

**San Francisco
Ethics Commission**

Annual Report
July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001



The Ethics Commission is pleased to present this report on the activities, progress and accomplishments of its sixth year to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and citizens of San Francisco.

Carol M. Kingsley
Chairperson

San Francisco Ethics Commission
30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900
San Francisco, California 94102

E-mail: ethics_commission@ci.sf.ca.us
Web site: www.sfgov.org/ethics
Telephone: (415) 581-2300
Fax: (415) 581-2317

SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT – FY 2000-2001

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SIXTH YEAR

The Ethics Commission serves the citizens of San Francisco, City employees, elected and appointed officials, and candidates for public office by enforcing the ethics laws and providing education about them. Its duties include acting as filing officer for campaign finance disclosure statements, auditing campaign finance statements for compliance with state and local laws, administering the City's laws regulating lobbyists and campaign consultants, investigating complaints alleging violations of the City's ethics laws, administering the Whistleblower program, serving as filing officer for financial disclosure statements required from City officials and designated employees, raising public awareness of ethics laws, researching and proposing ethics-related policy changes, and providing advice.

In FY 00-01, the Commission accomplished a wide-ranging set of goals aimed at supporting public accountability of government officials and candidates. During this period the Commission:

- Implemented two voter-approved ethics-related laws: Propositions O and J, both of which were adopted by voters in November 2000;
- Entered into an agreement with the City of Sacramento to license the City's award-winning On Line Filing System;
- Improved internet accessibility for campaign finance records;
- Oversaw the reporting obligations of 232 active political committees in the City, including administering filings due on July 31, 2000, October 5 and 26, 2000, November 30, 2000, and January 31, 2001;
- Registered and administered filing requirements for at least 15 campaign consultants, 48 lobbyists, and 470 City officials, imposing \$34,513 in registration fees and \$2,825 in late fines;
- Completed audits on 11 campaign finance committees for accuracy and legal compliance;
- Investigated complaints of ethics law violations; operated a whistleblower hotline; and settled complaints, levying \$1,300 in fines;
- Issued advice letters interpreting ethics laws and regulations;
- Conducted hearings on proposed changes to the S.F. Charter and advised the Board of Supervisors on Charter reform measures;
- Fielded hundreds of citizen questions on subjects such as campaign committee filing and disclosure obligations, conflicts of interests laws, lobbyist and campaign consultant registration and reporting requirements, auditing procedures, and public financing; and
- Occupied a new office with larger space to serve the public.

MANDATES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

In FY 00-01, the Commission continued to make important progress in fulfilling its mandates under the City Charter and governmental ethics laws.

NEW ACTIVITIES

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION O

On November 7, 2001, 52.6 percent of the San Francisco voters approved Proposition O, the Fair Elections Ordinance that the Ethics Commission placed on the ballot. The new law, which took effect on January 1, 2001, amends the San Francisco Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance, San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.100 et seq. ("CFRO"), in several ways.

Most importantly, the new law provides limited public financing for candidates for the Board of Supervisors who agree to limit their campaign spending. Limiting spending has been shown to be a major concern to voters. In addition, as testimony received by the Commission during consideration of the legislation indicated, public financing enables candidates to spend more time communicating with voters and less time raising money, gives voters greater access to information about candidates, permits more candidates to run for office and be elected on the basis of ideas and experience, and limits the influence or the appearance of influence of private contributions on policy making, thereby helping to restore public confidence in the electoral process.

The new law also sets new limits on contributions to candidate campaign committees and committees that make independent expenditures to support or oppose a candidate, restricts loans that a Board of Supervisors candidate may make to his or her campaign, and imposes additional disclosure requirements. These provisions strengthen limits on campaign contributions and reduce potential opportunities for contributors to influence elected officials. The provisions also ensure that before Election Day, voters have access to information about where political committees get their money.

The public financing provisions work as follows:

- Each candidate for the Board of Supervisors in the general election who raises a threshold amount of \$7,500 in private funds and meets certain other qualifying criteria is eligible for an initial grant of \$5,000.
- The candidate then receives four dollars in matching funds for each of the next \$5,000 raised in private contributions.
- Thereafter, the candidate receives dollar-for-dollar matching funds for each dollar privately raised, up to a maximum of \$43,750 of public funds.

