| # | TOPIC | ISSUE | FROM | POSSIBLE SOLUTION | TYPE | BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|---|--|---------------|--|---------------|--|
| 1 | Remove lobbyist exemption for non-profits | Per the action of the Board at its 1/10/18 meeting, strike the non-profit exemption so that the same rules apply whether former designated employees go to work for non-profit or forprofit organizations. | Board | Revise SJMC 12.12 to strike the non-profit exemption so that the same rules apply whether former designated employees go to work for non- profit or for-profit organizations. | ORD | Revise SJMC 12.12 to strike the non-profit exemption so that the same rules apply whether former designated employees go to work for non-profit or for-profit organizations. |
| 2 | Late fines for weekly Lobbyist reporting | SJMC 12.12.440 (D) requires the City Clerk to assess a late filing fine to lobbyist who fails to file a weekly report on time. This would require the Clerk's Office to cross-reference dozens of calendars with reports that can be amended at any time through the City's lobbyist portal. This is not feasible without adding another full-time staff person. | City Clerk | Revise the requirement of the late fine in SJMC 12.12.440. | ORD | Direct the City Attorney to draft language to revise the requirement for the City Clerk to assess late filing fees, and instead allow the City Clerk discretion. |
| 3 | Rejecting complaints outside of Board jurisdiction or does not specify allegations | The Board receives complaints that does not specifically allege violations within the Boards purview. It is costly to have the independent evaluator review and advise the Board that the complaint is outside their purview. | City Attorney | Revise SJMC 12.04.080 and City Council Resolution 79187 to further clarify the City Clerk/Board's authority to reject complaints, without prejudice, that are outside the jurisdiction of the Board or does not specifically allege a violation. | ORD & RESO | Approve City Attorney's draft language for the SJMC 12.04.080 revision and accept listed potential solution, in consultation with the City Clerk's office. |
| 4 | Nepotism Rules & Campaign Mailers | Clarify the BFCPP's jurisdiction regarding Nepotism Rules and Campaign Mailers. | City Attorney | Revise Resolution to clarify that the BFCPP does not have jurisdiction over the Nepotism Rules | RESO | Approve City Attorney's draft language to clarify the lack of the Board's jurisdiction regarding nepotism complaints. |

| # | TOPIC | ISSUE | FROM | POSSIBLE SOLUTION | TYPE | BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--|---|------------------------|---|------|---|
| 5 | Special Municipal Election Dates | Due to recent amendments to the Elections Code, the Council no longer has the discretion to submit an initiative that qualifies for a Special Municipal Election to a Regular Municipal Election if certain criteria are met | City Attorney | Amend SJMC Chapter 12.05 to authorize the City Council to submit an initiative that qualifies for a Special Municipal Election to a Regular Municipal Election if certain criteria are met. | ORD | Defer to the City Attorney's Office to address as an ad hoc item outside of the Biennial Review. |
| 6 | PRA Appeals | Clarify the Board's process for reviewing Public Records Act Appeals | Board | | | Request that the City Council remove sections 12.21.430.C and 12.21.430.D from the Municipal Code. |
| 7 | Defining "Officeholder" | The category of "officeholder" is not clearly defined in the SJMC | Ad Hoc Subcommittee | Defining a category of "officeholder" in the SJMC would allow the SJMC to explicitly state what restrictions apply to officeholders and clarify where officeholders are unrestricted. | | Direct the City Attorney to analyze items 7-11 and consolidate them with Councilmember Esparza's memorandum, dated November 30, 2022. |
| 8 | Clarifying Officeholder Accounts | Clarify definitions of "officeholder accounts" and "officeholder funds" within the SJMC | Ad Hoc Subcommittee | Futher define the term "officeholder funds" in SJMC 12.06.810; import or better reference the PRA definition of "officeholder account." Add language expressly allowing officeholders to fundraise controlled committees for independent expenditures (for other candidates or for ballot measures). Require that donations to a charity not be used for an independent expenditure committee acting in City elections, limit the | | Direct the City Attorney to analyze items 7-11 and consolidate them with Councilmember Esparza's memorandum, dated November 30, 2022. |

Revised as of: 2/22/2023

| # | TOPIC | ISSUE | FROM | POSSIBLE SOLUTION | TYPE | BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS |
|----|---|--|------------------------|--|------|---|
| | | | | transfer to only 501(c)(3) charities. | | |
| 9 | Revise Controlled Committees | The SJMC currently defines candidate-controlled committees and categorizes all other committees as independent | Ad Hoc Subcommittee | Define both candidate- controlled and officeholder- controlled committees similarly, in order to align better with the State PRA definitions. All other committees would then be independent. | | Direct the City Attorney to analyze items 7-11 and consolidate them with Councilmember Esparza's memorandum, dated November 30, 2022. |
| 10 | Add Explicit Statements Allowing Contributions | Lack of clarity where the SJMC imposes no restrictions (SJMC 12.06.210) | Ad Hoc Subcommittee | Clarify that the SJMC (12.06.210) imposes no restrictions on the following: • spending by anyone on ballot measures • independent expenditures by officeholders for/against (active) candidates • independent expenditures by non-controlled committees • [Note that coordination with a candidate by either officeholder-controlled or independent committees would be a violation] | | Direct the City Attorney to analyze items 7-11 and consolidate them with Councilmember Esparza's memorandum, dated November 30, 2022. |
| 11 | Revise Introductory Rationale | Lack of description on why contribution restrictions are not applied to officeholders and independent expenditures | Ad Hoc Subcommittee | Revise SJMC 12.06.200 to describe why contribution restrictions are not applied to officeholders and independent expenditures | | Direct the City Attorney to analyze items 7-11 and consolidate them with Councilmember Esparza's memorandum, dated November 30, 2022. |

Revised as of: 2/22/2023

| # | TOPIC | ISSUE | FROM | POSSIBLE SOLUTION | TYPE | BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS |
|----|---|--|---------------|--|------|---|
| 12 | Disclaimers for Editorials and Commentaries | Lack of disclaimers on commentaries and editorials that the opinions of candidates are their own | Board | Incorporation of a requirement that candidates include a disclaimer at the end of editorials and commentaries describing that the opinions are their own | | Direct the City Attorney to draft language addressing disclosure of unpaid campaign publications. |
| 13 | Exit Clause for Complaints | Lack of an exit clause in Resolution 79187 for a complainant to revoke their complaint | Board | Incorporation of an exit clause in Resolution 79187 to allow for complainants to revoke their complaint | | Direct the City Attorney to draft language to permit a complainant to revoke their complaint. |
| 14 | Campaign Committee Loans | Reviewing limitations of candidates to make loans to their campaign committee | City Attorney | Strike SJMC 12.06.295.D | | Accept the City Attorney's recommendation to strike section 12.06.295.D from the Municipal Code. |