

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



14-2

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, November 5, 2013, Shirley Ferrante spoke regarding political issues.

**ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH
CLERK OF THE BOARD**

**AGENDA NO.
14-2**

Clerk Perry
Jay Orr
County Clerk

November 5th, 2013

President Barack Obama
No Label Organization Democrat
Tea Party
No Label Organization Republican
Senator Barbara Boxer
Congressman Mark Takano
Mayor of Riverside
Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Riverside City Council Members
RNC Chairman
DNC Chairman
Senator Pat Murray
Congressman Paul Ryan

Blue Dog Democrats
Senator John Mc Cain
Senator Mark Warren
Senator Dianne Feinstein

We are a group of concerned senior and disabled citizens who want to voice some of our concerns regarding the country's state of affairs. We have several issues that we want to address.

We are disappointed with the tone use by political parties. We would like to see a change in the way that politicians address each other and a refrain from political verbal assault.

We believe that the Republicans should receive an F grade for shutting the government down. The Tea Party is especially responsible. We also give the Democrats a D or F for the new health plan.

We think that is was unfair for the Republicans to take 40 billion dollars from the SNAP Program. We are unhappy with Jerrymandering in other states. Independents don't get a voice in other states. We realize that the system in California works well. We are opposed to family members benefitting from campaigns. We are against having family members on campaign payrolls.

We would like politicians to go to the website, FixTheDebt.org. The website has useful information to help with the extreme debt of the country.

We are in favor of Senator Tom Coburn. We like his ideals and want the democrats to work with him.

We are still doing our own fact checking to find the truth about politics and details of corruption. We are aware of the false stories aired by FoxNews and MSNBC. The networks supply much rhetoric and we give them an F for their slanted information.

We would like to see the California border protected. We are aware that former democrats and republicans put a policy in place. We don't want to see new changes that leave the border vulnerable.

We were pleased with the actions of former Speaker of the House, Tom Foley. We would like to see people work like him. Tom Foley often met with the former Minority Leader Bob Michael, discussing concerns and issues and working together to find solutions. We want to note that former Senator, Bob Dole, was active in making a positive change for the political and economic climate. We would like to see politicians take a page out of what these individuals achieved. We want to see more positive action to improve the economy and the state of the country.

We are grateful to the President for signing legislation on climate change. We are concerned about the environment and appreciate the movement toward preservation of our resources.

We hope that you will consider our concerns and give thought to our suggestions.

Thank you for your prompt attention to these matters.

Sincerely,
Concerned senior and disabled citizens of the United States

Submitted by *Shirley Stegato*
11-5-13 Item *oral*
(date)

Lawmakers add relatives to campaign payrolls

Fredreka Schouten and Christopher Schnaars, USA TODAY 12:28 p.m. EDT March 18, 2013



(Photo: Evan Vucci AP)

WASHINGTON — Thirty-two members of Congress dispensed more than \$2 million in campaign funds to pay relatives' salaries during the 2012 election cycle, a USA TODAY analysis of the most recent campaign records shows.

Lawmakers have hired their children, spouses, aunts, parents and in-laws as consultants, accountants and record keepers, the examination shows. In some cases, multiple members of the family joined the payroll.

Rep. Rodney Alexander, R-La., for instance, paid his daughter, Lisa Lowe, more than \$73,000 between Jan. 1, 2011, and Dec. 31, 2012. Another daughter, Ginger Robinson, also works for the campaign and collected \$57,000 in salary during the 2012 election cycle. The campaign also underwrote 17 auto payments, totaling \$32,700, Federal Election Commission records show.

The payments to relatives do not involve taxpayer money, and the practice is considered legal as long as the relatives are qualified and earn market rate for their work. Although federal candidates have wide leeway in spending campaign funds, they cannot use contributors' money for personal expenses. However, campaign-finance watchdogs argue there's potential for conflict when political contributions — some from industries that lawmakers regulate — end up supporting family members.

"Special interests who are seeking to influence what you are doing in Congress are allowing you to employ your mom, your sister and brother-in-law," said Meredith McGehee, policy director of the Campaign Legal Center, a campaign-watchdog group. Nearly two decades ago, she unsuccessfully lobbied the FEC to prohibit the practice.

"You are enriching your family at the same time you are serving the public trust," she said.

Alexander and other lawmakers defended hiring family members, saying they are trusted, competent staffers.