- Candidates who qualify for a run-off election receive an initial \$5,000, following which they may receive four dollars of public funds for each dollar privately raised, up to a maximum of \$17,000 of public funds.
- Candidates who receive public financing must agree to accept the \$75,000 voluntary spending limit for the general election and \$20,000 spending limit for the run-off election. They must also agree to debate their opponents.
- Spending limits are lifted if a candidate who does not participate in the public financing program receives contributions, makes expenditures or has funds in a campaign trust account totaling 100 percent of the limit, or if a committee that makes independent expenditures spends 100 percent of the applicable spending limit to support or oppose a candidate for the same office.

The contribution limits allow for donations of:

- \$500 to any candidate for City office in a primary or general election, with an aggregate total of \$500 multiplied by the number of offices voted on in the primary or general election;
- \$250 to any candidate in a run-off election, with an aggregate total of \$250 multiplied by the number of offices voted on in the run-off election; and
- \$500 to any committee (including any committee that makes independent expenditures) that supports or opposes a candidate, with an aggregate total of \$3,000 per calendar year.

The measure also imposes additional reporting requirements on both committees and candidates.

The Commission subsequently adopted regulations to implement Proposition O, which were reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors. The regulations were drafted with input from interested citizens given at a specially arranged public meeting and regular Commission meetings. Commission staff also researched the operation of public financing programs in other jurisdictions, including New York City, Los Angeles and Tucson. The regulations provide:

- definitions of what constitutes qualifying and matching contributions,
- processes for establishing eligibility for participation in public financing,
- processes for disbursing public funds in the general and run-off elections,
- guidelines for determining the pro-ration of funds should available public money be insufficient for full payments to all eligible candidates,
- guidelines for surrender to the City of any campaign equipment worth over \$100 purchased with public funds,
- guidelines setting forth restrictions on the use of public funds, and
- guidelines regarding the forfeiture of unexpended funds.

The text of Proposition O, as well as its implementing regulations, is posted on the Commission's web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics/pertin.htm.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER CFRO REGULATIONS

The Commission also adopted regulations, which were subsequently reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors, regarding related provisions of the CFRO. These regulations clarify that unexpended funds from the general or primary election may be used in the run-off, identify the applicable contribution limit when there are accrued expenses from the general or primary election, and state that a candidate who does not file a statement indicating acceptance of the voluntary spending limits by the deadline for filing nomination papers will be deemed to have rejected the limits. These regulations are also available on the Commission's web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics/pertin.htm.

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE CFRO

The Ethics Commission also approved two other amendments to the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance that were proposed by members of the Board of Supervisors. One measure, which has since become law, requires persons and entities that fund recorded telephone calls that support or oppose candidates for City office to identify themselves as the source of funding on the recorded message. The new law seeks to discourage unethical campaign practices and to encourage public trust in local elections and the democratic process.

Another measure requires candidates who send out mass mailings to insert a "paid for by" statement on the mailing and to file an original or copy of the mailing with the Commission, along with a disclosure statement indicating the itemized costs of the mailing. This measure provides greater information to voters and discourages unscrupulous campaign activities such as in-kind contributions that violate contribution limits.

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION J:

Proposition J, the Taxpayer Protection Amendment of 2000, was approved by San Francisco voters in November 2000. The new law, intended to reduce the influence of gifts and prospective campaign contributions on the decisions of public officials to manage public assets and dispose public funds, prohibits City public officials from accepting gifts, payments, or campaign contributions from a person or group if the official previously approved granting the donor a contract or other public benefit. Proposition J provides for enforcement by the Ethics Commission, the District Attorney and any private citizen.

To implement the new law, the Commission adopted regulations that the Board of Supervisors subsequently reviewed and approved. The regulations:

- clarify various ambiguous terms in the law, such as "public benefit," "public benefit recipient," "personal or campaign advantage," and "City and County public official";

- clarify that the ban does not apply when a public official's action is ministerial in nature;
- provide guidance regarding the due diligence and monitoring that public officials must exercise under the law; and
- establish that the measure's provisions are not retroactive.

The new law and its regulations took effect on July 13, 2001. The text of the new law and regulations are available at www.sfgov.org/ethics/pertin.htm.

ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE REQUIRING ELECTRONIC FILING OF LOBBYIST AND CAMPAIGN CONSULTANT REPORTS

During FY 2000-2001, the Board of Supervisors passed and Mayor Brown signed into law legislation proposed by the Ethics Commission to authorize the Commission to require electronic filing of lobbyist and campaign consultant statements. Staff is working with the Department of Telecommunications and Information Services to develop the formats for these filings. When implemented, the new technology will greatly expedite public access to information submitted by filers and will save several weeks of staff time each year.

ADOPTION OF REGULATION RE: SUNSHINE ORDINANCE DECLARATIONS

On May 14, 2001, the Ethics Commission adopted a regulation to clarify the time and manner for filing the annual Sunshine Ordinance declaration required under local law. Beginning in 2002, all City officials, department heads and employees who are required to file an annual Statement of Economic Interests with the Ethics Commission must file a declaration by April 1 of each year, stating that they have read the Sunshine Ordinance and that they have attended or will attend an annual training session on the Sunshine Ordinance. April 1st is also the deadline for receipt of personal financial statements that City officers and certain City employees are required to file.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Commission makes recommendations on policy issues that affect its areas of jurisdiction. In FY 00-01, it submitted resolutions to the Board of Supervisors regarding proposed Charter amendments sponsored by Board members that affected the Commission. The Board subsequently placed a measure on the November 2000 ballot, Proposition E, which proposed various changes affecting the Commission's structure, authority and the political activity of its commissioners and staff.

Proposition E was approved by the voters in the November 2001 election. It provides that:

- The terms of all current Ethics Commissioners expire on February 1, 2002;
- Newly appointed Ethics Commissioners will assume office for staggered terms on February 1, 2002;
- The Assessor, rather than the Controller, appoints a member of the Ethics Commission;
- Current Ethics Commissioners will be eligible for reappointment to the Ethics Commission;
- The terms of Ethics Commissioners increase from four years to six years.
- Members and employees of the Ethics Commission are subject to new conflicts of interest rules that include prohibitions on participating in, contributing to, or publicly endorsing any City, district, state or federal office candidate or ballot measure that appears on the ballot in San Francisco; as well as a ban on holding any office or policymaking position with organizations that make endorsements regarding candidates or measures that appear on the ballot in San Francisco;
- For one year after ending service or employment with the Ethics Commission, members and management-level employees are subject to restrictions that include prohibitions on being a lobbyist or campaign consultant or being employed by or receiving gifts from a lobbyist, campaign consultant or political committee;
- The Ethics Commission is authorized to investigate any complaint independent of any investigation by the City Attorney or District Attorney.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REPORTING

The Commission administers and enforces the City's Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance ("CFRO"). The CFRO sets voluntary ceilings on campaign expenditures by candidates and imposes mandatory limits on contributions to candidates.

Under the CFRO, the Commission serves as filing officer for four categories of local candidates and committees:

- candidates seeking election to local office and their controlled committees,
- committees formed or existing primarily to support or oppose candidates seeking election to local office,
- committees formed or existing primarily to support or oppose qualification or passage of a local ballot measure being voted on only in San Francisco, and
- county general purpose committees active only in San Francisco.

As filing officer, the Commission promotes compliance by candidates and committees and maintains records of reports filed. It audits campaign statements to ensure compliance with applicable laws and imposes penalties for failure to adhere to filing deadlines and reporting requirements. It administers a strict

policy, which is distributed to all filers, mandating fines for campaign statements that are filed late.

During the fiscal year, 232 active committees filed reports with the Commission. The filings included regular semi-annual filings due on July 31, 2000 and January 31, 2001, as well as pre-election filings due on October 5 and 26, 2000 for the November 7 primary, and on November 30, 2000 for the December 12 run-off.

The Commission posted data from all electronic reports on its web site within 24 hours of their receipt.

MONITORING OF SPENDING LIMITS

The Commission lifted the \$75,000 voluntary campaign spending limits in nine of the 11 supervisorial districts during the November 2000 election. Spending limits were lifted in two districts when candidates who declined to adopt the spending limits received contributions that totaled more than 50 percent of the \$75,000 spending limit. Spending limits were lifted in seven of the districts when committees making independent expenditures to support or oppose candidates spent, in the aggregate, more than 25 percent of the limit in those districts. The lifting of the caps contrasted sharply with the two previous supervisorial elections in 1998 and 1996, prior to district elections, when all candidates adhered to the voluntary limit of \$250,000 in City-wide races for Supervisor.

ELECTRONIC FILING

The San Francisco Electronic Filing Ordinance requires that certain campaign statements be filed electronically as well as on paper.

