



#### **MEETING MINUTES**

June 11, 2014

#### I. Call to Order & Orders of the Day

## **Roll Call**

PRESENT: Chair Michael Smith, Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon, Commission Members

Leon Louie and Chris Peacock

ABSENT: Commission Member Linda Edgeworth

STAFF: Investigator/Evaluator Steven Miller, Deputy City Attorney Arlene Silva, City

Clerk Toni Taber and Assistant City Clerk Tom Graves

OTHER: Noelia Espinola, Court Reporter with Advantage Reporting Services

#### Call to Order

The members of the San José Ethics Commission convened at 5:38 p.m. in Room W-262 of City Hall, 200 E. Santa Clara Street, CA 95113.

#### Orders of the Day

<u>Action</u>: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon, and seconded by Commissioner Leon Louie and carried, the Commission approved the adoption of the June 11, 2014 agenda. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

#### II. Closed Session - None

#### III. Hearings

A. Hearing on Complaint filed by Tam Nguyen on May 2, 2014 alleging violations of the San Jose Municipal Code by Madison Nguyen for Mayor and Viet USA News. (Independent Investigator/Evaluator)

<u>Document Filed:</u> Report from Hanson Bridgett LLP dated May 30, 2014 regarding Tam Nguyen v. Madison Nguyen for Mayor, et al. Complaint filed May 2, 2014.

<u>Discussion</u>: Chair Michael Smith summarized the hearing procedures and opened the public hearing. All members of the Commission were present except for Commissioner Edgeworth. This complaint alleges a violation by Councilmember Nguyen of Section 12.06.1010 of the San Jose Municipal Code. The Evaluator (Steven Miller), received a copy of the Complaint on May 2, 2014, and he notified the respondent on May 5, 2014. The report and recommendations were received by

Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes page 2 June 11, 2014

the City Clerk on May 30, 2014, and copies were then distributed to the Respondents, Complainant, Commission Members, and posted to the City's website. Neither the Complainant nor the Respondents were present. The Evaluator presented the report, with the finding that no violations of the Municipal Code took place, and with a recommendation that the Commission close the file and take no further action.

Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon requested that the Evaluator furnish the name of the Translator for the record, and the Evaluator said that he would do so. Chair Smith asked that the name of the translator be included in the Evaluator's reports from now on.

<u>Action</u>: Upon a motion by Chair Michael Smith, and seconded by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon and carried, the Commission found that there was suffucuent evidence to establish that no violation occurred. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

Each Commissioner certified that he or she personally heard the testimony at the hearing and reviewed the entire evidence in the record.

Chair Smith	So certified
Vice Chair Pierre Dixon	So certified
Commissioner Louie	So certified
Commissioner Peacock	So certified
Commissioner Edgeworth	Absent

<u>Action</u>: Upon a motion by Chair Michael Smith, and seconded by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon and carried, the Commission moved to close the file in the matter with no further action. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon, and seconded by Commissioner Leon Louie, the Commission moved to direct the City Attorney to draft a Resolution on the Commission's Findings, and further, that the Commission authorizes the Chair to approve and sign the resolution. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

Vice Chair Pierre Dixon expressed concern regarding large segments of the population not being aware of rules and regulations as they pertain to elections. She asked the City Clerk to take note of the matter.

B. Hearing on Complaint filed by Duc Lam on May 9, 2014 alleging violations of the San Jose Municipal Code by Van Le and Van Le for City Council 2014 Committee, candidate for Council District 7. (Independent Investigator/Evaluator)

<u>Document Filed</u>: Report from Hanson Bridgett dated May regarding Duc Lam v. Van Le, et al. Complaint filed May 9, 2014.

<u>Discussion</u>: Chair Michael Smith summarized the hearing procedures and opened the public hearing. All members of the Commission were present except for Commissioner Edgeworth. This complaint alleges a violation by Van Le and Van Le

for City Council 2014 Committee of Section 12.06.1010 of the San Jose Municipal Code. The allegation is that the respondents placed a magazine advertisement that did not contain the correct "paid for by..." disclaimer required by the Municipal Code. The City Clerk notified and provided a copy of the Complaint to te Evaluator on May 9, 2014, and the Evaluator notified and provided a copy of the Complaint to the Respondents on May 12, 2014. The Independent Evaluator's report and recommendations were submitted to the City Clerk on June 3, 2014, and copies were then provided to the Complainant, Respondents and Commission Members, and posted on the City's website. Neither the Complainant nor the Respondents were present. The Evaluator presented the report, with the finding that no violations of the San Jose Municipal Code took place, and with a recommendation that the Commission close the file and take no further action.

Commissioner Peacock requested clarificatin of prohibitions on election-related ads for candidates; including the expenditure classifications for those ads. Evaluator Steve Miller responded and answered Commission questions.

<u>Action</u>: Upon a motion by Chair Michael Smith, and seconded by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon and carried, the Commission found that there was sufficient evidence to establish that no violation occurred. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

Each Commissioner certified that he or she personally heard the testimony at the hearing and reviewed the entire evidence in the record.

Chair Smith	So certified
Vice Chair Pierre Dixon	So certified
Commissioner Louie	So certified
Commissioner Peacock	So certified
Commissioner Edgeworth	Absent

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Michael Smith, and seconded by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon and carried, the Commission moved to close the file in the matter with no further action. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

<u>Action</u>: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Rolanda Pierre Dixon, and seconded by Commissioner Leon Louie, the Commission moved to direct the City Attorney to draft a Resolution on the Commission's findings, and further, that the Commission authorizes the Chair to approve and sign the resolution. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

#### IV. Consent Calendar

A. Approve the Minutes of April 9, 2014 – Regular Meeting

Document Filed: Draft Ethics Commission minutes for the April 9, 2014 meeting.

Action: Approval of minutes for April 9, 2014 meeting deferred to the next meeting.

B. Approve the Minutes of May 14, 2014 – Regular Meeting

Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes page 4 June 11, 2014

<u>Action</u>: Minutes of May 14, 2014 were not drafted in time for meeting. Approval deferred to next meeting.

#### V. Reports

- A. Chair None
- B. City Attorney None
  - 1. Legislative update
- C. City Clerk None
  - 1. Legislative update
  - 2. Status of compliance with Commission resolutions
  - 3. Status report on filings (Form 700, Campaign Statements, Lobbyists)
  - 4. Elections update None
    - a) Results of Primary Election
       <u>Document Filed</u>: Contribution and Expenditure Report
    - b) Review and possible action on multi-language outreach resources for the citizens regarding San Jose Municipal Code Title 12.
- D. Investigator/Evaluator None

#### VI. Old Business

A. Status, review and possible action on Gift Ordinance and Frequently Asked Questions Sheet (City Attorney)

Action: Continued to the meeting of July 9, 2014.

B. Status, review and possible action on officeholder/candidate legal defense fund ordinance (City Attorney)

Action: Continued to the meeting of July 9, 2014.

C. Discussion and possible action on reporting requirements from staff to Commission regarding filings (City Clerk)

<u>Discussion</u>: Chair Smith framed the discussion in terms of identifying and tracking what has been learned in terms of compliance as filings are processed. The City Clerk responded that the most interesting thing is the strategic late filings that have started to take place. Some filers now opt to pay the fine rather than disclose in a timely manner what has been raised and/or spent. Further, filings are much easier now that the City has instituted the new contract with Netfile. Filers may file any form at virtually any time they wish, which has resulted in more filings, and less fines for late filings. The late fines are \$10 per day up to the amount filers have in their account, or \$100, whichever is greater. Fining filers doesn't seem to have an impact. The Contribution and Expenditure Report ad placed in the newspaper regarding filers and amounts collected took the City Clerk and another staffer a full day to develop. The candidate information is fairly straightforward, but independent expenditures must be gone though individually, looking at each form filed. Chair Smith said that it

Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes page 5 June 11, 2014

> sounded like there were two issues for the Commission to take up: 1) strategic late filings; and 2) publishing the ad of funds raised. Chair Smith said he can't recall why the requirement for the ad was retained when Section 12.06.920 of the San Jose Municipal Code was last revised. City Clerk Taber said the newspaper ad should also be posted to our website, as well. Chair Smith said in all the years he has been doing this, he has never seen the ad. City Clerk Taber responded that the ad is in the Legal Publications section at the back of the paper. Evaluator Miller suggested that complaints about the actual late filing could be made to the Commission. Chair Smith responded that the Commission could fine late filers three times the amount of money involved, or \$5,000, whichever is greater. Chair Smith suggested that these two items should go on the Workplan for future consideration by the Commission. Commissioner Peacock recalled prior discussions about asking candidates to put links to the ad on their websites. Chair Smith suggested that ethics trainings for the media be placed on the Workplan as well. Vice Chair Pierre Dixon agreed with the suggestion. Finally, Chair Smith spoke about disclaimers on campaign signs, and asked why the City couldn't just adopt the same rules as the state as they pertain to campaign signs, and he suggested the issue also be placed on the Workplan.

Reporter Espiniola left the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

D. Discussion and possible action on revisions to the Ethics Commission Complaint Form (City Clerk)

<u>Discussion</u>: City Clerk Taber said the revision has already been instituted, and the checkboxes are helpful as well.