Alexander, a six-term congressman, said his daughter Lisa majored in finance in college and handles the day-to-day running of his campaign. Ginger Robinson is a certified public accountant and prepares filings for the Federal Election Commission, he said.

"It's a modest income for what they do," he said. "What's funny to me is that it would be OK for me to pay a complete stranger \$100,000 to do what they do."

The car payments, he said, now cover a lease on a Ford F-150 pickup that he uses for campaign purposes. Previously, the campaign leased two cars. Congressional rules bar him from using taxpayer money for campaign travel. "We have a district that's 700 miles long ... and it's cost-prohibitive to use personal vehicles," Alexander said.

As part of its examination, USA TODAY identified relatives by comparing the last names of campaign-fund recipients with those of lawmakers and researching their family ties. The nepotism in campaign hiring is likely to be even more widespread because the analysis does not include every example of relatives without the same last names as current members of Congress.

Among the biggest recipients of campaign money in the 2012 election: Illinois Rep. Bobby Rush's wife, Carolyn, took in \$147,549 in salary and consulting fees between Jan. 1, 2011, and Dec. 31, 2012, the USA TODAY tally shows. More than one-quarter of all the money Rush raised for his re-election went to pay his wife, records show.

Carolyn Rush has long been on the Illinois Democrat's payroll. She has received more than \$360,000 in campaign money since Jan 1, 2008, according to data compiled by the non-partisan Center for Responsive Politics, which tracks political money.

Two other members of the Illinois congressional delegation employ relatives. The campaign of Republican Sen. Mark Kirk has paid his mother, Judy, more than \$27,000 in salary and consulting fees in 2011 and 2012. Rep. Luis Gutierrez, a Democrat, paid wife Soraida nearly \$93,000 during the 2012 election cycle.

Rush declined to comment, through a spokeswoman, and Kirk's spokesman did not respond to interview requests.

Gutierrez spokesman Douglas Rivlin said Soraida Gutierrez, a former banking executive and lobbyist in Illinois, handles "all aspects" of the campaign's accounting. "The congressman trusts her."

Rivlin said there's no conflict with Gutierrez's duties in Congress, where he has been a leading champion of legislation to help the nation's 11 million illegal immigrants gain citizenship. "What drives the congressman is getting immigration reform passed and protecting people from getting deported," he said.

"This is not a get-rich-quick scheme."

Anti-nepotism rules prohibit Senate and House members from putting family on the government payroll, but efforts to ban using campaign money to pay spouses, children and others relatives have gained little traction — despite high-profile controversies.

More than a decade ago, the Federal Election Commission established the practice as appropriate for campaign committees as long as the relatives performed "bona fide" campaign services at a fair-market rate.

The 2001 ruling was sought by then-Illinois congressman Jesse Jackson Jr., whose campaign went on to pay his wife's firm more than \$430,000 from 2002 through 2012, data compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics show.

Last month, Jackson pleaded guilty in federal court to using campaign money to buy more than \$750,000 worth of luxury items, collectibles and clothes. Sandi Jackson, meanwhile, admitted falsifying the couple's tax returns. Sentencing for the couple is scheduled for this summer.

Payments to spouses came under intense scrutiny in 2006 after news emerged that then-congressman John Doolittle, R-Calif., was paying the fundraising firm run by his wife, Julie, a 15% commission on contributions it solicited for his campaign and leadership PAC. More than \$140,000 went to her firm between 2003 and 2006. Doolittle discontinued the practice. In 2008, he announced his retirement from Congress after being investigated as part of the Jack Abramoff lobbying scandal.

The House voted to ban campaign payments to spouses in 2007, but the measure died in the Senate.

In January, on the opening day of the new Congress, Sen. David Vitter, R-La., introduced a bill that would prohibit not only spouses but any immediate family members from drawing salaries from campaign accounts. On the Senate floor, he slammed the payments as "just a way ... for politicians to pad their family income."

Nearly two months later, the measure has failed to attract any co-sponsors.

"There's an accepted culture among many campaigns to surround themselves with family members they deeply trust," said Craig Holman of the left-leaning watchdog group Public Citizen. "As long as the FEC has given its blessing for this kind of nepotism, there isn't much of a call for members of Congress to change this."

Election-law experts say lawmakers have broad discretion in deciding how much to pay their relatives.