The City's pioneering On-Line Filing System (OLFS) provides free filing for all disclosure statements required by state and local law. It is compatible with the state of California's standardized CAL filing format and contains search and sort capabilities for the financial data posted on the Commission's web site.

The OLFS, designed and implemented by the Department of Telecommunications and Information Services, was rated among the best in the nation in FY 00-01 by the Center for Governmental Studies. Among e-filing systems rated by the Center, San Francisco's tied for first place with the Federal Elections Commission and the State of Illinois.

The Commission negotiated a \$25,000 licensing agreement with officials of the City of Sacramento for adoption by Sacramento of the On-Line Filing System. The contract, requested by the City of Sacramento, may prefigure licensing agreements with other jurisdictions. City staff installed the system in Sacramento and provided operational training for Sacramento City employees. Sacramento officials report that the system is working well there.

Commission staff conducted several instructional workshops throughout the year on the use of the system. The workshops were attended by campaign officials, reporters, and interested citizens.

AUDIT PROGRAM

The California Political Reform Act of 1974 and the CFRO require officeholders, candidates and committees supporting or opposing ballot measures or candidates to file finance statements disclosing campaign contributions and expenditures made in connection with a campaign.

The Commission serves as filing officer for statements filed locally. The statements require disclosure of monetary and non-monetary contributions, including loans and enforceable promises, expenditures (including loans), unpaid bills and miscellaneous increases to cash. Filers must also keep detailed records of receipts and expenditures of \$25 or more.

The Commission audits the statements for compliance. Its process is outlined in an audit manual available to the public. Filers at various levels of financial activity are selected for audit by random drawing at Commission meetings.

In October, ten committees active in the previous year (1999) were randomly selected for audit. By the close of the fiscal year, audits had been completed on six of these ten committees, in addition to five committees that had been selected for audit during the prior fiscal year. Of the eleven committees audited, seven were found to be in compliance, and four had material irregularities. Commission staff forwarded reports on the noncompliant committees to the California Fair Political Practices Commission. Upon review, the FPPC takes one of three actions. It either opens its own investigation, sends a warning letter to the offending committee, or determines that the Commission's audit serves as sufficient warning and closes the case.

Audits are posted on the Commission's web site as they are completed.

LOBBYIST REGISTRATION AND REPORTING

Lobbyists are required by ordinance to register with the City and to file quarterly reports of activity intended to influence local legislative or administrative action. The Commission reviews lobbyist statements to ensure completeness and accuracy. It assesses penalties for failure to adhere to deadlines and other requirements.

Registration is triggered by a threshold level of activity based on the number of City officials contacted and/or the amount of payments received or made. The threshold varies according to the type of lobbying engaged in.

Statements must disclose which City officials were contacted, the positions advocated by the lobbyist, and any campaign contributions or gifts donated. Contract lobbyists are required to disclose the names of their clients and how much money they received from them. During FY 00-01, contract lobbyists reported receiving \$4,875,164 in payments. Lobbyists who advocate on their own behalf are required to disclose payments made for the purpose of influencing local legislative or administrative action. During FY 00-01, business and organization and expenditure lobbyists reported making \$771,791 in payments.

Statements are summarized by the Commission in quarterly reports issued two to three weeks after filing deadlines and posted on the Commission's web site. Commission staff also conducts quarterly workshops in lobbyist filing procedures.

At the close of the fiscal year, 48 lobbyists were registered with the Commission. They paid \$26,063 in registration fees and \$625 in late fines.

CAMPAIGN CONSULTANT REGISTRATION AND REPORTING

San Francisco's Regulation of Campaign Consultant's Ordinance was passed in 1997. Under the Ordinance, anyone who earns \$1,000 or more in a calendar year from providing campaign consultant services must register with the City and submit quarterly reports.

Consultants are required to report names of clients, services provided, payments promised and received, contributions and gifts made to local officials, and other information. The Commission prepares summaries of the quarterly filings, which are posted on the web site.

During the fiscal year, 26 campaign consultants were registered with the Commission. They reported \$1,449,170 in earnings and paid \$8,450 in fees and \$2,200 in fines.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE BY CITY OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

The California Political Reform Act and the San Francisco Conflict of Interest Code require public officials and employees with significant decision-making authority to disclose their personal financial interests. Disclosure helps to alert public officials and designated employees to personal interests that may be affected while they are performing official duties; disclosure also helps inform the public about potential conflicts of interest.