Evaluator Miller left the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

E. Discussion and possible action on FY 2013-14 Annual Report and FY 2014-15 Workplan (Chair)

<u>Discussion</u>: Chair Smith said he revised the last draft of the Workplan, which is now draft 1.2. He is satisfied with both the Annual Report and Workplan now, except that the Annual Report needs to be updated to reflect that the first bullet under Objective 1, the third bullet under Objective 2 and both bullets under Objective 6 were accomplished in June 2014. City Clerk Taber agreed. City Clerk Taber said that she would update the previously agreed upon schedule for reporting on compliance monitoring to add Lobbyist compliance information and would send a memo to the Commission with the updated schedule attached. She also noted that in September, she would start agendizing the items enumerated in the compliance monitoring schedule. Commissioner Peacock suggested that a transmittal memo from the Chair to the Council via the Rules Committee would be in order. City Clerk Taber offered to draft the memo in cooperation with Chair Smith, with a summary of accomplishments for Commissioners to review in July.

Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes page 6 June 11, 2014

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Pierre Dixon, and seconded by Commissioner Leon Louie and carried, that the Commission approved the the Annual Report and Workplan as amended. Commissioner Peacock asked that issues surrounding ethnic media and the changing electronic media environment also be included in the Report. Chair Smith suggested that issues that arise throughout the year be placed on a list of issues ("Cecilia's List") for future action. Commissioner Peacock and Vice Chair Pierre Dixon both asked that outreach to ethnic and specialized media regarding campaign and ethics regulations and policies be put in Item 1 in the Workplan as a third bullet. Vice Chair Pierre Dixon accepted the amendment. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Pierre Dixon, and seconded by Commissioner Leon Louie and carried, requested that a letter be sent to the Rules Committee in connection with the Final Report, and asked that the Chair be empowered to send said memo on behalf of the Commission. (4-0-1; Absent: Edgeworth.)

#### VII. New Business

A. Discussion and possible action on "dark money" issue, regulations and policies. (City Clerk)

<u>Discussion</u>: Deputy City Attorney Arlene Silva raised some concerns about this issue, and the Commission agreed to await Commissioner Edgeworth's return before taking up the matter.

#### VIII. Public Comment - None.

## IX. Future Agenda Items and Adjournment

The next regular meeting is Wednesday, July 9, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall, Wing Room 262.

The following agenda items will be discussed at the July 9, 2014 Ethics Commission meeting:

- Compliance Monitoring Schedule
- Gift Ordinance and Officeholder Reporting Requirements
- "Dark Money" (Old Business)

Chair Smith asked that Commissioners hold the meeting date of July 9, 2014 on their calendars, but advised them the meeting may be cancelled.

Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes page 7 June 11, 2014

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:04 p.m.

MICHAEL SMITH, CHAIR

ATTEST:

ETHICS COMMISSION SECRETARY

TONI J. TABER, CMC

CITY CLERK

Attachment: Transcript of Hearing dated June 11, 2014, Reported by Noelia Espinola, CSR, License Number 8060, Advantage Reporting Services, No. 41408, pages 1 through 34.

Taken On June 11, 2014

# CITY OF SAN JOSE ETHICS COMMISSION

PAGE 1 TO PAGE 34

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT

Advantage Reporting



Services, LLC

1083 Lincoln Ave. San Jose, CA 95125 Phone 408-920-0222 Fax 408-920-0188 .

Page 3  CITY OF SAN JOSE ETHICS COMMISSION  1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The first one is and still don't know who it was that was going to show that we're potentially waiting for? 5 MS. TABER: No, I can't remember. 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've go minutes. 8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness. 10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, okay.	v up
ETHICS COMMISSION  2 CHAIRMAN SMITH: The first one is and still don't know who it was that was going to show that we're potentially waiting for?  5 MS. TABER: No, I can't remember.  6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've so minutes.  8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness.	v up
still don't know who it was that was going to show that we're potentially waiting for?  MS. TABER: No, I can't remember.  CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've go minutes.  Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.	v up
3 still don't know who it was that was going to show 4 that we're potentially waiting for? 5 MS. TABER: No, I can't remember. 6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've go minutes. 7 minutes. 8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness. 9 though, so it may have just been a witness.	v up
that we're potentially waiting for?  MS. TABER: No, I can't remember.  CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've of minutes.  Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.	•
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.  MS. TABER: No, I can't remember. CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've grain indices.  MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness.	got 20
REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  6 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've of minutes.  8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness.  10 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Well, they've of minutes.  8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness.	got 20
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.  7 minutes.  8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize though, so it may have just been a witness.	901 20
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.  8 MS. TABER: It was not a name I recognize 9 though, so it may have just been a witness.	
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 Time: 5:48 p.m.  9 though, so it may have just been a witness.	od
Time: 5:48 p.m.	ou,
1 1 the Company of the Company o	
Escation, Oan observing half	
200 E, Santa Clara Street 11 Okay. So the first one is the Tam Nguyen Clty Hall Wing - Room W262 12 case. So we will start the hearing on that	
San Inco CA 95113	
13 its wednesday, June the 11th, 2014, and the	
Reported By: Noelia Espinola, CSR 14 hearing of the San Jose Ethics Commission is be	
License Number #8060 15 In Room W-262 of the San Jose City Hall. All me	
16 of the Commission are present except Commission	oner
17 Edgeworth.	
18 Commission will conduct a hearing on a	
19 complaint filed on May 2nd, 2014, by Tam Nguye	n
#47898 20 alleging that Madison Nguyen for Mayor Committee	ee and
21 Viet News USA violated Section 12.06.1010 of the	e San
22 Jose Municipal Code. Specifically, the allegation	is
23 that the Respondents placed a newspaper advert	isement
24 that did not contain the correct "paid for by"	
25 disclaimer required by the Municipal Code. The C	City
Page 2 Page 4	
1 Clerk notified and provided a copy of the complain	ıl ko
3	li je
4 San Jose Elections Wilchael Sivil In, Chair	
t LEONI OUR	المحلللم ما
CHRIS PEACOCK Standard & Report and Recommendations were st	
7 Staff: ARLENE F, SILVA 7 then provided to the Complainant, Respondent and Deputy City Attorney 8 Commission members and posted to the City web	
8	site with
TONI TABER,  9 the agenda for tonight's hearing.	
9 City Clerk 10 On April 5th, 2014, the City Council adopted	
Assistant City Clerk	
11 regulations and procedures pertaining to investiga	
12 The Reporter: ADVANTAGE REPORTING SERVICES 13 and hearings. All parties to these proceedings have	ve ∣
BY: NOELIA ESPINOLA, 14 been provided copies of the Resolution. The CSR #8060	
1083 Lincoln Avenue 15 regulations and procedures have been adopted in	order
San Jose, CA 95125 16 to ensure the fair, just and timely resolution of	
(408) 920-0222 17 complaints before the Commission.	
This hearing is open to the public. It is	
17 000 19 being electronically recorded, and we have a court	
18 19 20 reporter with us to compile a transcript. The formation	վ
21 rules of evidence do not apply to this hearing, but a	all
21 22 testimony will be under oath or affirmation. The	
23 Complehent will be treated like any other witness	in
1 23 Complainant will be treated like any other withess	
23 Complainant will be treated like any other witness 24 providing evidence. The Chair may compel the test	slimony

2

2

4

#### Page 5

- documents to the Evaluator by subpoena. Witnesses may
- be excluded at the discretion of the Commission.
- Commission members may ask questions of wilnesses or
- 4 the Evaluator when recognized by the Chair.

5 At this time I would ask the Complainant 6 and/or Respondents or their representatives to identify

7 themselves for the record.

8

And I'll note that neither the Complainant

9 nor the Respondents are here. 10 Also identify City Staff and representative

11 of Hanson Bridgett, the Commission's Independent

12 Evaluator, who are here. And I'll do it since I know

13 you all. Steve Miller from Hanson Bridgett. Ariene

14 Silva, Deputy City Attorney. Toni Taber, City Clerk.

15 And Tom Graves, Assistant City Clerk.

16 Under the Commission's regulations and 17 procedures, the Respondents may submit a written response to the Report and Recommendations. The 18

19 response may contain legal arguments, a summary of 20 evidence and any mitigating or exculpatory information.

21 We do not have -- I'm not aware of any 22 written response from the -- from the Respondent. Is

23 that correct?

24

25

5

6

7

8

13

MS. TABER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. The Complainant or

#### Page 6

any other interested person may also submit a brief or 2 written argument -- I forgot to change that, but -- or

3 written argument, 4

And, again, we do not have any written submittal by the Complainant or anyone else, as I understand it.

Okay. The Commission's regulations and procedures allow for the Independent Evaluator to 9 present the Report and Recommendations. At this time ! 10 will recognize Steve Miller, from the Hanson Bridgett 11 law firm, to present the Report. The Recommendations

12 will be presented subsequently.

