

## San Francisco Ethics Commission

August	9,	2021
. 0	- /	

 To:
 Members of the Ethics Commission

 From:
 Eric Willett, Senior Investigator and Streamlined Program Administrator

 Subject:
 AGENDA ITEM 8: Proposed SARP Stipulation, Decision and Order

 •
 In the Matter of Yes on Proposition V and Bebecca Olson (SEEC Completed)

*In the Matter of Yes on Proposition V and Rebecca Olson* (SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048).

## Summary

This memorandum provides information regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation appearing in this agenda item and what the Commission may do next regarding this Proposed SARP Stipulation.

## Action Requested

The Commission may approve the Proposed SARP Stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation.

## **Regulatory Background**

Pursuant to the Commission's Enforcement Regulations, the Executive Director may enter negotiations with a respondent at any time to resolve the factual and legal allegations in a complaint by way of a stipulated order (*i.e.* a negotiated settlement). Enf. Reg. § 12(A). The Regulations require that the stipulated order set forth the pertinent facts and may include an agreement as to anything that could be ordered by the Commission under its authority pursuant to Charter section C3.699-13. *Id.* 

Immediately after the Executive Director enters a stipulated order with a respondent, the Executive Director must inform the Commission of the proposed stipulation. Enf. Reg. § 12(E). Thereafter, any member of the Commission may request that the stipulated order be reviewed in public session by the full panel of the Commission during its next meeting. *Id.* 

This proposed stipulation was reached pursuant to the Commission's <u>Streamlined Administrative</u> <u>Resolution Program</u>. As of today, no Commissioner had requested review of the attached streamlined stipulated order in public session by the full panel of the Commission. It therefore appears on the Consent Calendar. The Commission may approve the stipulation by majority vote, or it may provide guidance to Commission Staff regarding the Proposed SARP Stipulation. Enf. Reg.§ 12(F).

Members of the public may comment on the Proposed SARP Stipulation, noting that the Commission receives public comment once for all consent items collectively.

1 2 3	Senior Investigative Analyst	
4	San Francisco Ethics Commission	
5	San Francisco, CA 94102	
6	252-3112 Facsimile	
7	BEFORE THE SAM	N FRANCISCO
8	ETHICS COMMISSION	
9		SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048
10	In the Matter of	
11	UNITED TO REDUCE DIABETES IN CHILDREN BY )	Streamlined Administrative Resolution Program
12	DISTRIBUTION OF SUGARY DRINKS & ACTION	STIPULATION, DECISION, AND ORDER
13	NOW AND REBECCA J. OLSON.	
14	Respondents. )	
15	j	
16	THE PARTIES STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:	
17		ution Draggers Stigulation Desision and Order
18		ution Program Stipulation, Decision, and Order
19	(Stipulation) is made and entered into by and betweer	n Yes on Proposition V, San Franciscans United to
20	Reduce Diabetes in Children by Imposing a 1 Cent Per	Ounce Tax on the Distribution of Sugary Drinks &
21	Action Now and Rebecca J. Olson ("Respondents" colle	ectively) and the San Francisco Ethics Commission
22	(the Commission).	
23	2. Respondents and the Commission agr	ee to settle and resolve all factual and legal issues
24	in this matter and to reach a final disposition through	the Commission's Streamlined Administrative
25	Resolution Program and without an administrative hea	aring. Upon approval of this Stipulation and full
26	performance of the terms outlined in this Stipulation,	the Commission will take no future action against
27		
28	SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048	1 SARP STIPULATION, DECISION
I	11	ORDER

1	Respondents, and this Streamlined Stipulation shall constitute the complete resolution of all claims by	
2	the Commission against Respondents related to the violations of law described in Exhibit A.	
3	Respondents understand and knowingly and voluntarily waive all rights to judicial review of this	
4	Streamlined Stipulation and any action taken by the Commission or its staff on this matter.	
5	3. Respondents acknowledge responsibility for and agree to pay an administrative penalty	
6	as set forth in Exhibit A. Respondents agree that the administrative penalty set forth in Exhibit A is a	
7	reasonable administrative penalty.	
8	4. Within ten business days of the Commission's approval of this Stipulation, Respondents	
9	shall either pay the penalty through the City's online payment portal or otherwise deliver to the	
10 11	following address the sum as set forth in Exhibit A in the form of a check or money order made payable	
12	to the "City and County of San Francisco":	
13	San Francisco Ethics Commission	
14	Attn: Enforcement & Legal Affairs Division 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220	
15	San Francisco, CA 94102	
16	5. If Respondents fail to comply with the terms of this Stipulation, then the Commission	
17	may reopen this matter and prosecute Respondents under Section C3.699-13 of the San Francisco	
18	Charter for any available relief.	
19	6. Respondents understand, and hereby knowingly and voluntarily waive, any and all	
20	procedural rights under Section C3.699-13 of the San Francisco Charter and the Commission's	
21	Enforcement Regulations with respect to this matter. These include, but are not limited to, the right to	
22	appear personally at any administrative hearing held in this matter, to be represented by an attorney at	
23	Respondents' expense, to confront and cross-examine all witnesses testifying at the hearing and to	
24   25	subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing.	
26	7. Respondents understand and acknowledge that this Stipulation is not binding on any	
27	other government agency with the authority to enforce the San Francisco Campaign & Governmental	
28	2	
	SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048 SARP STIPULATION, DECISION a	

Conduct Code section 1.100 *et seq.*, and does not preclude the Commission or its staff from cooperating with or assisting any other government agency in its prosecution of Respondent for any allegations set forth in Exhibit A, or any other matters related to those violations of law set forth in Exhibit A.