The Commission serves as the filing officer for Statements of Economic Interests (SEIs). It notifies filers of deadlines and requirements, issues instructions on how

to complete the forms, reviews filings, assesses penalties, and requests amended filings where necessary.

Department heads and members of most City boards and commissions are required to file statements with the Ethics Commission. In addition, hundreds of designated employees file SEIs with their department heads rather than the Ethics Commission. These reports are maintained at the departmental office. The Commission instructs department heads about their duties as filing officers for their designated employees. It also surveys department heads to confirm that all designated employees have filed.

Annual Statements of Economic Interests were due April 2, 2001 (April 1 was a Sunday). At the close of the fiscal year, timely filing was received from 470 department heads and commissioners, 61 percent of all those required to file, up from 56 percent last year. Through the Commission's forceful pursuit of non-filers, the level of compliance has risen to 97 percent. In addition, over 90 percent of the departments and commissions responded to the Ethics Commission survey monitoring compliance by departmental employees.

SUNSHINE ORDINANCE DECLARATIONS

The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance requires department heads and commissioners who are required to file SEIs to sign an annual declaration stating under penalty of perjury that they have read the Sunshine Ordinance and that they have attended, or will attend, an annual training on the Sunshine Ordinance. As discussed above, in accordance with a regulation adopted by the Commission and reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors in FY 00-01, the declarations will be due on April 1 beginning in 2002. (For the current year only, these statements are due December 31.)

So far this year, 321 declarations have been filed with the Commission and may be viewed by members of the public at the Commission office.

INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT

Under the San Francisco Charter and ethics-related ordinances, the Ethics Commission is charged with investigating allegations of violations of laws concerning campaign finance, lobbying, conflicts of interest, campaign consulting and governmental ethics. In addition, the Improper Government Activities Ordinance, also known as the Whistleblower Ordinance, directs the Commission to investigate complaints filed by persons alleging that they have experienced retaliation because they filed a complaint with the Ethics Commission.

The Commission encourages the filing of whistleblower complaints, and operates a hotline for that purpose, (415) 581-2323. Since the hotline was installed in July, 1987, the Commission has received 42 whistleblower complaints. Some

have come in over the hotline, others by e-mail or in writing on the Commission's complaint form.

Since June 1995, a combined total of 165 whistleblower and non-whistleblower complaints have been filed. During the 2000 calendar year, the Commission received a total of 34 complaints, including 10 whistleblower complaints. The 34 complaints represented double the number of complaints filed in the previous year. In the first half of the 2001 calendar year, the Commission received 6 complaints, including two whistleblower complaints.

The Commission settled two complaints in FY 00-01, levying fines totaling \$1,300. Settlements are announced at public meetings of the Commission.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Commission conducts ongoing informational programs about ethics-related laws and requirements. It produces educational materials and actively publicizes its outreach activities through public notices.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the Commission held seminars in FY 00-01 on the operation of the On Line Filing System and the filing requirements for lobbyists. Commission staff also conducted a feedback workshop for candidates and treasurers following the November and December elections to discuss how the Commission can better serve campaign organizations.

ADVICE AND INFORMATION

Commission staff is available each workday to answer public inquiries about San Francisco ethics laws. In FY 00-01, the Commission responded to hundreds of requests for information from citizens and others both by phone and at the counter in the Commission office.

The Commission also issued a number of formal advice letters in FY 00-01, including opinions on conflicts of interest, the Compensated Advocacy Ordinance and the Campaign Consultants Ordinance. These opinion letters are available on the Commission's web site at www.sfgov.org/ethics.

AFFILIATIONS

The Commission is a member of the Council on Governmental Ethics Laws (COGEL), and participates in its annual conference. The Commission's Executive Director, Ginny Vida, represented the Commission at COGEL's annual conference and also served on its site selection committee. The organization decided to hold its 2004 conference in San Francisco. Ron Kane, Systems

Engineer at the Department of Technology and Information Services, made a presentation on the City's On Line Filing System at the COGEL conference.

OUTREACH

The Commission has a strong institutional commitment to educate the public about San Francisco's ethics laws and to support campaign reform efforts consistent with City policy throughout the state and elsewhere.