MR. MILLER: Okey-doke, Good evening,

14 So first point to mention is that the 15

complaint identified two respondents. And -- both the 16 Madison Nguyen committee as well as a newspaper. And

17 the complaint, as you indicated, alleges -- implicates

the disclaimer requirements -- "paid for by..." 18

19 disclaimer requirements newly added to the Municipal

20

21 And our first task was to determine, In 22 consultation with the City Attorney, that we're reading

23 the Municipal Code correctly in that these disclaimer

24 requirements do not apply to the newspaper itself. And

25 so we did not consider the newspaper to be a

#### Page 7

respondent, despite it being identified as such.

We spoke to the candidate and to the

3 publisher of the newspaper. And we also engaged a

professional translator to provide us with copies of

5 translations of the various documents in question, all

6 of which were in Vietnamese.

7 And the results of those Investigations, 8

pretty straightforward. What looks like -- the

9 complaint alleges that there was an advertisement.

10 But, in fact, the publisher printed what I would call a

11 commentary or an editorial, which started with clear 12 editorial remarks concerning two candidates, the

13 Complainant and the Respondent, and suggesting that the

newspaper was in favor of both of them. And followed

15 by that statement, underneath it, the publisher just

16 inserted a copy of an advertisement for the Respondent

that the Respondent had paid to run in other editions 17

18 of the newspaper but not -- had not paid for

19 advertisement to run in that particular Issue.

20 So it turned oul to be sort of a mixture of 21 things. Under the -- determined the candidate had

22 known about this. The candidate had not paid anything,

23 In fact, both the Respondent and the Complainant were

24 annoyed at being associated with each other, and both

25 complained to the newspaper publisher about its -- on

#### Page 8

its own initiative, lumping them together and

reprinting this ad. And they each felt that they had

3 been tarred unfairly with the brush of the other.

And the newspaper printed two retractions,

5 the first of which didn't satisfy one of -- the

Respondent, I believe. And so printed a second

7 retraction, both of which are offered both in their

8 Vietnamese original and in the translation. The

translations are quite flowery but confirm, in my view, 9

10 that the -- what I just described; namely, that the

11

candidate did not pay or know about the placing of the

alleged ad and that it wasn't an ad. It was part of a

13 commentary by the newspaper.

So, under your Code, the definition of an

14 15 "electioneering communication" to which these

16 disclaimer requirements attach are that it must be a

17 communication that was paid for. And then it says that

18 it does not apply to commentaries and editorials by

newspapers.

19

20 So I think, starting out with -- it's not

21 a -- we concluded it's not an electioneering

communication. Even had it been, the disclaimer 22

23 requirements on a candidate attach to electioneering

24 communications that are paid for by the candidate, and

that's indisputably not the case here. And so we

#### Page 9 Page 11 1 concluded that this was not the sort of document to and -- make sure It's four. Yeah, I was right. 2 which any disclaimer requirements attached. The Commission may find that further 3 And I'll pause -- that's sort of the end of investigation is necessary. If so, we would direct the our investigation. We should move, then, on to the Evaluator to conduct further investigation and report 4 5 5 recommendation phase, which I'll pause before getting back. 6 6 We may find that there is sufficient evidence 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions regarding what 7 to establish that no violation occurred. If so, we 8 we've heard so far? 8 make that finding and announce that fact. 9 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: My only thing is 9 We may find that there is insufficient 10 you used a professional translator, but I don't see a 10 evidence to establish violations occurred. If so, we make that finding and announce that fact. name. I think since it's a public record, I think 11 11 12 It's ---12 Or we may find that, on the preponderance of 13 MR. MILLER: Oh. Okay. So the name of the 13 the evidence, from the entire record of the 14 firm is California Translation Corporation, I believe. 14 proceedings, that a violation has occurred. 15 15 And the particular fellow is actually a fellow who has And I would offer this comment, that it looks 16 16 worked for us before. A year or so ago, there was like Number 2. 17 some -- there was a complaint involving the Jimmy 17 I'll open the floor to Commission discussion 18 Nguyen campaign and involving, in fact, some of the 18 on the case. We need to make a finding for each characters that appear in the story this evening. And 19 Respondent, for each polential violation. We can do it 20 this was the same fellow who ably translated documents 20 by separate motions, one for each Respondent and/or one 21 21 before. I'm afraid I'm going to butcher his name when for each potential violation. I say it, but I'm happy to provide it for the record. 22 Anybody -- comments or motions or --23 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I think we need 23 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: And Number 3. 24 if for the record. 24 there is insufficient evidence? 25 THE WITNESS: His first name is, I think, 25 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Right. The difference Page 10 Page 12 1 Trunc, T-r-u-n-c. And I should just stop there because between 2 and 3 is Number 2, we're sure that nothing I can't recall exactly his last name. And rather than has occurred. And Number 3 is that there is 3 be wrong, I'll just provide it to you later, if that's insufficient evidence. So that's why I said I think 4 all right. 4 it's Number 2. Because it seems completely clear that 5 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: All right. Thank there's not other evidence out there that would come 6 6 forward that would potentially -you. 7 CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess along with that, COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: All right. 8 probably in the future it would probably be a good idea 8 CHAIRMAN SMITH: But you're a lawyer, so you 9 9 to include that In the report somewhere. know better than I do. 10 10 MR. MILLER: Understood. COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: Just asking. 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If no other questions, 11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: If there's no questions or 12 12 normally we would go to the Respondent and the comments, would someone like to make a motion? 13 13 Complainant, if they have got any comments, before they Okay. I'll offer a motion. 14 14 get to the recommendation -- or other persons. But we COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: Go ahead. don't have anybody here. So let's go ahead with the 15 CHAIRMAN SMITH: All right. I would move 16 recommendation. 16 that we find that there is sufficient evidence to 17 17 MR. MILLER: Well, as it turned out, we . establish that no violation occurred by either of the concluded that there was no disclaimer requirement in 18 named respondents. Does that sound right? That's what the first place. We concluded that there was, 19 you basically recommend. 20 20 therefore, no violation of the Municipal Code. And we MR. MILLER: Yes, we don't even consider the 21 recommend that you close the file and take no further 21 newspaper to even be a respondent at this point. But 22 action. they are identified as a respondent. It's certainly in

23

24

25

Municipal Code.

our view that they did not commit any violations of the

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, So if -- somebody

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Questions about that?

Okay. Okay. At this point it's time to make

25 a decision. We have four options. I'm looking ahead

23

24

	Page 13	l	Page 15
	· ·	_	•
1	want to second, and then we can talk	1	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I'll second that.
2	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I would second	2	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, Thank you,
3	that motion.	3	Any discussion?
4	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.	4	Okay. If not, all in favor?
5	To your point, I think we since they were	5	(All Commissioners present responded Aye.)
6	named I understand that they shouldn't have been,	6	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any opposed?
7	but they are,	7	(No response.)
8	MR. MILLER: I agree with you.	8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. So, again, it's four,
9	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So I think we have to	9	zero and one,
10	MR, MILLER: I agree with you.	10	And do we have to we don't have to certify
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further discussion?	11	again on that? Okay. Next time we'll do it a little
12	If not, we'll vote on the motion. All In	12	bit better.
13	favor?	13	And then we also need a motion that the
14	(All Commissioners present responded Aye.)	14	Commission directs the City Attorney to draft a
15	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any opposed?	15	resolution on the Commission's finding and penalties
16	(No response.)	16	no penalties. On the Commission's finding and that the
17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. So it's four in	17	Commission authorizes the Chair to approve and sign the
18	favor, none opposed and one absent.	18	resolution.
19	Okay. And then I got to do upon	19	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I would so move.
20	certification of the mollon, I have to ask each	20	COMMISSIONER LOUIE: Second.
21	Commission member to certify that you have heard or	21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, Any discussion?
22	read the testimony at the hearing and have reviewed all	22	If not, all in favor?
23	the evidence in the record by affirming "so certified."	23	(All Commissioners present responded Aye.)
24	Commissioner Louie?	24	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any opposed?
25	COMMISSIONER LOUIE: So certified.	25	(No response.)
	Page 14		Page 16
1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Commissioner Plerre-Dixon?	1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Again, that's four, zero and
2	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: So certified.	2	one,
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Commissioner Peacock?	3	
4	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: So certified,	4	So we can move on to the second hearing.
5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And me, Commissioner Smith,	5	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: My only
6	so certified.	6	comment I do have a comment.
7	Okay. We have not found any violations, so	7	
8	penalties there are no penalties involved.	8	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is this part of the hearing
9	· •	9	or should I reopen?
	And I don't think we would be having anything	1	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: No, you don't
10	that would require us to or that would suggest that	.10	need to reopen.
11	we should refer anything to any other agency.	11	In reference to the newspaper, they were
12	So I'm missing what I'm missing is we	12	going to print a retraction. My but what I wanted
13	talked about this last time the business about that	13	to understand: Did they understand what they did that
14	we close the file. And I thought I had added that for	14	they should not have done, in terms of putting these
15	my how did that escape me? Maybe I put It in the	15	ads in the paper, in your conversation with them?
16	wrong place.	16	MR. MILLER: He understood that he had
17	Oh, okay. What I should have moved we'll	17	annoyed both of the people identified in his ad.
18	have to go back and have a second motion. What I	18	The Issue of the disclaimer because I had,
19	should have moved I got ahead of myself. That I	19	at that point, not determined that he was not a
20	move that the Elections Commission find that there is	20	respondent and, moreover, that the disclaimer rules did
21	sufficient evidence to establish no violation has	21	not apply to him, I did not have a conversation with
22	occurred and that the file in this matter be closed	22	him about that, to know what he thought about the
23	without further action.	23	activity of just taking an ad and plopping it into a
24	So I'll make a second motion that the file in	24	newspaper. This issue will come up in a few moments,
25	this matter be closed with no further action.	25	In a slightly different scenario, where I think I do

