishing the Officeholder Controlled Committee, Reporting and Recordkeeping:

(1) Formation: The officeholder shall establish a controlled committee by filing a statement of organization pursuant to Section 84101 if the officeholder receives \$2,000 or more in officeholder contributions in a calendar year.

(2) Committee Name: The controlled committee name shall include the officeholder's last name, the office held, the year the officeholder was elected to the current term of office, and the words "Officeholder Account." The statement of organization shall include the name, account number, and address of the financial institution where the committee established the officeholder account.

(3) Filing Requirements: The controlled committee shall file campaign statements and reports pursuant to Chapters 4 and 5, except Sections 85200 and 85201, of Title 9 of the Government Code at the same times and in the same places as it otherwise would be required to do for any other controlled committee formed by the officeholder for election to state office.

(4) Required Recordkeeping and Audits. The officeholder and treasurer shall be subject to recordkeeping requirements under Section 84104. The officeholder account and officeholder controlled committee shall be subject to audits under Chapter 10 of Title 9 of the Government Code. Any audit of the officeholder, or any of his or her controlled committees, under Section 90001 shall include all officeholder accounts and officeholder controlled committees maintained by the officeholder during the audit period as described in Regulation 18996(a)(1).

(d) Prohibitions:

(1) Officeholder funds may not be contributed or transferred to another state or local committee, including any other controlled committee of the officeholder, except as permitted in subdivisions (g) (2) and (g)(3).

(2) Officeholders may not use officeholder funds to pay "campaign expenses" as defined in Regulation 18525(a).

(3) The officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account, except as permitted in subdivision (g)(2) and (g)(3).

(e) Contributions to the Officeholder Account:

(1)(A) Required Notices: In addition to the requirements of Regulation 18523.1, a written solicitation for contributions to the officeholder account shall include the following: "For purposes of the Political Reform Act's contribution limits, a contribution to an officeholder

account is also considered to be a contribution to all campaign committees for future elective state office the officeholder seeks during his or her current term of office.”

(B) In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A) above, an officeholder who files a statement of intention to be a candidate for any elective state office during the officeholder's term of office shall provide notice of this filing to every person that has made a contribution to his or her officeholder account. The notice shall contain the language in subparagraph (A) and be transmitted or mailed within 10 days of filing the statement of intention to be a candidate.

(2) Cumulation: A contribution to the officeholder account shall also be deemed a contribution to the officeholder's controlled committee for election to elective state office for the purposes of Section 85316(b)(3) only under all of the following circumstances:

(A) The contributor makes the contribution between the day the election was held for the term of office for which the officeholder account was established and the end of that term of office;

(B) The officeholder maintains the controlled committee, established for a future term of elective state office, at any time during the period covered in subparagraph (A).

(3) Cumulation and Primary and General Elections: A person's contributions to the officeholder account, when combined with contributions from the same person for a primary and general election to the elective state office may not exceed the contribution limits applicable to the primary and general election.

(4) Multiple Officeholder Accounts: When an officeholder maintains more than one officeholder account in the same calendar year, he or she may not receive the following contributions to any of those accounts during that calendar year:

(A) Contributions from a single contributor that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount the contributor could give to the officeholder account having the highest per person contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(1).

(B) Contributions from all contributors that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount in total contributions the officeholder could receive in the officeholder account having the highest aggregate contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(2).

(f) Contributions Over the Limits:

(1) An officeholder shall return to the contributor the portion of any contribution to his or her officeholder account that exceeds the limits of Section 85301, 85302 (after cumulation) or 85316 (either alone or after cumulation) by the earlier of 14 days of receipt or 14 days of the date the officeholder files a statement of intention to be a candidate for elective state office pursuant to Section 85200.

(2) A contributor to the officeholder account does not violate the contribution limits applying to the officeholder's election to a future elective state office as otherwise provided under Section 85316(b)(3) if, when he or she makes the contribution, the officeholder has not filed a statement of organization to establish a controlled committee for election to a future elective state office.

(g) Terminating Officeholder Accounts and Committees:

(1) The officeholder may not accept contributions after the officeholder's term of office ends or the date he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier.

(2) The officeholder may redesignate the officeholder account as an officeholder controlled committee for a future term of the same office by amending the statement of

organization for the committee to reflect the redesignation for the future term of office prior to the date the officer's term of office ends.

(3) An officeholder may redesignate officeholder funds in the redesignated officeholder account as officeholder funds for the new term of office, subject to the limitations in subdivision

(e)(4).

(4) Once the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the officeholder may only use his or her officeholder funds for the following purposes:

(A) Paying outstanding officeholder expenses.

(B) Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder account.

(C) Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

(D) Paying for professional services reasonably required by the officeholder controlled committee to assist in the performance of its administrative functions.

(5) The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder controlled committee within 90 days of the date the officer's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Executive Director may for good cause extend the termination date or permit the candidate to reopen the account.

Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 84104, 85316 and 90000-90007, Government Code.

HISTORY

1. New section filed 7-3-2007; operative 8-2-2007. Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2007, No. 27). For prior history, see Register 2007, No. 26.
2. Change without regulatory effect amending section filed 3-22-2016; operative 4-21-2016 pursuant to 2 CCR 18312(e). Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2016, No. 13).



Office of the
City Attorney

DATE: December 28, 1999

TO: BARBARA GILBERT,
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

FROM: MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

SUBJECT: APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Reynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.¹ For similar reasons, the BERA does not

¹ However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.

Barbara Gilbert
Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts
December 28, 1999
Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.² Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinions Index: H.E.I. and H.L.G.

CCM

PAUSERS\BBL2\ofthldr.mam.doc

² Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

CITY OF BERKELEY

DATE: December 9, 1991

Memorandum

TO: FCPC COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Sarah Reynoso,  Secretary & Staff CounselSUBJECT: APPLICABILITY OF BERA'S CONTRIBUTION LIMIT TO FUNDS RAISED FOR OFFICEHOLDER EXPENSESBACKGROUND AND ISSUE

I received the attached letter from Richard N. Lerner, treasurer of Friends of Ioni Hancock Committee ("Committee"), regarding the applicability of BERA's (Berkeley Election Reform Act) \$250 contribution limit to funds raised to cover officeholder expenses. The Committee would like to raise money to cover activities by the Mayor for which the City has not allocated funds, for example, distribution of a newsletter and international travel to visit Berkeley Sister Cities.

Thus, the issue presented to the Commission is as follows: Is BERA's \$250 contribution limit applicable to funds raised for officeholder expenses?

CONCLUSION

No. The BERA's contribution limitation is only applicable to money raised "in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election" of a candidate. Since the Committee intends to raise these funds for activities unrelated to the nomination or election of the Mayor, they are not subject to the BERA's \$250 contribution limitation. However, such funds must be reported as contributions under the State Political Reform Act and their expenditure itemized on the disclosure forms.

ANALYSIS

The BERA prohibits candidates for elective office from soliciting or accepting a contribution of more than \$250 from any one contributor. (BERA section 2.12.415.) Thus, funds which fall within BERA's definition of a contribution, are subject to the \$250 limit. In order to determine whether funds raised for officeholder expenses are subject to the contribution limitation, BERA's definition of contribution must be reviewed.

The BERA defines contribution, in part, as follows:

"Contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly in aid of or

FCPC COMMISSIONERS
December 9, 1991
Page 2

in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the plain language of the BERA requires that a contribution be solicited for purposes related to the nomination or election of a candidate for office to be subject to its contribution limitation. Since the Committee intends to raise funds for purposes unrelated to the Mayor's nomination or election for elective office, such funds do not fall within the BERA's definition and are therefore not subject to its \$250 limitation.