Staff members are in routine communication with community organizations about the requirements of the laws and the record of compliance. Regular outreach activities touch a wide variety of individuals and organizations, including neighborhood associations, political clubs, unions, business groups, lobbyists, campaign consultants, reporters, and others.

The Commission encourages active participation in its monthly meetings by interested community members. Regular meetings are held on the second Monday of each month at 5:00 p.m. at City Hall, 1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 408, San Francisco. Agendas of the meetings are posted in accordance with the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance and are mailed to a large and expanding list.

The Commission occasionally serves as host to foreign visitors seeking to learn about San Francisco ethics laws. During FY 00-01, the Commission hosted three foreign delegations, a nine-member group from Wu Zhou City, Guangxi, People's Republic of China; a representative of the Chief Minister of Sarawak; and the executive director of the St. James Ethics Center in Sydney, Australia.

Discussions with the Chinese delegation centered on comparative ways San Francisco and Wu Zhou City handle employee-employer relations, conflicts of interest, and investigations. The representative from Sarawak sought information about Proposition O and the regulation of political spending in San Francisco. The director of the St. James Center interviewed Commission staff about the development of new technology as a means of fostering more effective political disclosure.

BUDGET

The Commission's budget for FY 00-01 reflects a continuing expansion of its workload as a result of voter initiatives and Board-adopted ordinances and directives. The budgetary increase over FY 99-00 includes additional rent for the Commission's new office at 30 Van Ness Avenue, technical upgrades to the On Line Filing System and staffing assistance for the November 2000 election.

Annual Budget for Ethics Commission since FY 1994-1995	
FY 94 - 95	\$157,000
FY 95 - 96	\$261,000
FY 96 - 97	\$313,274
FY 97 - 98	\$394,184
FY 98 - 99	\$475,646
FY 99 - 00	\$610,931
FY 00 - 01	\$727,787

MEMBERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION

The Ethics Commission has five non-salaried members and a staff of eight supported by varying numbers of interns throughout the year.

Commissioner	Appointing Authority	Date of Appointment
Carol M. Kingsley, Chairperson	City Attorney	June 1998 Elected Chair October 2000
Paul H. Melbostad, Vice-Chairperson	District Attorney	March 1996; Re-appointed August 1998
Isabella H. Grant	Board of Supervisors	May 1997; Re-appointed June 1998
Philip S. Ryan	Mayor	August 2000; Resigned August 2001
Sharyn Saslafsky	Controller	October 2000

The Commission staff for FY 00-01 was led by Ginny Vida, Executive Director. The Commission also welcomed a new Deputy Executive Director, Mabel Ng. Other staff members included: Joseph Lynn, Campaign Finance Officer; Katherine Havener, Ethics Investigator/Legal Analyst; Oliver Luby, Temporary Assistant Legal Analyst; Frank Martinez Lester, Campaign Finance Assistant; Shaista Shaikh, Campaign Finance Auditor; Jen Taloa, Principal Clerk; and Marvin Ford, Temporary Staff Assistant; as well as Mu-En Chen and Shannon Hardin, law clerks; Warren Chen and Chris Wong, Youthworks student interns; Kamari Wilson, Lianne Lau and Mike Webb, Pilgrim Community Center interns; and Angela Tsui, volunteer from Volunteer Center of San Francisco.

FUTURE INITIATIVES

In the forthcoming months, the Commission will continue to fulfill its mandates to the best of its abilities, including the implementation of the public financing

program under Proposition O. It will revise its candidate guide and audit manual to include public financing requirements, prepare forms and procedures, and will continue to educate candidates and committees about their obligations under the new law.

The Commission will also educate and provide advice to candidates, campaign consultants, and committees about new campaign finance laws enacted in 2001, governmental ethics laws and filing obligations. It will continue to enforce all laws under its jurisdiction.

In accordance with its Charter mandates, the Commission will consider proposals to clarify and strengthen laws and rules within its jurisdiction. It will also evaluate existing programs and procedures to make them more efficient.

In FY 00-01, the Commission took important steps toward fulfilling its mandates. The Commission will vigorously pursue legal and educational action to promote ethics in government in the City of San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol M. Kingsley
Chairperson
FY 2000-2001

The San Francisco Ethics Commission FY 2000 – 2001 Annual Report was compiled by Marc Slavin, Independent Consultant, and edited by the members and staff of the Ethics Commission.

San Francisco Ethics Commission

