STACEY FULHORST, Executive Director  
City of San Diego Ethics Commission  
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1530  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 533-3476  
Facsimile: (619) 533-3448  

Petitioner  

BEFORE THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
ETHICS COMMISSION  

In re the Matter of:  ) Case No.: 2004-49  
DICK MURPHY and C. APRIL BOLING,  ) STIPULATION, DECISION, AND  
Respondents.  ) ORDER  

STIPULATION  

THE PARTIES STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:  

1. Petitioner Stacey Fulhorst is the Executive Director of the City of San Diego Ethics  
Commission [Ethics Commission]. The Ethics Commission is charged with a duty to administer,  
implement, and enforce local governmental ethics laws contained in the San Diego Municipal  
Code [SDMC] relating to, among other things, the provisions of the City’s Election Campaign  
Control Ordinance [ECCO].  

2. At all times mentioned herein, Dick Murphy [Murphy] was the Mayor of the City of  
San Diego. The Friends of Mayor Dick Murphy committee [Committee] is a campaign  
committee registered with the State of California (Identification No. 990466) established to  
support Mayor Murphy’s bid for re-election in the 2004 election. At all relevant times herein, the  
committee was controlled by Mayor Murphy within the meaning of the California Political  
Reform Act, California Government Code section 82016.  

3. At all times mentioned herein, C. April Boling [Boling] was the treasurer for the  
Friends of Mayor Dick Murphy committee.
4. Murphy and Boling are referred to herein collectively as “Respondents.”
5. This Stipulation will be submitted for consideration by the Ethics Commission at its
   next scheduled meeting, and the agreements contained herein are contingent upon the approval
   of the Stipulation and the accompanying Decision and Order by the Ethics Commission.
6. This Stipulation resolves all factual and legal issues raised in this matter by the
   Ethics Commission without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to determine
   Respondents’ liability.
7. Respondents understand and knowingly and voluntarily waive any and all
   procedural rights under the SDMC, including, but not limited to, a determination of probable
   cause, the issuance and receipt of an administrative complaint, the right to appear personally in
   any administrative hearing held in this matter, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses
   testifying at the hearing, the right to subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, and the right to
   have the Ethics Commission or an impartial hearing officer hear this matter.
8. Respondents acknowledge that this Stipulation is not binding upon any other law
   enforcement or government agency and does not preclude the Ethics Commission from referring
   this matter to, cooperating with, or assisting any other law enforcement or government agency
   with regard to this or any other related matter.
9. The parties agree that in the event the Ethics Commission refuses to accept this
   Stipulation, it shall become null and void. Respondents further agree that in the event the Ethics
   Commission rejects the Stipulation and a full evidentiary hearing before the Ethics Commission
   becomes necessary, no member of the Ethics Commission or its staff shall be disqualified
   because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.

Summary of Law and Facts

10. Because the Friends of Mayor Dick Murphy committee is a committee formed for
    the purpose of supporting a candidate in a City of San Diego election, Respondents are required
    to comply with the provisions of ECCO.

///
///
Vendor Debt

11. SDMC section 27.2945 requires candidates and committees to pay for goods and services in full no later than ninety calendar days after receipt of a bill or invoice, and in no event later than ninety calendar days after the last calendar day of the month in which the goods were delivered or the services were rendered.

12. Respondents received an invoice from Michael’s Printing Company dated December 12, 2003. Respondents did not pay this bill within ninety calendar days as required by ECCO. Instead, Respondents paid this bill on July 28, 2004.

13. Respondents received an invoice from the Sierra Club dated February 8, 2004. Respondents did not pay this bill within ninety calendar days as required by ECCO. Instead, Respondents paid this bill on July 14, 2004.

Non-deposit of Contributions Requiring Additional Information

14. SDMC section 27.2921(e) requires candidates and committees to deposit all contributions into a campaign checking account within 20 business days of receipt, and to return contributions not deposited to contributors within 25 business days.

15. From December 2003 through May 2004, Respondents received contributions from 92 contributors totaling $26,395.

16. The 92 contributions identified in paragraph 15 were not deposited into the campaign checking account because Respondents needed to obtain additional information from the contributors, such as occupation and employer information required by SDMC section 27.2921(d).