4

7

#### Page 17

- 1 have some concerns about how that works. In this
- particular case, as it seemed to be part of the
- editorial plece and not actually a placing of an ad, I
- did not discuss with him anything like that.
- 5 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: All right. My
- 6 only concern is we have talked before about large
- segments of our population not being aware of rules and
- regulations. And certainly we've run up against this
- before with the Vielnamese community. And when we have
- 10 a public -- we have a publication that is pul out to
- that community that then corrected, my concern is that
- 12 people are gelting the wrong information in that
- 13 community.
- 14 So, Ms. Clerk, I don't know what we can do
- 15 about that, but that may be a matter of trying to
- 16 educate these individuals. Because I think it can
- 17 Impact the elections as we go on further in this
- 18 process, as we have more members of the Vletnamese
- 19 community wanting to run for election and be invoived
- 20 in office, if you have someone just sort of going off
- 21 the grid and then maybe polentially getling lhese
- 22 candidates in trouble for something that they didn't
- 23 have any knowledge of.
  - So I'm seeing this kind of become a
- 25 reoccurring theme. So I'm concerned about that.

## Page 18

- 1 MS. TABER: Point taken.
- 2 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: All right. Thank
- 3 you.

6

24

- 4 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. We can start with the
- 5 second hearing.
  - Okay. I'm going to repeat some but not ail
- of the front-end stuff. Again, It is Wednesday,
- June 11, 2014, and this hearing of the City of San Jose
- Ethics Commission is being held in Room W-262 in San
- Jose City Hall. All members of the Commission are
- 11 present except Commissioner Edgeworth.
- 12 Commission will conduct a hearing on a
- 13 complaint filed on May 9th, 2014, by Duc Lam alleging
- 14 that Van Le and the Van Le for City Council 2014
- 15 Commiltee violated Section 12.06.1010 of the San Jose
- 16 Municipal Code. Specifically, the allegation is that
- 17 the Respondents placed a magazine advertisement that
- 18 did not contain the correct "paid for by..." disclaimer
- 19 required by the Municipal Code. The City Clerk
- 20 notified and provided a copy of the complaint to the
- 21 Independent Evaluator on May 9th, 2014, and the
- 22 Evaluator notified and provided a copy to the
- 23 Respondents on May 12th, 2014. The Independent
- 24 Evaluator's Report and Recommendations were submitted
- 25 to the City Clerk on June 3, 2014, and copies were then

#### Page 19

- provided to the Complainant, Respondent and Commission
- members and posted on the City web site with the agenda
- 3 for tonight's meeting.
  - I'm not going to repeat -- I don't need to
- 5 repeat the material about 76954, et cetera, because
- 6 It's good.
  - And I'm not going to repeat the stuff about
- this is open to the public, et cetera. We just
- discussed -- and since there's no one here from the 10
- 11 And I won't ask the Complainant or
- 12 Respondents to identify themselves because they're not
- 13
- 14 And I don't think I need to reidentify City
- 15 Staff and representatives of Hanson Bridgett, because
- 16 we did that on the other hearing.
- 17 And, again, under our regulations, the
- 18 Respondent may submit a written response. And as in
- 19 the last case, we did not have anything in writing that
- 20 i'm aware of or anybody indicating otherwise.
- 21 Again, the Complainant or any interested
- 22 person may also submit a brief or written argument.
- 23 And we don't have anything there.
  - So we're back to the independent Evaluator to
- 25 describe what ---

24

1

#### Page 20

- MR, MILLER: Thank you.
- 2 So this is similar to the complaint we just
- discussed and also similar to a complaint filed by the
- same Complainant against the same Respondent that came
- 5 up last month.
- 6 And just a brief editorial comment as I'm
- thinking about your comment of a moment ago. The
- Complainant in both of these ceses, but here in
- 9 particular, was a Respondent in an earlier complaint.
- 10 And I think there is at least one member of the
- 11 Vietnamese community who is now very aware of these
- 12 rules and is interested in --
- 13 COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: Making sure we're
- 14 following them.

15

22

25

- MR. MILLER: -- in compliance and making sure
- 16 that people follow. So I think the City Clerk's
- 17 efforts are very proved in that regard -- this is the
- 18 second from him in two months.
- 19 The facts are a little similar in that they
- 20 Involve the same law, the disclaimer rules, the "paid
- 21 for by..." rules. And they involve what looks like an
- 23 to the owner of the magazine in question and engaged

advertisement. Again, we spoke to the Respondent and

- 24 the same translator whose name I will provide for you.
  - There's no question that this document would

#### Page 21

meet the definition of an election -- electioneering communication. It looks like an ad, it urges people

to vote for the candidate. Unlike the first complaint,

there is no additional editorial component that would give anyone looking at this any indication other than

that this is a campaign ad.

However, what our investigation revealed to my satisfaction -- I have no reason to doubt the

credibility of the folks I've spoken to -- the 9

10 candidate, the Respondent, had no knowledge of this

11 being placed. Dldn't pay anything for it. And

12 identified this document as a flyer that she had handed

13 out a few months earlier at some events in the

14 Vietnamese community. And publisher confirmed that the

15 magazine took that flyer and just reprinted it in its 16 entirety.

And so we reached the same conclusions that we reached in the last complaint, which is that it is not an electioneering communication because there was

no payment made for -- made for il. And that even had 21 there been, the Respondents didn't pay for it and so

22 it's not subject to the disclaimer requirements. And

23 the magazine is exempt from the requirements, and so 24 there essentially would be no disclaimer requirements.

25 Now, I will note one other interesting aspect

#### Page 23

contribution?

2 MR. MILLER: That's exactly right. That's 3

4 The result of that, I call to your attention, 5

is that there was in this magazine e -- what anyone

looking at it would think was an ad is a disclaimer that's incorrect. And so the public has no way of

8 knowing who actually funded this. And I think that's

9 worth thinking about, and perhaps you may want to talk

10

11 I think there ere some, perhaps -- I know the

12 City Attorney may want to weigh in also -- there are

some First Amendment issues dealing with how you -- how

14 the -- how might one instruct the newspaper to put

15 appropriate disclaimers on it. And I think you quickly

16 get into some complex First Amendment Issues.

17 Certainly beyond the scope of this complaint. I just

would flag this. 18

19 And maybe I should restrain myself and get 20 back to the matter at hand, which is that we concluded

21 that there was no violation of the Municipal Code

22 because there were no disclaimer requirements that

23 attached to this particular document,

24 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Any questions or 25 comments before we go on to recommendations?

#### Page 22

- of -- interesting, at least, to me and I hope to you --
- that there is -- even under the facts I just described,
- there is an avenue by which one would have some
- concern. The Code defines a contribution made at the
- behest -- a contribution to include an expenditure made
- by someone at the behest of the candidate. And so had
- there been some kind of coordination or even
- consultation or even knowledge by the candidate, if
- the -- you know, the publisher had said, "Hey, I would
- 10 like to help you. Could I put this ad in my newspaper
- 11 and not charge you for it?" we might have a very
- 12 different set of facts, because that might be treated
- as a contribution to the candidate by the magazine. 13
- 14 And those facts were the ones that came up a few years
- 15 ago in this Jimmy Nyugen affair that we discussed
- 16

17

25

17

18

19

But there was -- not only was there no 18 evidence that there was that kind of consultation;

there was evidence that there was no consultation. And 19 20 so I don't think there would be a need to treat the

21 expenditure as a contribution.