8. This Stipulation is subject to the Commission's approval. In the event the Commission declines to approve this Stipulation, the Stipulation shall become null and void, except Paragraph 9, which shall survive.

9. In the event the Commission rejects this Stipulation, and further administrative proceedings before the Commission are necessary, Respondents agree that the Stipulation and all references to it are inadmissible. Respondents moreover agree not to challenge, dispute, or object to the participation of any member of the Commission or its staff in any necessary administrative proceeding for reasons stemming from his or her prior consideration of this Stipulation.

10. This Stipulation, along with the attached Exhibit A, reflects the entire agreement between the parties hereto and supersedes any and all prior negotiations, understandings, and agreements with respect to the transactions contemplated herein. This Stipulation may not be amended orally. Any amendment or modification to this Stipulation must be in writing duly executed by all parties and approved by the Commission at a regular or special meeting.

11. This Stipulation shall be construed under, and interpreted in accordance with, the laws of the State of California. If any provision of the Stipulation is found to be unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall remain valid and enforceable.

12. The parties hereto may sign different copies of this Stipulation, which will be deemed to have the same effect as though all parties had signed the same document.

Π

		DocuSigned by:
1	08-03-2021   15:59:28 PDT Dated:	Gayatlıri Hiaikkeindiyil B248CC9FC96449D
1 2		GAYATHRI THAIKKENDIYIL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
3		SAN FRANCISCO ETHICS COMMISSION
4		DocuSigned by:
5	08-03-2021   13:27:22 PDT Dated:	Repecca J. Olson 6EBFB22B04954BB
6		REBECCA J. OLSON, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF YES ON
7		PROPOSITION V, SAN FRANCISCANS UNITED TO REDUCE DIABETES IN CHILDREN BY IMPOSING A 1 CENT PER OUNCE TAX ON THE
8		DISTRIBUTION OF SUGARY DRINKS & ACTION NOW
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20 21		
21		
22		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	SEEC Complaint No. 1020 040	4
	SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048	SARP STIPULATION, DECISION a ORDER 005

1	DECISION AND ORDER		
2	The foregoing Stipulation of the parties in the matter of "Yes on Proposition V, San Franciscans		
3	United to Reduce Diabetes in Children by Imposing a 1 Cent Per Ounce Tax on the Distribution of Sugary		
4	Drinks & Action Now and Rebecca J. Olson, SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048," including the attached		
5	Exhibit A, is hereby accepted as the final Decision and Order of the San Francisco Ethics Commission,		
6	effective upon execution below by the Chairperson.		
7			
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
9			
10			
11	Datada		
12	Dated:		
13	Yvonne Lee, Acting Chairperson San Francisco Ethics Commission		
14			
15 16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	- -		
28	5 SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048 SARP STIPULATION, DECISION a		
	Agenda Item 8 - Page 006 ORDER		

1	Exhibit A
2	<b>Description of Respondent:</b> Yes on Proposition V, San Franciscans United to Reduce Diabetes in Children
3	by Imposing a 1 Cent Per Ounce Tax on the Distribution of Sugary Drinks and Action Now, FPPC Identification Number 1377697 ("the Committee") was a primarily-formed committee to support
4	Proposition V in the City and County of San Francisco in connection with the November 8, 2016 election.
5	
6	<b>Description of Violation:</b> Based on the Commission's audit of the Committee and an assessment of
7	additional records provided by the Committee to the Enforcement Division, Investigators concluded there were three findings with respect to the Committee:
8	1) The Committee failed to maintain supporting documentation for monetary contributions totaling
9	\$163,250 or 6% of total monetary contributions reported on the campaign statements. SF C&GCC §
10	1.106; Gov't Code § 84104.
11	2) & 3) The Committee failed to include required language in disclaimer notices included in two postcard mailing committee communications. SF C&GCC §§ 1.161, 1.162.
12	
13	
14	Specific Eligibility Requirements: Respondents must sign and return this stipulated agreement within 90
15	days of contact by the Commission's Enforcement Division.
16	
17	
18	Specific Financial Penalty Modifiers:
19	✓ \$10,163 if the stipulation is signed and returned by July 26, 2021.*
20	\$18,885 if the stipulation is signed and returned by August 23, 2021.
21	\$28,578 if the stipulation is signed and returned by September 22, 2021.
22	b Deen on death an at the July 20, 2021 dee dline by any distance band course
23	<ul> <li>Respondents met the July 26, 2021 deadline by providing a hard copy signature at that time; the August 3, 2021 date of electronic signature reflected above was purely for administrative convenience and at the</li> </ul>
24	request of the Commission.
25	
26	
27	
28	6 SFEC Complaint No. 1920-048 SARP STIPULATION, DECISION an