Campaign-finance lawyer Stefan Passantino, who advises corporations and Republican candidates on their political activity, urges politicians who want to hire relatives to create a paper trail, showing they have compared their family members' skills, job descriptions and salaries with others in similar posts.

Even so, "there hasn't been a great deal of oversight — other than public scrutiny and public opinion," he said.

The USA TODAY analysis shows vast differences in campaign pay.

Rep. Buck McKeon, R-Calif., chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, paid out more than \$126,000 to his wife, Patricia, during the election cycle to serve as campaign treasurer and a fundraiser. The campaign also reported providing nearly \$10,000 in contributions and equipment to Patricia McKeon's unsuccessful California state assembly bid last year.

His top contributors are defense manufacturers.

McKeon spokeswoman Alissa McCurley said there's no potential for conflict. Patricia McKeon "earns a salary, not a commission," McCurley said. "It's not like she gets a cut" of the money she raises.

Other lawmakers paying their relatives more than six figures over the two-year election cycle include Rep. Jim Moran, D-Va., who paid daughter Mary Elise Moran nearly \$105,000, and Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, who paid daughter Kristin Barton more than \$131,000, including nearly \$17,000 in bonuses.

Barton's spokesman did not return phone calls. Moran's spokeswoman, Ann Hughes, said that Mary Moran, her father's campaign manager for the 2010 and 2012 elections, was a "valuable member" of the team but no longer works for the campaign.

By contrast, Colorado Rep. Doug Lamborn, a Republican now in his fourth term, paid his wife, Jean, nearly \$33,000 to keep the campaign's books, organize fundraisers and file FEC reports.

"Congressman Lamborn and his wife would much prefer to hire this out to someone else but haven't found the right person for the job," spokeswoman Catherine Mortensen said.

The practice is not limited to senior lawmakers.

Rep. Raúl Labrador, R-Idaho, elected as part of a Tea Party wave in 2010, added his wife, Rebecca, to the campaign staff a few months after he was sworn into Congress. She earned a little more than \$41,000 between May 2011 and the end of last year as the campaign's "custodian of records."

Labrador's spokesman did not return phone calls. "I don't think we have any comment right now," Rebecca Labrador said when reached by phone.



(e.g. Donors, Politicians, Corporations and more)



Revolving Door: Top Lobbying Firms

When American voters discard elected officials—and their staffs—lobbying firms and interest groups are quick to snap up the unemployed. Lobbying firms—which often charge steep fees from their deep-pocketed clients—can offer former government employees salaries far greater than those proffered by Uncle Sam, as well as continued influence on Capitol Hill. In return, firms get lobbyists who already have established connections in the federal government and whose résumés can act as a powerful draw for potential clients. The lobbying firms shown here have the greatest track record of hiring former government employees.

Firm	Number of revolving door people profiled	
	Former	Current
<u>Patton Boggs LLP</u>	80	99
<u>Akin, Gump et al</u>	79	96
<u>Cassidy & Assoc</u>	71	60
<u>Hogan & Hartson</u>	64	44
<u>Van Scoyoc Assoc</u>	52	46
<u>Covington & Burling</u>	33	68
<u>Holland & Knight</u>	31	56
<u>K&L Gates</u>	14	69
<u>DLA Piper</u>	27	50
<u>Van Scoyoc Kelly</u>	68	9
<u>McDermott, Will & Emery</u>	20	53
<u>Venable LLP</u>	20	53
<u>Preston, Gates et al</u>	68	0
<u>Podesta Group</u>	14	49
<u>Verner, Liipfert et al</u>	64	0
<u>Kirkpatrick & Lockhart</u>	62	0
<u>Crowell & Moring</u>	22	37
<u>Livingston Group</u>	31	27
<u>Greenberg Traurig LLP</u>	38	20

(e.g. Donors, Politicians, Corporations and more)



Lobbying Database

In addition to campaign contributions to elected officials and candidates, companies, labor unions, and other organizations spend billions of dollars each year to lobby Congress and federal agencies. Some special interests retain lobbying firms, many of them located along Washington's legendary K Street; others have lobbyists working in-house. We've got totals spent on lobbying, beginning in 1998, for everyone from AAI Corp. to Zurich Financial.

You can use the options on the right to search through our database in several ways: search by name for a company, lobbying firm or individual lobbyist; search for the total spending by a particular industry; view the interests that lobbied a particular government agency; or search for lobbying on a general issue or specific piece of legislation.