22 CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would be an in-kind 23 contribution in that case?

24 MR. MILLER: Excuse me?

CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would be an in-kind

#### Page 24

1 Yes.

7

8

- 2 COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: One question. This is
- 3 sort of helping me clarify this. If I'm the publisher
- 4 and I find this ad, I don't coordinate with anybody and
- 5 put it in the paper, run it -- basically what we're
- saying, this situation here.
  - MR. MILLER: Right.
  - COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: If I'm not the
- 9 publisher but I'm just an independent person, I go to
- 10 the paper and say, I would like to pay for this thing
- 11 to run -- the exact same thing -- and pay for it to be
- included, is -- and, again, no coordination with the
- 13 candidate -- is there -- is that the same side of the
- 14 line or is that a different issue?
- 15
- MR. MILLER: The newspaper is the same in the
- 16 two scenarios you just described.
- 17 COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Uh-huh.
- 18 MR. MtLLER: But you -- if you now are the
- 19 person who paid the newspaper to place the ad --
- 20 COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Right.
- 21 MR. MILLER: -- you have now made an
- 22 expenditure. And depending on the amount of money you
- 23 have expended --
- 24 COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Right.
- 25 MR. MILLER: -- you may have certain

Г	Page 25		Page 27
,		1	below that threshold, I think there is also a calegory
1 2	reporting obligations.  COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Right.	2	of people for which the disclaimer requirements
3	MR, MILLER: And the money you have spent	3	technically would not apply.
4	would have to be treated as a contribution to the	4	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Okay, So If I'm the
5	candidate.	5	publisher of the paper and I have that I'm foregoing
6	CHAIRMAN SMITH; Would it be or would it be	6	some income by doing that, correct? So I could sell
7	treated as an independent expenditure?	7	I don't care how big the space is. I could sell that?
8	MR. MILLER: Could be. Depends on facts we	8	MR. MILLER: Absolutely.
9	don't know.	9	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: And so I'm basically
10		10	making an in-kind contribution there, correct?
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: If you didn't If you didn't talk to the candidate, as he described it	11	MR. MILLER: Except that these disclaimer
12	MR. MILLER: If there's absolutely no	12	rules do not apply to newspapers.
13	consultation of any sort, I think you're right. It	13	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Right.
14	would not be a contribution. It would be an	14	MR. MILLER: So the value that you are
15	independent expenditure.	15	foregoing is not, I think, relevant to the issue of
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And you would have to	16	whether you need to put a disclaimer.
17	register as an independent	17	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: I guess that what I'm
18	MR. MILLER: Depending on the amount of money	18	saying, though, is the I understand it's what the
19	that you	19	newspaper runs, is one thing. But I, as the
20	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, it's only when it's	20	publisher I'm essentially making an in-kind
21	above a thousand or something that you have to	21	contribution, correct, by doing that?
22	register?	22	MR. MILLER: Yes, I do understand, So if
23	MS. TABER; I'm not quoting amounts, But	23	you If Il cosis \$5,000 to place an ad in your
24	they can file as a major donor. If there is an	24	newspaper and you are the publisher
25	individual person and it's the only money they're	25	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Right.
25		-	
	Page 26		Page 28
1	giving, they can file I can't remember the name of	1	MR. MILLER: and you print the candidate's
2	the form the number of the form, but they can file a	2	ad, you don't violate the disclaimer requirements
3	major donor form.	3	because there are no disclaimer requirements on the
4	MS, SILVA: II's 461.	4	newspaper. But, yes, you have made an independent
5	MS. TABER: 461.	.5	expenditure. That's why in your report you'll notice
6	MR. MILLER: So, again, in addition to that,	6	that I mentioned that the value of the ad was \$25 is
7	I think under your ordinance the disclaimer	7	what they had foregone, which would be below the
8	requirements would apply well, now you raise an	В	threshold where reporting of an independent expenditure
9	Interesting question. Because if you look let's	9	would be required.
10	see. Why am I not finding	10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: is it below the point where
11	CHAIRMAN SMITH: That would have to identify	11	some disclaimer is required, though?
12	the person who paid.	12	MR. MILLER: The disclaimer requirements do
13	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Uh-huh.	13	not attach to dollar value, except in that they attach
14	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Rather than the candidate.	14	to an independent committee. And you don't become an
15	MS. TABER: Right.	15	independent committee until you pass over a dollar
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: They would have to have them	16	threshold. Does that make sense?
17	change the ad.	17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: So they didn't need to print
18	MR, MILLER: So you have your disclaimer	18	any disclosure as distinguished from the previous
19	rules apply to election communications paid for by the	19	complaint, where it was clearly editorial because they
20	candidate and to electioneering communications paid for	20	had some additional stuff
21	by an independent committee.	21	MR. MILLER: Right.
22	MS. TABER: For whom the City Clerk is the	22	CHAIRMAN SMITH: In this case they just
23	filling officer.	23	printed the ad
24	MR. MILLER: So to be an Independent	24	MR. MILLER: I think this is where you
	committee, there is a dollar threshold. So if you were	25	start getting into First Amendment issues. It's who's

	Page 29		Page 31
1	to say that that's not an editorial decision to do	1	the same situation, where we have sufficient evidence
2	that.	2	to establish no violation has occurred.
3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: But is this the one I've	3	So the motion would be since I'm reading
4	forgotten from reading the two reports. Is this the	4	it, I'll just go ahead and make a motion. I move that
5	one where the disclaimer is there, but it's too small	5	the Elections Commission find that there is sufficient
6	to read, and It gives the FPPC number rather than the	6	evidence to establish that no violation has occurred
7	address or	7	and that the file in this matter be closed without
8	MR. MILLER: 1 think that's both that	8	further action. And I should mention that that would
9	describes both.	9	apply to both Respondents.
10	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that true for both?	10	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I would second
11	Okay.	11	that motion.
12	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: But if there were a	12	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Any discussion on the
13	higher dollar amount, then we could be talking about an	13	motion?
14	In-kind contribution	14	If not, all in favor?
15	MR. MILLER: That's correct.	15	(All Commissioners present responded Aye.)
16	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK; Issue in this case	16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any opposed?
17	because of the 25.	17	(No response.)
18	MR. MILLER: That's exactly right.	18	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. It's, once again,
19	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: Thank you.	19	four-zero and one missing.
20	MR. MILLER: I'll also mention that there is	20	Okay. And I need to ask each of you lo
21	a requirement, I think, also not doesn't attach to	21	certify that you have heard or read the testimony at
22	newspapers and outside the authority of the Elections	22	the hearing and have reviewed all the evidence in the
23	Commission, and it's not even in the Political Reform	23	record by affirming "so certified."
24	Act, which has rules that get swept into your Code by	24	Commissioner Louie?
25	reference. But the Elections Code of California has a	25	COMMISSIONER LOUIE: So certified.
	Page 30		Page 32
1	requirement that advertisements in newspapers have to	1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Commissioner Pierre-Dixon?
2	say "political advertisement." But that is a it is	2	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: So certified,
3	a requirement for which there is no remedy. There is	3	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Commissioner Peacock?
4	no enforcement mechanism. And so it just sort of sits	4	COMMISSIONER PEACOCK: So certified.
5	there in the statute book without, you know	5	CHAIRMAN SMITH: And me, Commissioner Smith,
6	MS. SILVA: Teeth.	6	so certified,
7	MR. MILLER: Without teeth or much attention.	7	There are no orders or penaltles because we
8	MS. SILVA: It's actually a recommendation to	8	closed the file. And no need to refer enything to
9	the FPPC.	9	other agencies.
10	MR. MILLER: Oh.	10	So at this point I would entertain a motion
11	MS. SILVA: It just says "recommended,"	11	that the Commission directs the City Attorney to draft
12	Elections Code.	12	a Resolution of the Commission's findings and that the
13	MR. MILLER: Well, there you go. So they	13	Commission authorizes the Chair to approve and sign the
14	recommend compliance with the Elections Code but lack	14	Resolution.
15	the ability to do anything about it.	15	COMMISSIONER PIERRE-DIXON: I would so move.
16	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any other	16	COMMISSIONER LOUIE: I'll second,
17	questions before we go to recommendations?	17	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thenk you.
18	l think we're ready.	18	Discussion?
19	MR. MILLER: Okay. So our recommendation,	19	Okay. If not, all in favor?
20	given that we found no violation of the Municipal Code,	20	(All Commissioners present responded Aye.)
21	is that you close the file on the matter and take no	21	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any opposed?
22	further action, find no violations.	22	(No response.)
23	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. So, according to our	23	III
24	options I don't need to read our options since we	24	III
25	talked about it last time. I think I think this is	25	

	Page 33	
		·
1	CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Once again, it's	
2	four-zero-one.	
4	And I will declare the hearing to be closed. (Whereupon, Item III Hearings adjourned at	
5	(vviereupon, item in Hearings adjourned at 6:21 p.m.)	<u>-</u>
6	0.21 p.m.)	
7		
8		• •
9		·
10		
11		
12		
13		·
14		
15		
16		·
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		•
25		·
	Page 34	
1	Page 34	
1 2		
	Page 34  I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the	
2	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to	
2 3 4 5	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction.	
2 3 4 5 6	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in	
2 3 4 5 6 7	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in	
2 3 4 5 6 7	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the outcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, NOELIA ESPINOLA, do hereby certify: That said hearing was taken down by me at the time and place therein named, and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription under my direction. I further certify that I am not interested in the cutcome of this hearing.	