However, because the state Political Reform Act defines contribution to include any funds raised for political purposes, funds raised for officeholder expenses are considered contributions and must be reported on campaign disclosure forms.^{1/} (Government Code section 82015.) Additionally, since the court's ruling in SEIU v. FPPC invalidated the state's \$1,000 contribution limit, funds raised for officeholder expenses are not subject to any limitation.

As a final precaution, the Committee should be advised that the FPPC has issued regulations concerning officeholder expenses and it should review them with respect to their interaction with the BERA.

Attachment

^{1/}I spoke with the FPPC's legal staff and confirmed that funds raised for officeholder expenses must be reported as contributions on the campaign disclosure forms.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the prohibition of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, February 4, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City's website at www.CityofBerkeley.info as of **January 30, 2020**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.


Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley City Council are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the City Clerk. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk at 981-6900 or clerk@cityofberkeley.info for further information.

Published: January 24, 2020 – The Berkeley Voice
Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on January 30, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Numainville, City Clerk



[First Last name]  
Councilmember District [District No.]

## SUPPLEMENTAL REVISED AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

**Meeting Date:** February 4, 2020

**Item Number:** 2


**Item Description:** Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

**Submitted by:** Councilmember Hahn

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.



**SOPHIE HAHN**

Berkeley City Council, District 5  
 2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor  
 Berkeley, CA 94704  
 (510) 981-7150  
 shahn@cityofberkeley.info

ACTION CALENDAR

February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
 From: Vice Mayor Sophie Hahn  
 Subject: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Officeholder accounts are accounts an elected official can open, and raise funds for, to pay for expenses related to the office they hold.<sup>1</sup> They are not campaign accounts, and cannot be used for campaign purposes. The types of expenses Officeholder Accounts can be used for include research, conferences, events attended in the performance of government duties, printed newsletters, office supplies, travel related to official duties, etc. Cities can place limits on Officeholder Accounts, as Oakland has done.<sup>2</sup> Officeholder Accounts must be registered as official "Committees" and adhere to strict public reporting requirements, like campaign accounts. They provide full transparency to the public about sources and uses of funds.

The FCPC bases its recommendation to prohibit Officeholder Accounts on arguments about "equity" and potential "corruption" in elections. The report refers repeatedly to "challengers" and "incumbents," suggesting that Officeholder Accounts are vehicles for unfairness in the election context.

I believe that the FCPC's recommendations reflect a misunderstanding of the purpose and uses of Officeholder Accounts, equating them with campaign accounts and suggesting that they create an imbalance between community members who apparently have already decided to run against an incumbent (so-called "challengers") and elected officials who are presumed to be

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/Regulations/Index/Chapter5/18531.62.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

always running for office. The recommendations do not take into account some important framing: the question of what funds are otherwise available to pay for Officeholder-type expenses for Officeholders or members of the public. Contrary to the conclusions of the FCPC, I believe Officeholder accounts are an important vehicle to redress a significant disadvantage for elected officials, whose ability to exercise free speech in the community and participate in conferences and events related to their profession is constrained by virtue of holding public office, as compared to community members, whose speech rights are unrestricted in any manner whatsoever, and who can raise money to use for whatever purposes they desire.

Outlawing Officeholder Accounts is also posited as a means to create equity between more and less wealthy Officeholders, on the theory that less affluent Officeholders will have less access to fundraising for Officeholder Accounts than more affluent Officeholders. Because there are no prohibition on using personal funds for many of the purposes for which Officeholder Account funds can be used, prohibiting Officeholder Accounts I believe has the opposite effect; it leaves more affluent Officeholders with the ability to pay for Officeholder expenses from personal funds, without providing an avenue for less affluent Officeholders, who may not have available personal funds, to raise money from their supporters to pay for such Officeholder expenses.

The question of whether Officeholder Accounts should be allowed in Berkeley plays out in the context of a number of rules and realities that are important to framing any analysis.

First, by State Law, elected officials are prohibited from using public funds for a variety of communications that many constituents nevertheless expect. For example, an elected official may not use public funds to send a mailing announcing municipal information to constituents, "such as a newsletter or brochure, [ ] delivered, by any means [ ] to a person's residence, place of employment or business, or post office box."<sup>3</sup> Nor may an elected official mail an item using public funds that features a reference to the elected official affiliated with their public position.<sup>4</sup> Note that Electronic newsletters are not covered by these rules, and can and do include all of these features, even if the newsletter service is paid for by the public entity. That said, while technically not required, many elected officials prefer to use email newsletter distribution services (Constant Contact, MailChimp, Nationbuilder, etc.) paid for with personal (or "Officeholder") funds, to operate in the spirit of the original rules against using public funds for communications that include a photo of, or references to, the elected official.

Without the ability to raise funds for an Officeholder Account, for an elected official to send a paper newsletter to constituents or to use an email newsletter service that is not paid for with public funds, they must use personal funds. A printed newsletter mailed to 5-6,000 households (a typical number of households in a Berkeley City Council District) can easily cost \$5,000+, and an electronic mail service subscription typically costs \$10 (for the most basic service) to \$45 per month, a cost of \$120.00 to over \$500 per year - in personal funds.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

Second, Berkeley City Councilmembers and the Mayor of Berkeley are not paid enough for there to be any reasonable expectation that personal funds should be used for these types of expenses.<sup>5</sup> For many Councilmembers and/or the Mayor, work hours are full time - or more - and there is no other source of income.

Finally, and most importantly, local elected officials are restricted from accepting money or gifts. An elected official cannot under any circumstances raise money to pay for Officeholder expenses such as printed communications, email newsletter services, travel and admission to industry conferences for which the elected official is not an official delegate (e.g., conferences on City Planning, Green Cities, Municipal Finance, etc.), and other expenses related to holding office that are not covered by public funds. Again, without the possibility of an Officeholder Account, an elected official generally must use personal funds for these expenses, allowing more affluent elected officials to participate while placing a hardship or in some cases a prohibition on the ability of less affluent elected officials to undertake these Officeholder-type activities - which support expected communications with constituents and participation in industry activities that improve the elected official's effectiveness.

The elected official's inability to raise funds from others must be contrasted with the ability of a community member - a potential "challenger" who has not yet declared themselves to be an actual candidate - or perhaps a neighborhood association, business or corporation (Chevron, for example) - to engage in similar activities. Nothing restricts any community member or organization from using their own funds - or funds obtained from anyone - a wealthy friend, a corporation, a local business, a community organization or their neighbors - for any purpose whatsoever.

Someone who doesn't like the job an elected official is doing could raise money from family or connections anywhere in the community - or the world - and mail a letter to every person in the District or City criticizing the elected official, or buy up every billboard or banner ad on Facebook or Berkeleyside to broadcast their point of view. By contrast, the elected official, without access to an Officeholder Account, could only use personal funds to "speak" with their own printed letter, billboard or advertisement. Community members (including future "challengers") can also attend any and all conferences they want, engage in travel to visit interesting cities and projects that might inform their thoughts on how a city should be run, and pay for those things with money raised from friends, colleagues, businesses, corporations, foreign governments - *anyone*. They are private citizens with full first amendment rights and have no limitations, no reporting requirements, no requirements of transparency or accountability whatsoever.