17. Respondents did not deposit the 92 contributions within 20 business days of receipt, and did not return the contributions to the contributors within 25 business days as required by SDMC section 27.2921. Instead, Respondents returned the contributions to the contributors in June 2004.

Non-deposit of Improper Contributions

18. SDMC section 27.2948 states that if a candidate or committee receives a monetary contribution the acceptance of which would constitute a violation of ECCO, the candidate or
committee must refrain from depositing the contribution, and must return the contribution to the contributor within 20 business days of receipt.

19. From January 2004 through May 2004, Respondents received contributions from 33 contributors totaling $8,875.

20. The 33 contributions identified in paragraph 19 were not deposited into the campaign checking account because they were drawn on business or trust accounts and could not lawfully be used in a candidate election, or because the contributions would cause the total amount contributed by a particular contributor to exceed the $250 per election contribution limit set forth in SDMC section 27.2941.

21. Although Respondents appropriately did not deposit the 33 contributions into their campaign checking account, they did not return the contributions to the contributors within 20 business days as required by SDMC section 27.2948. Instead, Respondents returned the contributions to the contributors in June 2004.

Counts

Count 1 - Violations of SDMC section 27.2945

22. Respondents failed to pay two vendors within 90 days as required by SDMC section 27.2945. Respondents received an invoice from Michael’s Printing Company dated December 12, 2003, but did not pay this bill until July 28, 2004, 229 days after it was received. Respondents received an invoice from the Sierra Club dated February 8, 2004, but did not pay this bill until July 14, 2004, 157 days after it was received.

Count 2 - Violations of SDMC sections 27.2921 and 27.2948

24. Respondents did not timely return improper contributions and contributions requiring additional information to 125 contributors as required by SDMC sections 27.2921 and 27.2948. Respondents received contributions from these contributors from December 2003 through May 2004, but did not return these contributions to the contributors until June 2004, in some cases nearly six months after the contributions were originally received.

///
///
Factors in Mitigation

26. The Commission’s investigation revealed that Respondent Murphy was not personally aware that vendor invoices were not being timely paid, or that non-deposited contributions were not being returned to contributors in a timely manner. Respondent Murphy reasonably relied on Respondent Boling to process vendor invoices for payment and to deposit or return contributions as appropriate and as required by local law. Respondent Boling has therefore taken full responsibility for the violations described herein as well as the monetary penalty referenced below.

27. Upon discovery of the oversights and prior to the filing of any complaint, Respondents self-reported the violations to the Ethics Commission by letter dated June 29, 2004.

28. The Commission’s investigation revealed that the failures to timely pay vendors and timely return contributions resulted from negligence and were not intentional.

29. Although Respondents failed to timely return contributions to contributors, they did not unlawfully deposit those contributions or use them in any regard. The contributions were returned to the contributors prior to the Ethics Commission’s initiation of an enforcement action.

30. Respondents have cooperated fully with the Ethics Commission investigation.

Conclusion

31. Respondent Boling agrees to implement appropriate controls and adequate supervisory measures to prevent future similar violations of ECCO.

32. Respondent Boling agrees to pay a fine in the amount of $500 for violating SDMC sections 27.2945 and 27.2948. Respondent agrees to pay this amount no later than November 12, 2004.
33. This Stipulation shall not become effective until Respondent Boling has provided to the Ethics Commission the amount set forth in paragraph 32, by check or money order made payable to the City Treasurer.

DATED:_________________  STACEY FULHORST, Executive Director
ETHICS COMMISSION, Petitioner

DATED:_________________  DICK MURPHY, Respondent

DATED:_________________  C. APRIL BOLING, Respondent

DECISION AND ORDER

The Ethics Commission considered the above Stipulation at its meeting on November 18, 2004. The Ethics Commission hereby approves the Stipulation and orders that, in accordance with the Stipulation, Respondent Boling pay a fine in the amount of $500.

DATED:_________________  Dorothy L.W. Smith, Chair
SAN DIEGO ETHICS COMMISSION