	1	1	1 .	1
A	ahead 10:15,25	23:23	campaign 9:18	26:11,14,16
ability 30:15	12:14 14:19	attention 23:4	21:6	28:10,17,22
ably 9:20	31:4	30:7	candidate 7:2,21	29:3,10 30:16
absent 13:18	allegation 3:22	Attorney 2:7	7:22 8:11,23	30:23 31:12,16
absolutely 25:12	18:16	5:14 6:22	8:24 21:3,10	31:18 32:1,3,5
27:8	alleged 8:12	15:14 23:12	22:6,8,13	32:17,21 33:1
Act 29:24	alleges 6:17 7:9	32:11	24:13 25:5,11	change 6:2
action 10:22	alleging 3:20	authority 29:22	26:14,20	26:17
14:23,25 30:22	18:13	authorizes 15:17	candidates 7:12	characters 9:19
31:8	allow 6:8	32:13	17:22	charge 22:11
activity 16:23	Amendment	avenue 2:13	candidate's 28:1	CHRIS 2:5
ad 8:2,12,12	23:13,16 28:25	22:3	care 27:7	City 1:1,13,14
16:17,23 17:3	amount 24:22	aware 5:21 17:7	case 3:12 8:25	2:7,9,10 3:15
21:2,6 22:10	25:18 29:13	19:20 20:11	11:18 17:2	3:25 4:6,8,10
23:6 24:4,19	amounts 25:23	Aye 13:14 15:5	19:19 22:23	5:10,14,14,15
26:17 27:23	and/or 5:6 11:20	15:23 31:15	28:22 29:16	6:22 15:14
28:2,6,23	announce 11:8	32:20	cases 20:8	18:8,10,14,19
added 6:19	11:11		category 27:1	18:25 19:2,14
14:14	annoyed 7:24	B	certain 24:25	20:16 23:12
addition 26:6	16:17	back 11:5 14:18	certainly 12:22	26:22 32:11
additional 21:4	anybody 10:15	19:24 23:20	17:8 23:17	Clara 1:13
28:20	11:22 19:20	basically 12:19	certification	clarify 24:3
address 29:7	24:4	24:5 27:9	13:20	clear 7:11 12:4
1	appear 9:19	behest 22:5,6	certified 13:23	clearly 28:19
adjourned 33:4 adopted 4:10,15	apply 4:21 6:24	believe 8:6 9:14	13:25 14:2,4,6	Clerk 2:9,10 4:1
ads 16:15	8:18 16:21	better 12:9	31:23,25 32:2	4:6 5:14,15
ADVANTAGE	26:8,19 27:3	15:12	32:4,6	17:14 18:19,25
2:12	27:12 31:9	beyond 23:17	certify 13:21	26:22
advertisement	appropriate	big 27:7	15:10 31:21	Clerk's 20:16
3:23 7:9,16,19	23:15	bit 15:12	34:2,6	close 10:21
18:17 20:22	approve 15:17	book 30:5	cetera 19:5,8	14:14 30:21
30:2	32:13	Bridgett 5:11,13	Chair 2:4 4:24	closed 14:22,25
advertisements	April 4:10	6:10 19:15	5:4 15:17	16:3 31:7 32:8
30:1	argument 6:2,3	brief 6:1 19:22	32:13	33:3
affair 22:15	19:22	20:6	CHAIRMAN	Code 3:22,25
affirmation 4:22	arguments 5:19	brush 8:3	3:2,6,10 5:25	6:20,23 8:14
affirming 13:23	Arlene 2:7 5:13	business 14:13	9:7 10:7,11,23	10:20 12:24
31:23	asking 12:10	butcher 9:21	11:25 12:8,11	18:16,19 22:4
afraid 9:21	aspect 21:25		12:15,25 13:4	23:21 29:24,25
agencies 32:9	Assistant 2:10	C	13:9,11,15,17	30:12,14,20
agency 14:11	5:15	C 2:2 3:1	14:1,3,5 15:2,6	come 12:5 16:24
agency 14.11 agenda 4:9 19:2	associated 7:24	CA 1:15 2:14	15:8,21,24	comment 11:15
age 10a 4.9 19:2 ago 9:16 20:7	attach 8:16,23	California 9:14	16:1,7 18:4	16:6,6 20:6,7
22:15	28:13,13 29:21	29:25	22:22,25 23:24	commentaries
agree 13:8,10	attached 9:2	call 7:10 23:4	25:6,10,16,20	8:18
agree 17.0'IA		·		

				. A. S.
commentary	communicatio	22:19 25:13	24:22 25:18	7:5 9:20
7:11 8:13	8:24 26:19,20	contain 3:24	Depends 25:8	doing 27:6,21
comments 10:13	community 17:9	5:19 18:18	Deputy 2:7 5:14	dollar 26:25
11:22 12:12	17:11,13,19	contribution	describe 19:25	28:13,15 29:13
23:25	20:11 21:14	22:4,5,13,21	described 8:10	donor 25:24
Commission 1:2	compel 4:24,25	22:23 23:1	22:2 24:16	26:3
2:4 3:14,16,18	compile 4:20	25:4,14 27:10	25:11	doubt 21:8
4:8,17 5:2,3	Complainant	27:21 29:14	describes 29:9	draft 15:14
11:2,17 13:21	4:7,23 5:5,8,25	conversation	despite 7:1	32:11
14:20 15:14,17	6:5 7:13,23	16:15,21	determine 6:21	Duc 18:13
18:9,10,12	10:13 19:1,11	coordinate 24:4	determined 7:21	Duc 10,15
19:1 29:23	19:21 20:4,8	coordination	16:19	E
31:5 32:11,13	complained 7:25	22:7 24:12	difference 11:25	E 1:13 2:2,2 3:1
Commissioner	complaint 3:19	copies 4:6,14 7:4	different 16:25	3:1
3:16 9:9,23	4:1 6:15,17 7:9	18:25	22:12 24:14	earlier 20:9
10:5 11:23	9:17 18:13,20	copy 4:1,3 7:16	direct 11:3	21:13 22:16
12:7,10,14	20:2,3,9 21:3	18:20,22	direction 34:5	Edgeworth 3:17
13:2,24,25	21:18 23:17	Corporation	directs 15:14	18:11
14:1,2,3,4,5	28:19	9:14	32:11	editions 7:17
15:1,19,20	complaints 4:17	correct 3:24	disclaimer 3:25	editorial 7:11,12
16:5,9 17:5	completely 12:4	5:23,24 18:18	6:18,19,23	17:3 20:6 21:4
18:2,11 20:13	complex 23:16	1	, ,	28:19 29:1
24:2,8,17,20	compliance	27:6,10,21 29:15	8:16,22 9:2	editorials 8:18
24:24 25:2	20:15 30:14	!	10:18 16:18,20	educate 17:16
26:13 27:4,9	1	corrected 17:11	18:18 20:20	efforts 20:17
•	component 21:4	correctly 6:23	21:22,24 23:6	either 12:17
27:13,17,25	computerized 34:5	costs 27:23	23:22 26:7,18	election 17:19
29:12,16,19	1 1 1 1	Council 4:10	27:2,11,16	21:1 26:19
31:10,24,25	concern 17:6,11	18:14	28:2,3,11,12	electioneering
32:1,2,3,4,5,15 32:16	22:4	court 4:19	29:5	8:15,21,23
	concerned 17:25	credibility 21:9	disclaimers	
Commissioners	concerning 7:12	CSR 1:17 2:13	23:15	21:1,19 26:20 elections 2:4
13:14 15:5,23	concerns 17:1	34:11	disclosure 28:18	
31:15 32:20	concluded 8:21	D	discretion 5:2	14:20 17:17
Commission's	9:1 10:18,19	D 3:1	discuss 17:4	29:22,25 30:12
4:11 5:11,16	23:20	Date 1:11	discussed 19:9	30:14 31:5
6:7 15:15,16	conclusions	Dated 34:10	20:3 22:15	electronically
32:12	21:17	· ·	discussion 11:17	4:19
commit 12:23	conduct 3:18	dealing 23:13 decision 10:25	13:11 15:3,21	enforcement
committee 3:20	11:4 18:12	29:1	31:12 32:18	30:4
6:16 18:15	confirm 8:9		distinguished	engaged 7:3
26:21,25 28:14	confirmed 21:14	declare 33:3	28:18	20:23
28:15	consider 6:25	defines 22:4	document 9:1	ensure 4:16
communication	12:20	definition 8:14	20:25 21:12	entertain 32:10
8:15,17,22	consultation	21:1	23:23	entire 11:13
21:2,19	6:22 22:8,18	depending	documents 5:1	entirety 21:16