The imbalance is significant. Outside of the campaign setting, where all declared candidates can raise funds and must abide by the same rules of spending and communications, *elected officials cannot raise money for any expenses whatsoever, from any source, while community*

---

<sup>5</sup> Councilmembers receive annual compensation of approximately \$36,000, while the Mayor receives annual compensation of approximately \$55,000.<sup>5</sup>

*members, including organizations and private companies, can raise as much money as they want from any sources, and use that money for anything they choose.*

Without the ability to establish and fund an Officeholder Account, the only option an elected official has is to use personal funds, which exacerbates the potential imbalance between elected officials with more and less personal funds to spend. Elected officials work within a highly regulated system, which can limit their ability to “speak” and engage in other activities members of the public are able to undertake without restriction. Officeholder Accounts restore some flexibility by allowing elected officials to raise money for expenses related to holding office, so long as the sources and uses of those funds is made transparent.


By allowing Officeholder Accounts and regulating them, Berkeley can place limits on amounts that can be raised, and on the individuals/entities from whom funds can be accepted, similar (or identical) to the limits Berkeley places on sources of campaign funds. Similarly, Berkeley can restrict uses of funds beyond the State’s restrictions, to ensure funds are not used for things like family members’ travel, as is currently allowed by the State. Oakland has taken this approach, and has a set of Officeholder Account regulations that provide a good starting point for Berkeley to consider.<sup>6</sup>

I respectfully ask for a vote to send the question of potential allowance for, and regulation of, Officeholder Accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

CONTACT: Sophie Hahn, District 5: (510) 981-7150

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

**Date:** February 12, 2020  
**To:** FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMISSION  
**From:** Dean Metzger, Commission Chair  
**Subject:** Council discussion and action with regards to the Officeholder Accounts FCPC proposal.

---

At the Special City Council meeting of Tuesday February 4, 2020, the City Council had a lengthy discussion about their D13 accounts, and the lack of discretionary funds Council Members have to spend. They then decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

To remedy this concern the FCPC should request from the City Manager the amount each Council Member receives in their D13 accounts and after some discussion make a recommendation to Council. If the D13 account is large enough to allow Council members to make the expenditures they feel will keep their constituents informed of their activities, travel to local meetings, provide transportation expenses and meals - there would be no need for Officeholders Accounts.

A search of the City's Budget documents did not reveal the amounts allocated to the Council D13 accounts. Once the information is available the FCPC can make its recommendations to City Council.

**Attachments:**

1. Mayor and City Council Financial Summary
2. Draft request to City Manager for budget details of the Mayor and each individual Council Member

**MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL FINA**

|                        | FY 2015<br>Actual | FY 2016<br>Actual | FY 2017<br>Adopted | FY 2018<br>Proposed | FY 2019<br>Proposed |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>EXPENDITURES</b>    |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
| <b>By Type:</b>        |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
| Salaries and Benefits  | 1,660,661         | 1,760,619         | 1,723,617          | 1,833,734           | 1,880,031           |
| Services and Materials | 36,942            | 43,407            | 113,526            | 113,526             | 113,526             |
| Capital Outlay         | 1,953             | 7,674             |                    |                     |                     |
| Internal Services      | 89,100            | 81,181            | 81,181             | 81,181              | 81,181              |
| Indirect Cost Transfer |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
|                        | <u>1,788,656</u>  | <u>1,892,881</u>  | <u>1,918,324</u>   | <u>2,028,441</u>    | <u>2,074,738</u>    |
| <b>By Division:</b>    |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
| Mayor's Office         | 515,095           | 558,137           | 584,877            | 554,389             | 566,917             |
| Council Offices        | 1,273,561         | 1,334,744         | 1,333,447          | 1,474,052           | 1,507,821           |
| Exiting Officials      |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
|                        | <u>1,788,656</u>  | <u>1,892,881</u>  | <u>1,918,324</u>   | <u>2,028,441</u>    | <u>2,074,738</u>    |
| <b>By Fund:</b>        |                   |                   |                    |                     |                     |
| General Fund           | 1,788,656         | 1,892,881         | 1,918,324          | 2,028,441           | 2,074,738           |
|                        | <u>1,788,656</u>  | <u>1,892,881</u>  | <u>1,918,324</u>   | <u>2,028,441</u>    | <u>2,074,738</u>    |

|                         |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>General Fund FTE</b> | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |
| <b>Total FTE</b>        | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 |

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**Date:** February 20, 2020

**To:** Dee Williams-Riley  
City Manager

**From:** Fair Campaign Practices Commission

**Subject:** Request for budget details of the Mayor and each individual Council Member.

---

At the Special Council meeting of Tuesday, February 4, 2020 the Council heard and took action on the FCPC recommendation to amend the Berkeley Municipal Code to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The Council discussion went to great lengths about why they needed the Officeholder Account before declining to approve the FCPC recommendation.

The FCPC needs to understand why the Council took the action it did.

To help the Commission determine if any further action on its part would be helpful, the Commission requests that your office provide the FCPC with the detailed budgets of the Mayor and each Council Member. The Commission has the budget summaries of the Mayor and City Council but it is of little use for the discussion.

Please provide the requested information in time for the FCPC meeting on March 19, 2020.

Thank you,

**Fair Campaign Practices Commission**



Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Open Government Commission

ACTION CALENDAR  
January 26, 2021

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Submitted by: Samuel Harvey, Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions

Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) and Change to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.)

RECOMMENDATION

Form a joint subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to (1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Officeholder accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA. However, under existing law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and may trigger various local and state legal requirements.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from Councilmember's discretionary council budgets (D-13 accounts) are allowed by the authority of City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.).



*Action: Motion to submit report to City Council recommending creation of a subcommittee of members of the Council, FCPC and OGC to (1) prepare an ordinance prohibiting or regulating officeholder accounts and (2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies*

Vote: M/S/C: Blome/Metzger; Ayes: O'Donnell, Ching, Blome, Tsang, Smith; Noes: Metzger, Sheahan; Abstain: none; Absent: McLean.

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Changes to the City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) can be made by a majority vote of the Council.

## BACKGROUND

### ***Officeholder Accounts***

During 2019, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) discussed whether there is a need to amend the law relating to these accounts. These accounts are not expressly regulated by BERA, but under current law, if funds for officeholder accounts are used for campaign purposes, this may implicate campaign financing law and trigger various local and state legal requirements. A 1999 legal opinion from the City Attorney stated: "[t]he mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable laws."

In the course of its review of the issue of officeholder accounts, the FCPC considered three options:

- (1) leaving the law on officeholder accounts unchanged;
- (2) prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely (an approach used by the City of San Jose), or
- (3) authorizing officeholder accounts but limiting their use and imposing various restrictions and requirements on them (an approach used by the City of Oakland).

The Commission referred the issue of officeholder accounts to a subcommittee, which met several times in the fall of 2019 and considered the options. The subcommittee unanimously recommended prohibiting officeholder accounts entirely. At its regular meeting on November 21, 2019 the Commission voted without opposition to recommend amendments to the BERA that would prohibit officeholder accounts.

The Commission's proposal was presented to the City Council at a February 4, 2020 special meeting. (Report to the Council, with Attachments, is attached.) The FCPC report summarized its proposal: "Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also the goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016." (Report, page 1.)

At the February 4, 2020 meeting, the Council had a lengthy discussion about their D- 13 accounts and the lack of discretionary funds that members have to spend. They also decided not to approve the FCPC recommendation to prohibit officeholder accounts. The City Council referred the issues relating to officeholder and D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

***Proposed Changes to City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement Policies***

At the April 23, 2020 meeting of the Open Government Committee (OGC), a motion to direct staff to develop a proposal recommending Council change City policy to remove councilmember names from donations to nonprofit organizations from D- 13 accounts was approved unanimously.