Total Lobbying Spending		Number of Lobbyists*	
1998	\$1.45 Billion	1998	10,406
1999	\$1.44 Billion	1999	12,933
2000	\$1.56 Billion	2000	12,536
2001	\$1.63 Billion	2001	11,832
2002	\$1.82 Billion	2002	12,115
2003	\$2.04 Billion	2003	12,913
2004	\$2.18 Billion	2004	13,167
2005	\$2.42 Billion	2005	14,071
2006	\$2.62 Billion	2006	14,496
2007	\$2.86 Billion	2007	14,837
2008	\$3.30 Billion	2008	14,196
2009	\$3.50 Billion	2009	13,789
2010	\$3.55 Billion	2010	12,966
2011	\$3.33 Billion	2011	12,712
2012	\$3.31 Billion	2012	12,432
2013	\$2.38 Billion	2013	11,935

NOTE: Figures are on this page are calculations by the Center for Responsive Politics based on data from the Senate Office of Public Records. Data for the most recent year was downloaded on .

*The number of unique, registered lobbyists who have actively lobbied.

Feel free to distribute or cite this material, but please credit the Center for Responsive Politics. For permission to reprint for commercial uses, such as textbooks, contact the Center.

**Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Request to Speak**

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
to Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME: Shirley Ferrante & Lori Makony

Address: 4291 Monroe #81
(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City: Riverside **Zip:** 92504

Phone #: ⁹⁵¹ 500-7713

Date: 11/5/03 **Agenda #** oral

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

Support **Oppose** **Neutral**

I give my 3 minutes to: _____

BOARD RULES

Requests to Address Board on "Agenda" Items:

You may request to be heard on a published agenda item. Requests to be heard must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board before the scheduled meeting time.

Requests to Address Board on items that are "NOT" on the Agenda:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of these rules, member of the public shall have the right to address the Board during the mid-morning "Oral Communications" segment of the published agenda. Said purpose for address must pertain to issues which are under the direct jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. YOUR TIME WILL BE LIMITED TO THREE (3) MINUTES.

Power Point Presentations/Printed Material:

Speakers who intend to conduct a formalized Power Point presentation or provide printed material must notify the Clerk of the Board's Office by 12 noon on the Monday preceding the Tuesday Board meeting, insuring that the Clerk's Office has sufficient copies of all printed materials and at least one (1) copy of the Power Point CD. Copies of printed material given to the Clerk (by Monday noon deadline) will be provided to each Supervisor. If you have the need to use the overhead "Elmo" projector at the Board meeting, please insure your material is clear and with proper contrast, notifying the Clerk well ahead of the meeting, of your intent to use the Elmo.

Individual Speaker Limits:

Individual speakers are limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes. Please step up to the podium when the Chairman calls your name and begin speaking immediately. Pull the microphone to your mouth so that the Board, audience, and audio recording system hear you clearly. Once you start speaking, the "green" podium light will light. The "yellow" light will come on when you have one (1) minute remaining. When you have 30 seconds remaining, the "yellow" light will begin flash, indicating you must quickly wrap up your comments. Your time is up when the "red" light flashes. The Chairman adheres to a strict three (3) minutes per speaker. **Note: If you intend to give your time to a "Group/Organized Presentation", please state so clearly at the very bottom of the reverse side of this form.**

Group/Organized Presentations:

Group/organized presentations with more than one (1) speaker will be limited to nine (9) minutes at the Chairman's discretion. The organizer of the presentation will automatically receive the first three (3) minutes, with the remaining six (6) minutes relinquished by other speakers, as requested by them on a completed "Request to Speak" form, and clearly indicated at the front bottom of the form.

Addressing the Board & Acknowledgement by Chairman:

The Chairman will determine what order the speakers will address the Board, and will call on all speakers in pairs. The first speaker should immediately step to the podium and begin addressing the Board. The second speaker should take up a position in one of the chamber aisles in order to quickly step up to the podium after the preceding speaker. This is to afford an efficient and timely Board meeting, giving all attendees the opportunity to make their case. Speakers are prohibited from making personal attacks, and/or using coarse, crude, profane or vulgar language while speaking to the Board members, staff, the general public and/or meeting participants. Such behavior, at the discretion of the Board Chairman may result in removal from the Board Chambers by Sheriff Deputies.