///				
escape 14:15	22:12,14 25:8	found 14:7	handed 21:12	indisputably
Espinola 1:17	fair 4:16	30:20	Hanson 5:11,13	8:25
2:12 34:2,11	far 9:8	four 10:25 11:1	6:10 19:15	individual 25:25
essentially 21:24	favor 7:14 13:13	13:17 15:8	happy 9:22	individuals
27:20	13:18 15:4,22	16:1	heard 9:8 13:21	17:16
establish 11:7	31:14 32:19	four-zero 31:19	31:21	information
11:10 12:17	fellow 9:15,15	four-zero-one	hearing 3:12,14	5:20 17:12
14:21 31:2,6	9:20	33:2	3:18 4:9,18,21	initiative 8:1
establishes 4:11	felt 8:2	<b>FPPC</b> 29:6 30:9	13:22 16:3,4,7	inserted 7:16
et 19:5,8	file 10:21 14:14	front-end 18:7	18:5,8,12	instruct 23:14
Ethics 1:2 3:14	14:22,24 25:24	funded 23:8	19:16 31:22	insufficient 11:9
18:9	26:1,2 30:21	further 10:21	33:3 34:3,7	11:24 12:3
Evaluator 4:2,3	31:7 32:8	11:2,4 13:11	hearings 4:13	interested 6:1
5:1,4,12 6:8	filed 3:19 18:13	14:23,25 17:17	33:4	19:21 20:12
11:4 18:21,22	20:3	30:22 31:8	held 3:14 18:9	34:6
19:24	filing 26:23	34:6	help 22:10	interesting
Evaluator's 4:5	find 11:2,6,9,12	future 10:8	helping 24:3	21:25 22:1
18:24	12:16 14:20		Hey 22:9	26:9
evening 6:13	24:4 30:22	G	higher 29:13	investigation 9:4
9:19	31:5	$\mathbf{G}3:1$	hope 22:1	11:3,4 21:7
events 21:13	finding 11:8,11	getting 9:5	hope 22.1	investigations
evidence 4:21,24	11:18 15:15,16	17:12,21 28:25	I	4:12 7:7
5:20 11:6,10	26:10	give 21:5	idea 10:8	involve 20:20,21
11:13,24 12:3	findings 32:12	given 30:20	identified 6:15	involved 14:8
12:5,16 13:23	firm 6:11 9:14	gives 29:6	7:1 12:22	17:19
14:21 22:18,19	first 3:2,11 6:14	giving 26:1	16:17 21:12	involving 9:17
31:1,6,22	6:21 8:5 9:25	go 10:12,15	identify 5:6,10	9:18
exact 24:11	10:19 21:3	12:14 14:18	19:12 26:11	in-kind 22:22,25
exactly 10:2	23:13,16 28:25	17:17 23:25	III 33:4	27:10,20 29:14
23:2,3 29:18	flag 23:18	24:9 30:13,17	impact 17:17	issue 7:19 16:18
excluded 5:2	floor 11:17	31:4	implicates 6:17	16:24 24:14
	i i	going 3:3 9:21	include 10:9	27:15 29:16
exculpatory 5:20	flowery 8:9	16:12 17:20	22:5	
Excuse 22:24	flyer 21:12,15 folks 21:9	18:6 19:4,7	included 24:12	issues 23:13,16 28:25
exempt 21:23	follow 20:16	good 6:13 10:8	income 27:6	Item 33:4
exempt 21,23 expended 24:23	followed 7:14	19:6	incorrect 23:7	1tem 55.4
expended 24:25 expenditure		Graves 2:10	independent 4:2	J
22:5,21 24:22	following 20:14	5:15	4:4 5:11 6:8	Jimmy 9:17
1 -	foregoing 27:5 27:15	grid 17:21	18:21,23 19:24	22:15
25:7,15 28:5,8		guess 10:7 27:17	24:9 25:7,15	Jose 1:1,13,15
F	foregone 28:7	Page 10.1 2/11	25:17 26:21,24	2:4,14 3:14,15
F 2:7	forgot 6:2	H	28:4,8,14,15	3:22 18:8,10
fact 7:10,23 9:18	forgotten 29:4	Hall 1:13,14	indicated 6:17	18:15
11:8,11	form 26:2,2,3	3:15 18:10	indicating 19:20	June 1:11 3:13
facts 20:19 22:2	formal 4:20	hand 23:20	indicating 19:20	18:8,25
Answer auti / Latin	forward 12:6		AMMANGERUM ZI,J	10,0,20

K	22:13 23:5	months 20:18	newspapers	Okey-doke 6:13
kind 17:24 22:7	major 25:24	21:13	8:19 27:12	once 31:18 33:1
22:18	26:3	motion 12:12,13	29:22 30:1	ones 22:14
know 3:3 5:12	making 20:13	13:3,12,20	Nguyen 3:11,19	open 4:18 11:17
8:11 12:9	20:15 27:10,20	14:18,24 15:13	3:20 6:16 9:18	19:8
16:22 17:14	material 19:5	31:3,4,11,13	Noelia 1:17 2:12	opposed 13:15
22:9 23:11	matter 14:22,25	32:10	34:2,11	13:18 15:6,24
25:9 30:5	17:15 23:20	motions 11:20	normally 10:12	31:16 32:21
knowing 23:8	30:21 31:7	11:22	note 5:8 21:25	options 10:25
knowledge	Mayor 3:20	move 9:4 12:15	notice 28:5	30:24,24
17:23 21:10	mechanism 30:4	14:20 15:19	notified 4:1,3	order 4:15
22:8	meet 21:1	16:4 31:4	18:20,22	orders 32:7
known 7:22	meeting 19:3	32:15	number 1:18	ordinance 26:7
	member 13:21	moved 14:17,19	11:16,23 12:1	original 8:8
L	20:10	Municipal 3:22	12:2,4 26:2	outcome 34:7
lack 30:14	members 3:15	3:25 6:19,23	29:6	outside 29:22
Lam 18:13	4:8 5:3 17:18	10:20 12:24	Nyugen 22:15	owner 20:23
large 17:6	18:10 19:2	18:16,19 23:21	0	o0o 2:17
law 6:11 20:20	mention 6:14	30:20	O3:1	P
lawyer 12:8	29:20 31:8	N	oath 4:22	P 2:2,2 3:1
Le 18:14,14	mentioned 28:6	N 2:2 3:1		,
legal 5:19	MICHAEL 2:4	name 3:8 9:11	obligations 25:1	paid 3:24 6:18
LEON 2:5	Miller 5:13 6:10	9:13,21,25	11:10,14 12:2	7:17,18,22
let's 10:15 26:9	6:13 9:13	10:2 20:24	12:17 14:22	8:17,24 18:18
License 1:18	10:10,17 12:20	26:1	31:2,6	20:20 24:19
Lincoln 2:13	13:8,10 16:16	named 12:18	offer 11:15	26:12,19,20
line 24:14	20:1,15 22:24	13:6 34:4	12:13	paper 16:15
little 15:11	23:2 24:7,15	necessary 11:3	offered 8:7	24:5,10 27:5
20:19	24:18,21,25	need 9:23 11:18	office 17:20	part 8:12 16:7 17:2
Location 1:13	25:3,8,12,18	15:13 16:10	officer 26:23	particular 7:19
look 26:9	26:6,18,24	19:4,14 22:20	Oh 3:10 9:13	9:15 17:2 20:9
looking 10:25	27:8,11,14,22	27:16 28:17	14:17 25:20	23:23
21:5 23:6	28:1,12,21,24	30:24 31:20	30:10	parties 4:13
looks 7:8 11:15	29:8,15,18,20	32:8	okay 3:6,10,11	parties 4.13 pass 28:15
20:21 21:2	30:7,10,13,19	neither 5:8	5:25 6:7 9:13	pause 9:3,5
Louie 2:5 13:24	minutes 3:7	newly 6:19	10:24,24 12:13	pause 9.3,3 pay 8:11 21:11
13:25 15:20	missing 14:12	News 3:21	12:25 13:17,19	21:21 24:10,1
31:24,25 32:16	14:12 31:19	newspaper 3:23	14:7,17 15:2,4	payment 21:20
umping 8:1	mitigating 5:20 mixture 7:20	6:16,24,25 7:3	15:8,11,21	Peacock 2:5
M	mixture 7:20 moment 20:7	7:14,18,25 8:4	18:4,6 23:24	14:3,4 24:2,8
Madison 3:20	moment 20:7 moments 16:24	8:13 12:21	27:4 29:11	24:17,20,24
6:16	moments 16:24 money 24:22	16:11,24 22:10	30:19,23 31:12	25:2 26:13
nagazine 18:17	•	23:14 24:15,19	31:18,20 32:17	27:4,9,13,17
20:23 21:15,23	25:3,18,25 month 20:5	27:19,24 28:4	32:19 33:1	27:25 29:12,16