Donations to nonprofit organizations from the Councilmember's discretionary council budget (D-13 accounts) puts that elected official in a favorable light with Berkeley citizens at no cost to the Councilmember, an option not available to a challenger for that office. A look at the Consent Calendar of City Council Meeting Agendas will often contain one or more items from one or more Councilmembers making a donation to a nonprofit organization "from the discretionary council budget" of the Councilmember. This line item ("Services and Materials") from the General Fund was increased from \$50,938 in FY 2017 to \$113,526 in FY 2018 (approximately \$40,000 for the Mayor, the balance evenly divided among the Councilmembers; see Attachment – Council Office Budget Summaries). While not technically a "campaign contribution," those individuals in the organization as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds would certainly see it favorably. A person running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to match a Councilmember's contribution from public funds and without the public notice of the contribution the Councilmember receives.

In addition to favoring incumbents, the use of public moneys for contributions to nonprofit organizations from the discretionary council budgets of individual Council members is arguably improper and certainly bad optics. The commissioners of the OGC have no argument with contributions being made to nonprofit organizations from the City of Berkeley, but believe they should be made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley, not from individual Council members. Perhaps a nonprofit fund could be set up from which the donations could be made from recommendations made to one of the Council's Policy Commissions. This would free funds for other purposes now being directed to nonprofit organizations from individual Councilmember's D-13 accounts.

**Proposed Action:**

At this stage, the Council has referred both the issues relating to officeholder accounts and those relating to D-13 accounts to its Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration. At a special meeting on March 9, 2020, that Committee agreed to work collaboratively with the FCPC and OGC on matters relating to officeholder accounts and D-13 accounts. This collaborative work with the Council was included in the FCPC and OGC 2020-2021 workplans, which were approved on May 21, 2020.

Consistent with the prior actions of the Council and the FCPC/OGC, the Commissions recommend the establishment of a subcommittee of members of the City Council and members of the Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions to:

(1) prepare an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BMC Chapter 2.12) to prohibit or regulate officeholder accounts, and

(2) prepare a change in City Council Expenditure and Reimbursement policies (Resolution 67,992-N.S.) to have donations to nonprofit organizations made in the name of the entire Berkeley City Council on behalf of the citizens of Berkeley rather than from individual Council members.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The “double green light” process requires that the FCPC adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote, and that the City Council hold a public hearing and also adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote. Evidence to date suggests there are differences of perspective regarding this matter between the City Council and the FCPC regarding the D-13 accounts. It would seem to be a rational step to discuss and come to agreement and possibly compromise prior to the “double green light” process.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

None.

CITY MANAGER


CONTACT PERSON

Brad Smith, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions, (510) 981-6998

Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary, Fair Campaign Practices and Open Government Commissions, (510) 981-6998

Attachments:

1. FCPC February 4, 2020 report to Council and attachments
2. Mayor and City Council Financial Summary



Fair Campaign Practices Commission

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Submitted by: Dean Metzger, Chairperson, Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Subject: Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion, adopt first reading of an ordinance amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act, Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts (See Section 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts, Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission).

SUMMARY

Contributions to and expenditures from Officeholder Accounts provide an unfair advantage to incumbents. They also increase the reliance on private campaign contributions and risk increasing the perception of corruption. Amending the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts will help to level the playing field in municipal elections, which was also a goal of the Fair Elections Act of 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

None.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The proposed amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) were adopted by the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC) at its regular meeting of November 21, 2019.

**Action:** M/S/C (Smith/Saver) to adopt the proposed amendments to BERA related to Officeholder Accounts.

**Vote:** Ayes: Metzger, Ching, Saver, Blome, McLean, Tsang, Smith; Noes: none; Abstain: none; Absent: O'Donnell (excused).

Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051, BERA may be amended by the "double green light" process. This process requires that the FCPC adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote, and the City Council hold a public hearing and adopt the amendments by a two-thirds vote.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

BACKGROUND

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission has supported creating the circumstances in which the incumbent and challengers during an election play on as level a playing field as possible and reducing the influence of private campaign contributions. For instance, the Berkeley Fair Elections Act of 2016, which was passed by voters and recommended to Council by the Commission, included the following express purposes:

- Eliminate the danger of actual corruption of Berkeley officials caused by the private financing of campaigns.
- Help reduce the influence of private campaign contributions on Berkeley government.
- Reduce the impact of wealth as a determinant of whether a person becomes a candidate.

(Section 2.12.490(B)-(D).)

A recent inquiry to the Commission Secretary regarding the regulation of Officeholder Accounts resulted in a request from a Commissioner to have discussion of these accounts placed on the May 16, 2019 agenda for possible action. The following motion was made and passed at that meeting:

Motion to request staff work with Commissioner Smith to bring to a future meeting background information and a proposal to eliminate officeholder accounts (M/S/C: O'Donnell/Blome; Ayes: Blome, Ching, McLean, Metzger, O'Donnell, Saver, Smith, Tsui; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Harper (excused)).

**Definition of an Officeholder Account**

Under state law, an "officeholder account" refers to the funds held in a single bank account at a financial institution in the State of California separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder and that are used for "paying expenses associated with holding public office." Officeholder Account funds cannot be used to pay "campaign expenses." This definition is drawn from state law applicable to statewide elected officials: Government Code section 85316 (Attachment 2), and the accompanying regulation by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) codified at Title 2, Division 6, of the California Code of Regulations, Section 18531.62 (Attachment 3).

Contributions to or expenditures from an Officeholder Account are not subject to BERA's reporting requirements. (The FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to Officeholder Accounts, which is available to view on Berkeley's Public Access Portal.) If, however, a complaint is filed that an Officeholder Account is used for

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

campaign contributions or to pay "campaign expenses," BERA can be used to respond to the complaint. The legal arguments for these statements are contained in a memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert, dated December 28, 1999 and a December 9, 1991 memorandum by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, that is attached to the December 28, 1999 memo. (Attachment 4.) Because the BERA provisions relied on in these memoranda have not been amended, and because no other BERA provisions have been added to regulate officeholder accounts, the memoranda's conclusions remain valid and are still controlling guidance.

**Contributions to Officeholder Accounts**

Funds raised for Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley are not subject to any limitations, either from the FPPC or BERA. Neither is there a limit on the total amount the Officeholder Account fund may receive in contributions per year. Contributions to an elected official's Officeholder Account may put that contributor in a more favorable light with the elected official than might otherwise be the case.

**Expenditures from Officeholder Accounts**

Except for the restriction that Officeholder Account funds cannot be used for "campaign expenses," BERA does not restrict how funds from Officeholder Accounts can be used.

There are a number of permissible expenditures from Officeholder Accounts that could put an elected official in a favorable light with voters that are not available to a challenger for that office. A donation to a nonprofit organization, although technically not a "campaign expense," would be seen favorably by those receiving the funds as well as individuals favorably disposed to the nonprofit organization receiving the funds. An individual running against this incumbent would have to draw on their own resources to make contributions to nonprofit organizations.

As long as political campaigns are not included, newsletters mailed to constituents related to events, information, or an officeholder's position on matters before the Council are a permissible Officeholder Account expenditure. This keeps the incumbent's name in front of the voter in a way unavailable to a challenger unless they pay for a newsletter and its distribution from their own resources.

Expenditures from Officeholder Account funds for flowers and other expressions of condolences, congratulations, or appreciation, while technically not "campaign expenses," also increase the probability that the recipient will be favorably predisposed toward the elected official as a candidate for reelection or election to another office. Again, a challenger would have to draw on their own resources to express condolences, congratulations, or appreciation to their potential supporters.

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
February 4, 2020

Further, officeholder accounts can be used to pay for a broad range of office expenses, such as meals, travel, parking tickets, or contributions to other candidates or political parties.<sup>1</sup> Eliminating officeholder accounts would reduce reliance on and the influence of private contributions for these expenditures.

**Recommendation**

To make elections more equitable between challengers and incumbent and for the reasons given above, the Fair Campaign Practices Commission recommends prohibiting Officeholder Accounts.

Berkeley will not be the first to prohibit Officeholder Accounts. The San Jose Municipal Code was amended to prohibit officeholder accounts in January 2008. (Chapter 12.06 – ELECTIONS, San Jose, CA Code of Ordinances, p. 10)

**Part 8 - OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS**

**12.06.810 - Officeholder account prohibited.**

No city officeholder, or any person or committee on behalf of a city officeholder may establish an officeholder account or an account established under the Political Reform Act, California Government Code Section 8100 et seq. as amended, for the solicitation or expenditure of officeholder funds. Nothing in this section shall prohibit an officeholder from spending personal funds on official or related business activities.

The following additions to BERA are proposed:

**2.12.157 Officeholder Account**

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

**2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited**

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under state law applicable to state elected officials, officeholders may use campaign contributions for “expenses that are associated with holding office.” (Govt. Code, § 89510.) To qualify, expenditures must be “reasonably related to a legislative or governmental purpose.” (*Id.*, § 89512.) “Expenditures which confer a substantial personal benefit shall be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.” (*Ibid.*)

Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act  
to prohibit Officeholder Accounts

PUBLIC HEARING  
January 21, 2020

- C. Anyone holding an active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account, in accordance with FPPC guidelines.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identified environmental effects related to the recommendation in this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

This proposed change to BERA will help to level the playing field between challengers and the incumbent running for elective office.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

A Subcommittee was formed to consider the options of (1) amending the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts, (2) amending BERA to mitigate possible advantages incumbents with an Officeholder Accounts have over challengers, or (3) doing nothing with regard to Officeholder Accounts. The four members of the Subcommittee recommended unanimously to the full Commission to amend the Berkeley Elections Reform Act, BMC Chapter 2.12, to prohibit Officeholder Accounts.

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager takes no position on the content and recommendations of this report.

CONTACT PERSON

Dean Metzger, Chair, Fair Campaign Practices Commission. 981-6998

Attachments:

- 1: Proposed Ordinance
- 2: Government Code section 85316
- 3: Section 18531.62 (Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts), Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations
- 4: Memorandum signed by City Attorney Manuela Albuquerque to Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean, Barbara Gilbert (including attached memorandum signed by Secretary and Staff Counsel to the FCPC, Sarah Reynoso, to the FCPC)



ORDINANCE NO. ##,###-N.S.

OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNT PROHIBITED; AMENDING BERKELEY MUNICIPAL CODE  
CHAPTER 2.12

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Section 1. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.157 is added to read as follows:

**BMC 2.12.157 Officeholder account**

“Officeholder Account” means any bank account maintained by an elected officer or by any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, and whose funds are used for expenses associated with holding office and not for direct campaign purposes.

Section 2. That Berkeley Municipal Code section 2.12.441 is added to read as follows:

**BMC 2.12.441 Officeholder account prohibited**

- A. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may establish an officeholder account.
- B. No elected officer, or any person or committee on behalf of an elected officer, may use contributions, as defined in 2.12.100, for expenses associated with holding office.
- C. This provision does not affect a candidate’s ability to establish a legal defense fund or the requirements for such a fund, as set forth in the Political Reform Act or by regulation.
- D. Any active Officeholder Account on the date this change to BERA is adopted on a second reading by the City Council has one year from that date to terminate their Officeholder Account.

Section 3. Copies of this Ordinance shall be posted for two days prior to adoption in the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Within 15 days of adoption, copies of this Ordinance shall be filed at each branch of the Berkeley Public Library and the title shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation



California  
LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

Home

Bill Information

California Law

Publications

Other Resources

My Subscriptions

My Favorites

Code:

Section:



[Up^](#) [<< Previous](#) [Next >>](#)

[cross-reference chaptered bills](#)

[PDF](#) | [Add To My Favorites](#)



Search Phrase:

**GOVERNMENT CODE - GOV**

**TITLE 9. POLITICAL REFORM [81000 - 91014]** ( Title 9 added June 4, 1974, by initiative Proposition 9. )

**CHAPTER 5. Limitations on Contributions [85100 - 85802]** ( Chapter 5 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73. )

**ARTICLE 3. Contribution Limitations [85300 - 85321]** ( Article 3 added June 7, 1988, by initiative Proposition 73. )

**85316.** (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a contribution for an election may be accepted by a candidate for elective state office after the date of the election only to the extent that the contribution does not exceed net debts outstanding from the election, and the contribution does not otherwise exceed the applicable contribution limit for that election.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an elected state officer may accept contributions after the date of the election for the purpose of paying expenses associated with holding the office provided that the contributions are not expended for any contribution to any state or local committee. Contributions received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deposited into a bank account established solely for the purposes specified in this subdivision.

(1) No person shall make, and no elected state officer shall receive from a person, a contribution pursuant to this subdivision totaling more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Three thousand dollars (\$3,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) in the case of the Governor.

(2) No elected state officer shall receive contributions pursuant to paragraph (1) that, in the aggregate, total more than the following amounts per calendar year:

(A) Fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in the case of an elected state officer of the Assembly or Senate.

(B) One hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in the case of a statewide elected state officer other than the Governor.

(C) Two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) in the case of the Governor.

(3) Any contribution received pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be a contribution to that candidate for election to any state office that he or she may seek during the term of office to which he or she is currently elected, including, but not limited to, reelection to the office he or she currently holds, and shall be subject to any applicable contribution limit provided in this title. If a contribution received pursuant to this subdivision exceeds the allowable contribution limit for the office sought, the candidate shall return the amount exceeding the limit to the contributor on a basis to be determined by the Commission. None of the expenditures made by elected state officers pursuant to this subdivision shall be subject to the voluntary expenditure limitations in Section 85400.

(4) The commission shall adjust the calendar year contribution limitations and aggregate contribution limitations set forth in this subdivision in January of every odd-numbered year to reflect any increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index. Those adjustments shall be rounded to the nearest one hundred dollars (\$100).

(Amended by Stats. 2007, Ch. 130, Sec. 149. Effective January 1, 2008. Note: This section was added by Stats. 2000, Ch. 102, and approved in Prop. 34 on Nov. 7, 2000.)

(Regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission, Title 2, Division 6, California Code of Regulations.)

**§ 18531.62. Elected State Officeholder Bank Accounts.**

(a) Application and Definitions. For purposes of Section 85316(b) and this regulation, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Officeholder" means an elected state officer.

(2) "Officeholder controlled committee" means a committee formed pursuant to subdivision (c) of this regulation.

(3) "Officeholder account" means the bank account established at a financial institution located in the State of California pursuant to Section 85316(b).

(4) "Officeholder funds" means money in the officeholder account.

(b) Establishing the Officeholder Account: For purposes of Section 85316(b), an officeholder shall maintain officeholder funds in a single bank account separate from any other bank account held by the officeholder.

(c) Establishing the Officeholder Controlled Committee, Reporting and Recordkeeping:

(1) Formation: The officeholder shall establish a controlled committee by filing a statement of organization pursuant to Section 84101 if the officeholder receives \$2,000 or more in officeholder contributions in a calendar year.