12:6 17:21 preponderance 11:12	Q question 7:5 20:23,25 24:2	reference 16:11 29:25 Reform 29:23	30:1,3 requirements 6:18,19,24	29:18 ROLANDA 2:4 Room 1:14 3:15
11:21 potentially 3:4	<b>p.m</b> 1:12 33:5	refer 14:11 32:8	requirement 10:18 29:21	25:2,13 26:15 27:13,25 28:21
potential 11:19	putting 16:14	recorded 4:19 reduced 34:4	18:19 28:9,11	24:7,20,24
posted 4:8 19:2	24:5 27:16	13:23 31:23	required 3:25	18:2 23:2,3
population 17:7	22:10 23:14	9:22,24 11:13	require 14:10	12:18 17:5
30:2	put 14:15 17:10	record 5:7 9:11	reprinting 8:2	11:25 12:7,15
political 29:23	27:5,20,24	30:11	reprinted 21:15	right 10:4,5 11:1
28:10 32:10	22:9 24:3,9	recommended	5:6 19:15	31;22
16:3,19 18:1	7:15,25 21:14	30:17	representatives	reviewed 13:22
12:21 13:5	publisher 7:3,10	18:24 23:25	5:10	revealed 21:7
point 6:14 10:24	17:10	4:5 5:18 6:9,11	representative	retractions 8:4
plopping 16:23	publication	recommendati	reports 29:4	16:12
17:3	23:7	30:8,19	25:1 28:8	retraction 8:7
placing 8:11	17:10 19:8,10	9:5 10:14,16	reporting 2:12	results 7:7
18:17 21:11	public 4:18 9:11	recommendati	1:8	result 23:19
27:23 34:4 placed 3:23	providing 4:24	30:14	REPORTER'S	restrain 23:19
27:23 34:4	4:14 18:20,22 19:1	10:21 12:19	reporter 2:12 4:20	15:7,25 19:18 31:17 32:22
place 10:19 14:16 24:19	provided 4:1,3,7	recommend	Reported 1:17	5:19,22 13:16
32:15	10:3 20:24	5:4	28:5	response 5:18
31:10 32:1,2	provide 7:4 9:22	recognized 3:8	11:4 18:24	21:21 31:9
18:2 20:13	proved 20:17	recognize 6:10	6:9,11 10:9	18:17,23 19:12
16:5,9 17:5	9:10	reason 21:8 recall 10:2	report 4:5 5:18	6:15 12:18
14:1,2 15:1,19	professional 7:4	ready 30:18 reason 21:8	19:5,7	3:23 5:6,9,17
12:14 13:2	production 4:25	29:4 31:3	repeat 18:6 19:4	respondents
11:23 12:7,10	process 17:18	reading 6:22	reopen 16:8,10	20:22 21:10
2:4 9:9,23 10:5	4:13 11:14	30:24 31:21	17:25	19:1,18 20:4,9
Pierre-Dixon	proceedings 1:8	read 13:22 29:6	reoccurring	12:21,22 16:20
piece 17:3	4:15 5:17 6:8	21:18	26:1	10:12 11:19,20
phase 9:5	procedures 4:12	reached 21:17	remember 3:5	7:16,17,23 8:6
pertaining 4:12	probably 10:8,8	raise 26:8	remedy 30:3	4:7 5:22 7:1,13
persons 10:14	8:6 28:23	R2:2 3:1	remarks 7:12	respondent 4:4
26:12	printed 7:10 8:4	R	27:15	32:20
24:9,19 25:25	28:17	quoting 25,25	relevant 4:25	15:5,23 31:15
person 6:1 19:22	print 16:12 28:1	quoting 25:23	reidentify 19:14	responded 13:1
21:2 27:2	pretty 7.8 previous 28:18	quite 8:9	17:8 19:17	15:18 32:12,1
people 16:17 17:12 20:16	presented 6:12 pretty 7:8	quickly 23:15	regulations 4:12 4:15 5:16 6:7	4:14,16 15:15
15:15,16 32:7	į.	30:17		27:2 28:2,3,12 resolution 4:11
penalties 14:8,8	15:5,23 18:11 31:15 32:20	9:7 10:11,23 12:11 23:24	register 25:17 25:22	23:22 26:8
29:19 32:3,4	6:11 13:14	questions 5:3	regarding 9:7	21:22,23,24

rules 4:21 16:20	site 4:8 19:2	story 9:19	31:21	9:10 20:24	
17:7 20:12,20	sits 30:4	straightforward	Thank 10:5 13:4	treat 22:20	
20:21 26:19	situation 24:6	7:8	15:2 18:2 20:1	treated 4:23	
27:12 29:24	31:1	Street 1:13	29:19 32:17	22:12 25:4,7	
run 7:17,19 17:8	slightly 16:25	stuff 18:7 19:7	theme 17:25	trouble 17:22	
17:19 24:5,11	small 29:5	28:20	thing 9:9 24:10	true 29:10	
runs 27:19	Smith 2:4 3:2,6	subject 21:22	24:11 27:19	Trunc 10:1	
~	3:10 5:25 9:7	submit 5:17 6:1	things 7:21	trying 17:15	
<u>S</u>	10:7,11,23	19:18,22	think 8:20 9:11	turned 7:20	
\$2:23:1	11:25 12:8,11	submittal 6:5	9:11,23,25	10:17	
San 1:1,13,15	12:15,25 13:4	submitted 4:5	12:3 13:5,9	two 6:15 7:12	
2:4,14 3:14,15	13:9,11,15,17	18:24	14:9 16:25	8:4 20:18	
3:21 18:8,9,15	14:1,3,5,5 15:2	subpoena 5:1	17:16 19:14	24:16 29:4	
Santa 1:13	15:6,8,21,24	subsequently	20:10,16 22:20	T-r-u-n-c 10:1	
satisfaction 21:8	16:1,7 18:4	6:12	23:6,8,11,15		
satisfy 8:5	22:22,25 23:24	sufficient 11:6	25:13 26:7	U	
saying 24:6	25:6,10,16,20	12:16 14:21	27:1,15 28:24	Uh-huh 24:17	
27:18	26:11,14,16	31:1,5	29:8,21 30:18	26:13	
says 8:17 30:11	28:10,17,22	suggest 14:10	30:25,25	underneath 7:1	
scenario 16:25	29:3,10 30:16	suggesting 7:13	thinking 20:7	understand 6:6	
scenarios 24:16	30:23 31:12,16	summary 5:19	23:9	13:6 16:13,13	
scope 23:17	31:18 32:1,3,5	sure 11:1 12:1	thought 14:14	27:18,22	
second 8:6 13:1	32:5,17,21	20:13,15	16:22	understood	
13:2 14:18,24	33:1	swept 29:24	thousand 25:21	10:10 16:16	
15:1,20 16:4	somebody 12:25		threshold 26:25	unfairly 8:3	
18:5 20:18	sort 7:20 9:1,3	T	27:1 28:8,16	urges 21:2	
31:10 32:16	17:20 24:3	Taber 2:8 3:5,8	time 1:12 5:5 6:9	USA 3:21	
Section 3:21	25:13 30:4	5:14,24 18:1	10:24 14:13		
18:15	sound 12:18	25:23 26:5,15	15:11 30:25	V	
ee 9:10 26:10	space 27:7	26:22	34:4	value 27:14 28:	
eeing 17:24	Specifically 3:22	take 10:21 30:21	timely 4:16	28:13	
egments 17:7	18:16	taken 18:1 34:3	Tom 2:10 5:15	Van 18:14,14	
ell 27:6,7	spent 25:3	talk 13:1 23:9	Toni 2:8 5:14	various 7:5	
ense 28:16	spoke 7:2 20:22	25:11	tonight's 4:9	Vice-Chair 2:4	
eparate 11:20	spoken 21:9	talked 14:13	19:3	Viet 3:21	
SERVICES	Staff 2:7 5:10	17:6 30:25	transcript 1:8	Vietnamese 7:6	
2:12	19:15	talking 29:13	4:20	8:8 17:9,18	
et 22:12	start 3:12 18:4	Tam 3:11,19	transcription	20:11 21:14	
how 3:3	28:25	tarred 8:3	34:5	view 8:9 12:23	
ide 24:13	started 7:11	task 6:21	translated 9:20	violate 28:2	
ign 15:17 32:13	starting 8:20	technically 27:3	translation 8:8	violated 3:21	
Silva 2:7 5:14	statement 7:15	teeth 30:6,7	9:14	18:15	
26:4 30:6,8,11	statute 30:5	terms 16:14	translations 7:5	violation 10:20	
imilar 20:2,3	Steve 5:13 6:10	testimony 4:22	8:9	11:7,14,19,21	
20:19	stop 10:1	4:24 13:22	translator 7:4	12:17 14:21	

23:21 30;20			1	
	year 9:16	6		
31:2,6	years 22:14	6:21 33:5		
violations 11:10	Z	7		
12:23 14:7	zero 15:9 16:1			
30:22	2010 13.9 10.1	<b>76954</b> 4:11 19:5		
vote 13:12 21:3	\$	9		
W	\$25 28:6	9th 18:13,21		
waiting 3:4	\$5,000 27:23	920-0222 2:14		
want 13:1 23:9		95113 1:15		
23:12	#	<b>95125</b> 2:14		
wanted 16:12	#47898 1:25	731432,14		
wanting 17:19	#8060 1:18 2:13	·		
wasn't 8:12	34:11			
way 23:7				
web 4:8 19:2	1			
Wednesday 1:11	1083 2:13			
3:13 18:7	11 1:11 18:8			
weigh 23:12	11th 3:13			
we'll 13:12	12th 18:23			
14:17 15:11	12.06.1010 3:21		<u> </u>	
we're 3:4 6:22	18:15			
12:1 19:24	2			
20:13 24:5		1		
30:18	2 11:16 12:1,1,4			
we've 9:8 17:8	2nd 3:19 4:2			
Wing 1:14	20 3:6			
witness 3:9 4:23	200 1:13			
9:25	<b>2014</b> 1:11 3:13 3:19 4:2,4,6,10			
witnesses 4:25	1 ' ' '			
5:1,3	18:8,13,14,21 18:23,25			
worked 9:16	25 29:17			
works 17:1	&3 47,1   			
worth 23:9	3			
writing 19:19	3 11:23 12:1,2			
written 5:17,22	18:25			
6:2,3,4 19:18	<b>30th</b> 4:6			
19:22				
wrong 10:3	4			
14:16 17:12	<b>408</b> 2:14			
W-262 3:15 18:9	<b>461</b> 26:4,5			
<b>W262</b> 1:14				
	5	,		
<u>Y</u>	5th 4:4,10			
Yeah 11:1	5:48 1:12			
•	,			

.