(2) Committee Name: The controlled committee name shall include the officeholder's last name, the office held, the year the officeholder was elected to the current term of office, and the words "Officeholder Account." The statement of organization shall include the name, account number, and address of the financial institution where the committee established the officeholder account.

(3) Filing Requirements: The controlled committee shall file campaign statements and reports pursuant to Chapters 4 and 5, except Sections 85200 and 85201, of Title 9 of the Government Code at the same times and in the same places as it otherwise would be required to do for any other controlled committee formed by the officeholder for election to state office.

(4) Required Recordkeeping and Audits. The officeholder and treasurer shall be subject to recordkeeping requirements under Section 84104. The officeholder account and officeholder controlled committee shall be subject to audits under Chapter 10 of Title 9 of the Government Code. Any audit of the officeholder, or any of his or her controlled committees, under Section 90001 shall include all officeholder accounts and officeholder controlled committees maintained by the officeholder during the audit period as described in Regulation 18996(a)(1).

(d) Prohibitions:

(1) Officeholder funds may not be contributed or transferred to another state or local committee, including any other controlled committee of the officeholder, except as permitted in subdivisions (g) (2) and (g)(3).

(2) Officeholders may not use officeholder funds to pay "campaign expenses" as defined in Regulation 18525(a).

(3) The officeholder may not transfer or contribute funds from any other committee he or she controls to the officeholder account, except as permitted in subdivision (g)(2) and (g)(3).

(e) Contributions to the Officeholder Account:

(1)(A) Required Notices: In addition to the requirements of Regulation 18523.1, a written solicitation for contributions to the officeholder account shall include the following: "For purposes of the Political Reform Act's contribution limits, a contribution to an officeholder

account is also considered to be a contribution to all campaign committees for future elective state office the officeholder seeks during his or her current term of office."

(B) In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A) above, an officeholder who files a statement of intention to be a candidate for any elective state office during the officeholder's term of office shall provide notice of this filing to every person that has made a contribution to his or her officeholder account. The notice shall contain the language in subparagraph (A) and be transmitted or mailed within 10 days of filing the statement of intention to be a candidate.

(2) Cumulation: A contribution to the officeholder account shall also be deemed a contribution to the officeholder's controlled committee for election to elective state office for the purposes of Section 85316(b)(3) only under all of the following circumstances:

(A) The contributor makes the contribution between the day the election was held for the term of office for which the officeholder account was established and the end of that term of office;

(B) The officeholder maintains the controlled committee, established for a future term of elective state office, at any time during the period covered in subparagraph (A).

(3) Cumulation and Primary and General Elections: A person's contributions to the officeholder account, when combined with contributions from the same person for a primary and general election to the elective state office may not exceed the contribution limits applicable to the primary and general election.

(4) Multiple Officeholder Accounts: When an officeholder maintains more than one officeholder account in the same calendar year, he or she may not receive the following contributions to any of those accounts during that calendar year:

(A) Contributions from a single contributor that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount the contributor could give to the officeholder account having the highest per person contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(1).

(B) Contributions from all contributors that, when cumulated for all the accounts, exceed the maximum amount in total contributions the officeholder could receive in the officeholder account having the highest aggregate contribution limit under Section 85316(b)(2).

(f) Contributions Over the Limits:

(1) An officeholder shall return to the contributor the portion of any contribution to his or her officeholder account that exceeds the limits of Section 85301, 85302 (after cumulation) or 85316 (either alone or after cumulation) by the earlier of 14 days of receipt or 14 days of the date the officeholder files a statement of intention to be a candidate for elective state office pursuant to Section 85200.

(2) A contributor to the officeholder account does not violate the contribution limits applying to the officeholder's election to a future elective state office as otherwise provided under Section 85316(b)(3) if, when he or she makes the contribution, the officeholder has not filed a statement of organization to establish a controlled committee for election to a future elective state office.

(g) Terminating Officeholder Accounts and Committees:

(1) The officeholder may not accept contributions after the officeholder's term of office ends or the date he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier.

(2) The officeholder may redesignate the officeholder account as an officeholder controlled committee for a future term of the same office by amending the statement of

organization for the committee to reflect the redesignation for the future term of office prior to the date the officer's term of office ends.

(3) An officeholder may redesignate officeholder funds in the redesignated officeholder account as officeholder funds for the new term of office, subject to the limitations in subdivision

(e)(4).

(4) Once the officeholder's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier, the officeholder may only use his or her officeholder funds for the following purposes:

(A) Paying outstanding officeholder expenses.

(B) Repaying contributions to contributors to the officeholder account.

(C) Making a donation to a bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, if no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the officeholder, a member of his or her immediate family, or his or her committee treasurer.

(D) Paying for professional services reasonably required by the officeholder controlled committee to assist in the performance of its administrative functions.

(5) The officeholder shall terminate the officeholder controlled committee within 90 days of the date the officer's term of office ends or he or she leaves that office, whichever is earlier. The Executive Director may for good cause extend the termination date or permit the candidate to reopen the account.

Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 84104, 85316 and 90000-90007, Government Code.

**HISTORY**

1. New section filed 7-3-2007; operative 8-2-2007. Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2007, No. 27). For prior history, see Register 2007, No. 26.

2. Change without regulatory effect amending section filed 3-22-2016; operative 4-21-2016 pursuant to 2 CCR 18312(e). Submitted to OAL for filing pursuant to *Fair Political Practices Commission v. Office of Administrative Law*, 3 Civil C010924, California Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, nonpublished decision, April 27, 1992 (FPPC regulations only subject to 1974 Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements and not subject to procedural or substantive review by OAL) (Register 2016, No. 13).





Office of the City Attorney

**DATE:** December 28, 1999

**TO:** BARBARA GILBERT,  
Aide to Mayor Shirley Dean

**FROM:** MANUELA ALBUQUERQUE, City Attorney *MA*  
By: CAMILLE COUREY, Deputy City Attorney

**SUBJECT:** APPLICATION OF BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT TO OFFICEHOLDER ACCOUNTS

ISSUE:

Does the Berkeley Election Reform Act (BERA) govern officeholder accounts?

CONCLUSION:

No. The BERA does not govern true officeholder accounts per se. However, the mere fact that an account may be designated an officeholder account does not insulate it from scrutiny under the BERA or other applicable local law if the officeholder account is not used strictly for officeholder purposes or if some action taken with respect to the officeholder account implicates campaign contributions and expenditures or other applicable local laws.

ANALYSIS:

Sarah Reynoso, former secretary and staff counsel to the Fair Campaign Practices Commission (FCPC), issued an opinion to the FCPC dated December 2, 1991, a copy of which is attached, stating that the BERA's contribution limit does not apply to contributions made to an officeholder account. The opinion reasons that the BERA's contribution limit applies only to "contributions" as defined in the BERA, i.e., which are made directly or indirectly in support of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) § 2.12.100.) Contributions to a true officeholder account are not made for the purpose of nominating or electing a candidate to office, but rather for the use of an officeholder in carrying out the duties of his or her office. Therefore, the contribution limit of the BERA is inapplicable to officeholder accounts.<sup>1</sup> For similar reasons, the BERA does not

<sup>1</sup> However, the opinion also provided that contributions to officeholder accounts still had to be reported on campaign statements because the State Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Regulations broadly defined contributions as any contribution for "political purposes." Since officeholder expenses are for political purposes, they must be reported to the State.

Barbara Gilbert

Re: Application of Berkeley Election Reform Act To Officeholder Accounts

December 28, 1999

Page 2

apply to true officeholder accounts.

The BERA requires the filing of statements to report the amounts received and expended in municipal elections. (See BMC §§ 2.12.015, 2.12.030 through 2.12.050) Specifically, a "campaign statement" required to be filed under the BERA is an itemized report which provides the information required by Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 of the BERA. (BMC § 2.12.080.) Sections 2.12.245 through 2.12.325 govern the reporting of contributions and expenditures. "Contributions" and "expenditures" are defined by the BERA as any amounts received or expended, respectively, in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office. (See BMC §§ 2.12.100 and 2.12.130.) Contributions to or expenditures from a true officeholder account are not subject to the BERA's reporting requirements because they are made for the purpose of carrying out the duties of elective office, and not for the purpose of aiding or opposing the nomination or election of one or more candidates to elective office.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the BERA does not apply to true officeholder accounts.

However, the fact that an account may be designated as an officeholder account will not shield it from scrutiny under the BERA if the officeholder account is, in fact, being used for the receipt of contributions or the making of expenditures in aid of the nomination or election of a candidate for local elective office. Nor will BERA requirements, such as the \$250 contribution limit or the prohibition against contributions from businesses to candidates, be held inapplicable if contributions made initially to an officeholder account are transferred subsequently to a campaign account. Where the actions taken with respect to an officeholder account implicate campaign contributions and expenditures in municipal elections, the officeholder account will be scrutinized under the BERA and other applicable local law.

Attachment

cc: Fair Campaign Practices Commission  
Sherry Kelly, City Clerk

City Attorney Opinions Index: H.E.I. and H.L.G.

CCM

PAUSERS\BBL2\ofhldr.mem.doc

<sup>2</sup> Again, however, the State FPPC still requires the reporting of activity relating to an officeholder account. (See footnote 1.)

## CITY OF BERKELEY

DATE: December 9, 1991

Memorandum

TO: FCPC COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Sarah Reynoso, Secretary &amp; Staff Counsel

SUBJECT: APPLICABILITY OF BERA'S CONTRIBUTION LIMIT TO FUNDS RAISED FOR OFFICEHOLDER EXPENSESBACKGROUND AND ISSUE

I received the attached letter from Richard N. Lerner, treasurer of Friends of Ioni Hancock Committee ("Committee"), regarding the applicability of BERA's (Berkeley Election Reform Act) \$250 contribution limit to funds raised to cover officeholder expenses. The Committee would like to raise money to cover activities by the Mayor for which the City has not allocated funds, for example, distribution of a newsletter and international travel to visit Berkeley Sister Cities.

Thus, the issue presented to the Commission is as follows: Is BERA's \$250 contribution limit applicable to funds raised for officeholder expenses?

CONCLUSION

No. The BERA's contribution limitation is only applicable to money raised "in aid of or in opposition to the nomination or election" of a candidate. Since the Committee intends to raise these funds for activities unrelated to the nomination or election of the Mayor, they are not subject to the BERA's \$250 contribution limitation. However, such funds must be reported as contributions under the State Political Reform Act and their expenditure itemized on the disclosure forms.

ANALYSIS

The BERA prohibits candidates for elective office from soliciting or accepting a contribution of more than \$250 from any one contributor. (BERA section 2.12.415.) Thus, funds which fall within BERA's definition of a contribution, are subject to the \$250 limit. In order to determine whether funds raised for officeholder expenses are subject to the contribution limitation, BERA's definition of contribution must be reviewed.

The BERA defines contribution, in part, as follows:

"Contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, pledge, forgiveness of indebtedness, payment of a debt by a third party, contract, agreement, or promise of money or anything of value or other obligation, whether or not legally enforceable, made directly or indirectly in aid of or

FCPC COMMISSIONERS

December 9, 1991

Page 2

in opposition to the nomination or election of one or more candidates . . . . (Emphasis added.)

Thus, the plain language of the BERA requires that a contribution be solicited for purposes related to the nomination or election of a candidate for office to be subject to its contribution limitation. Since the Committee intends to raise funds for purposes unrelated to the Mayor's nomination or election for elective office, such funds do not fall within the BERA's definition and are therefore not subject to its \$250 limitation.

However, because the state Political Reform Act defines contribution to include any funds raised for political purposes, funds raised for officeholder expenses are considered contributions and must be reported on campaign disclosure forms.<sup>1/</sup> (Government Code section 82015.) Additionally, since the court's ruling in SEIU v. FPPC invalidated the state's \$1,000 contribution limit, funds raised for officeholder expenses are not subject to any limitation.

As a final precaution, the Committee should be advised that the FPPC has issued regulations concerning officeholder expenses and it should review them with respect to their interaction with the BERA.

Attachment

---

<sup>1/</sup>I spoke with the FPPC's legal staff and confirmed that funds raised for officeholder expenses must be reported as contributions on the campaign disclosure forms.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE BERKELEY ELECTION REFORM ACT**

The Fair Campaign Practices Commission is proposing amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act related to the prohibition of officeholder accounts.

The hearing will be held on, February 4, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 1231 Addison Street.

A copy of the agenda material for this hearing will be available on the City's website at [www.CityofBerkeley.info](http://www.CityofBerkeley.info) as of **January 30, 2020**.

For further information, please contact Samuel Harvey, Commission Secretary at 981-6998.


Written comments should be mailed or delivered directly to the City Clerk, 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, in order to ensure delivery to all Councilmembers and inclusion in the agenda packet.

Communications to the Berkeley City Council are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the City Council, will become part of the public record.** If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the City Clerk. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk at 981-6900 or [clerk@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:clerk@cityofberkeley.info) for further information.

**Published:** January 24, 2020 – The Berkeley Voice  
Pursuant to Berkeley Municipal Code Section 2.12.051

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the Notice for this Public Hearing of the Berkeley City Council was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on January 30, 2020.

Mark Numainville, City Clerk



[First Last name]
Councilmember District [District No.]

SUPPLEMENTAL REVISED AGENDA MATERIAL for Supplemental Packet 2

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020


Item Number: 2

Item Description: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

Submitted by: Councilmember Hahn

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.



SOPHIE HAHN

Berkeley City Council, District 5
2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 981-7150
shahn@cityofberkeley.info

ACTION CALENDAR

February 4, 2020

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Vice Mayor Sophie Hahn
Subject: Statement on Item 2 - Amendments to the Berkeley Election Reform Act to prohibit Officeholder Accounts; Amending BMC Chapter 2.12

RECOMMENDATION

This item seeks to outlaw Officeholder Accounts in Berkeley. I would like to offer an alternative: to allow Officeholder Accounts but establish regulations to limit them in ways that reflect Berkeley's limitations on campaign donations and consider narrowing the uses for which Officeholder Account funds can be used.

The action I advocate for Council to take is to refer a discussion of Officeholder accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee, to consider a reasonable set of limitations and rules for such accounts and bring back recommendations to the full Council, for the Council to consider referring to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Officeholder accounts are accounts an elected official can open, and raise funds for, to pay for expenses related to the office they hold.¹ They are not campaign accounts, and cannot be used for campaign purposes. The types of expenses Officeholder Accounts can be used for include research, conferences, events attended in the performance of government duties, printed newsletters, office supplies, travel related to official duties, etc. Cities can place limits on Officeholder Accounts, as Oakland has done.² Officeholder Accounts must be registered as official "Committees" and adhere to strict public reporting requirements, like campaign accounts. They provide full transparency to the public about sources and uses of funds.

The FCPC bases its recommendation to prohibit Officeholder Accounts on arguments about "equity" and potential "corruption" in elections. The report refers repeatedly to "challengers" and "incumbents," suggesting that Officeholder Accounts are vehicles for unfairness in the election context.

I believe that the FCPC's recommendations reflect a misunderstanding of the purpose and uses of Officeholder Accounts, equating them with campaign accounts and suggesting that they create an imbalance between community members who apparently have already decided to run against an incumbent (so-called "challengers") and elected officials who are presumed to be

¹ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/Regulations/Index/Chapter5/18531.62.pdf>

² <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

always running for office. The recommendations do not take into account some important framing: the question of what funds are otherwise available to pay for Officeholder-type expenses for Officeholders or members of the public. Contrary to the conclusions of the FCPC, I believe Officeholder accounts are an important vehicle to redress a significant disadvantage for elected officials, whose ability to exercise free speech in the community and participate in conferences and events related to their profession is constrained by virtue of holding public office, as compared to community members, whose speech rights are unrestricted in any manner whatsoever, and who can raise money to use for whatever purposes they desire.

Outlawing Officeholder Accounts is also posited as a means to create equity between more and less wealthy Officeholders, on the theory that less affluent Officeholders will have less access to fundraising for Officeholder Accounts than more affluent Officeholders. Because there are no prohibition on using personal funds for many of the purposes for which Officeholder Account funds can be used, prohibiting Officeholder Accounts I believe has the opposite effect; it leaves more affluent Officeholders with the ability to pay for Officeholder expenses from personal funds, without providing an avenue for less affluent Officeholders, who may not have available personal funds, to raise money from their supporters to pay for such Officeholder expenses.

The question of whether Officeholder Accounts should be allowed in Berkeley plays out in the context of a number of rules and realities that are important to framing any analysis.

First, by State Law, elected officials are prohibited from using public funds for a variety of communications that many constituents nevertheless expect. For example, an elected official may not use public funds to send a mailing announcing municipal information to constituents, "such as a newsletter or brochure, [] delivered, by any means [] to a person's residence, place of employment or business, or post office box."³ Nor may an elected official mail an item using public funds that features a reference to the elected official affiliated with their public position.⁴ Note that Electronic newsletters are not covered by these rules, and can and do include all of these features, even if the newsletter service is paid for by the public entity. That said, while technically not required, many elected officials prefer to use email newsletter distribution services (Constant Contact, MailChimp, Nationbuilder, etc.) paid for with personal (or "Officeholder") funds, to operate in the spirit of the original rules against using public funds for communications that include a photo of, or references to, the elected official.

Without the ability to raise funds for an Officeholder Account, for an elected official to send a paper newsletter to constituents or to use an email newsletter service that is not paid for with public funds, they must use personal funds. A printed newsletter mailed to 5-6,000 households (a typical number of households in a Berkeley City Council District) can easily cost \$5,000+, and an electronic mail service subscription typically costs \$10 (for the most basic service) to \$45 per month, a cost of \$120.00 to over \$500 per year - in personal funds.

³ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

⁴ <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/public-officials-and-employees-rules-/communications-sent-using-public-funds/campaign-related-communications.html>

Second, Berkeley City Councilmembers and the Mayor of Berkeley are not paid enough for there to be any reasonable expectation that personal funds should be used for these types of expenses.⁵ For many Councilmembers and/or the Mayor, work hours are full time - or more - and there is no other source of income.

Finally, and most importantly, local elected officials are restricted from accepting money or gifts. An elected official cannot under any circumstances raise money to pay for Officeholder expenses such as printed communications, email newsletter services, travel and admission to industry conferences for which the elected official is not an official delegate (e.g., conferences on City Planning, Green Cities, Municipal Finance, etc.), and other expenses related to holding office that are not covered by public funds. Again, without the possibility of an Officeholder Account, an elected official generally must use personal funds for these expenses, allowing more affluent elected officials to participate while placing a hardship or in some cases a prohibition on the ability of less affluent elected officials to undertake these Officeholder-type activities - which support expected communications with constituents and participation in industry activities that improve the elected official's effectiveness.

The elected official's inability to raise funds from others must be contrasted with the ability of a community member - a potential "challenger" who has not yet declared themselves to be an actual candidate - or perhaps a neighborhood association, business or corporation (Chevron, for example) - to engage in similar activities. Nothing restricts any community member or organization from using their own funds - or funds obtained from anyone - a wealthy friend, a corporation, a local business, a community organization or their neighbors - for any purpose whatsoever.

Someone who doesn't like the job an elected official is doing could raise money from family or connections anywhere in the community - or the world - and mail a letter to every person in the District or City criticizing the elected official, or buy up every billboard or banner ad on Facebook or Berkeleyside to broadcast their point of view. By contrast, the elected official, without access to an Officeholder Account, could only use personal funds to "speak" with their own printed letter, billboard or advertisement. Community members (including future "challengers") can also attend any and all conferences they want, engage in travel to visit interesting cities and projects that might inform their thoughts on how a city should be run, and pay for those things with money raised from friends, colleagues, businesses, corporations, foreign governments - *anyone*. They are private citizens with full first amendment rights and have no limitations, no reporting requirements, no requirements of transparency or accountability whatsoever.

The imbalance is significant. Outside of the campaign setting, where all declared candidates can raise funds and must abide by the same rules of spending and communications, *elected officials cannot raise money for any expenses whatsoever, from any source, while community*

⁵ Councilmembers receive annual compensation of approximately \$36,000, while the Mayor receives annual compensation of approximately \$55,000.⁵

members, including organizations and private companies, can raise as much money as they want from any sources, and use that money for anything they choose.

Without the ability to establish and fund an Officeholder Account, the only option an elected official has is to use personal funds, which exacerbates the potential imbalance between elected officials with more and less personal funds to spend. Elected officials work within a highly regulated system, which can limit their ability to “speak” and engage in other activities members of the public are able to undertake without restriction. Officeholder Accounts restore some flexibility by allowing elected officials to raise money for expenses related to holding office, so long as the sources and uses of those funds is made transparent.

By allowing Officeholder Accounts and regulating them, Berkeley can place limits on amounts that can be raised, and on the individuals/entities from whom funds can be accepted, similar (or identical) to the limits Berkeley places on sources of campaign funds. Similarly, Berkeley can restrict uses of funds beyond the State’s restrictions, to ensure funds are not used for things like family members’ travel, as is currently allowed by the State. Oakland has taken this approach, and has a set of Officeholder Account regulations that provide a good starting point for Berkeley to consider.⁶

I respectfully ask for a vote to send the question of potential allowance for, and regulation of, Officeholder Accounts to the Agenda and Rules Committee for further consideration.

CONTACT: Sophie Hahn, District 5: (510) 981-7150

⁶ <http://www2.oaklandnet.com/w/OAK052051>

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Adopted	FY 2018 Proposed	FY 2019 Proposed
EXPENDITURES					
By Type:					
Salaries and Benefits	1,660,661	1,760,619	1,723,617	1,833,734	1,880,031
Services and Materials	36,942	43,407	113,526	113,526	113,526
Capital Outlay	1,953	7,674			
Internal Services	89,100	81,181	81,181	81,181	81,181
Indirect Cost Transfer					
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
By Division:					
Mayor's Office	515,095	558,137	584,877	554,389	566,917
Council Offices	1,273,561	1,334,744	1,333,447	1,474,052	1,507,821
Exiting Officials					
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
By Fund:					
General Fund	1,788,656	1,892,881	1,918,324	2,028,441	2,074,738
	<u>1,788,656</u>	<u>1,892,881</u>	<u>1,918,324</u>	<u>2,028,441</u>	<u>2,074,738</u>
General Fund FTE	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Total FTE	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00