

Independent Ethics Commission

DATE FILED: April 3, 2013 1:13 PM
FILING ID: D3EB0A97

- About the IEC
- Agendas & Minutes
- FYIs
- Handbook
- Opinions
- Complaints
- Rules of Procedure

Contact Us Home > FYI 6: Advisory Opinions >

FYI 6: Advisory Opinions

FYI 1: What is the IEC?

FYI 2: Asking the IEC for Help

FYI 3: Confidentiality and the IEC

FYI 4: Filing a Complaint with the IEC

FYI 5: Position Statements

FYI 6: Advisory Opinions

FYI 7: Letter Rulings

FYI 8: Education and Training

FYI 9: The IEC's Jurisdiction

FYI 10: What are "other standards of conduct?"

FYI 11: Lobbyists

FYI 12: Travel

FYI 13 What is a Gift?

FYI 14 Holiday Giving

When a government employee, member of the General Assembly or a public official under the jurisdiction of the IEC wants to know if a particular activity is permissible under Article XXIX of the Colorado Constitution or any other standard of conduct under the jurisdiction of the IEC, the person may file a request for Advisory Opinion from the Commission.

Advisory Opinions address a very specific set of facts or circumstances. For example, an employee of a municipal government office might want to find out in advance if accepting a cash award and invitation to an award ceremony as result of work done for the city is acceptable. In the Advisory Opinion the IEC will review the facts of the request, apply prior decisions (if any) and provide the employee with guidance as to whether or not accepting the award and invitation violates applicable laws. Facts such as the size of the award, the relationship between the employee and the awarding organization, and how the winner was selected may be facts that affect the Commission's opinion.

It is important that individuals understand that Advisory Opinions are designed to provide guidance to the requestor only under the facts as presented in the original request. An Advisory Opinion does not apply to other situations – no matter how similar they may appear to be on the surface. For this reason, Advisory Opinions are not necessarily precedent setting, but they may provide the requestor a "safe haven" should the conduct be questioned at a later time, but only if the facts as presented to the Commission are accurate and complete.

The Commission typically does not name the requestor of an advisory opinion in the decision, unless confidentiality is waived. An opinion may simply say, "an employee of the Department of _____." However, if the Commission receives an open records act request, the original request will be supplied, without redactions of any identifying information.

To request an Advisory Opinion, send a letter or email to the Executive Director outlining the facts and issues.



Independent Ethics Commission
101 West Colfax Avenue
Suite 500
Denver, Colorado 80203

January 2, 2013

Via email jane.feldman@state.co.us

RE: REQUEST FOR AN ADVISORY OPINION REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF a LEGAL DEFENSE FUND FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Question Presented

In Colorado, Amendment 41 prohibits gifts to public officials to ensure they do not realize any personal financial gain through public office. Public officials are often sued solely because of decisions made in their official capacity, and incur significant legal expenses for which they are personally liable. Would donations to a legal defense fund violate Amendment 41's gift ban?

Short Answer

No. First, donations to a legal defense fund fall outside of Amendment 41's gift ban because they do not result in any personal financial gain; rather, monies in such a fund would go directly to licensed attorneys to cover actual litigation costs. Second, even if donations to a legal defense fund did fall under the technical definition of gifts under Amendment 41, the donations are exempt as components of usual compensation or incentives given in the normal course of business, just as they are in many other states and at the federal level. Third, the donations are exempted under the special occasion gift exemption because the donations are personal in nature and raise no appearance of impropriety. And last, disallowing the establishment of, and donations to, a legal defense fund discourages bright and driven people from seeking or accepting public office.



Introduction

Because public officials in Colorado are in the public eye, citizens often bring legal challenges against them for activities performed in furtherance of their public duties. Public officials make difficult decisions, decisions that often times please some while angering others. Because special interest groups and partisan organizations are permitted to file politically-driven and often-baseless claims, an elected official should be able defend him or herself without incurring crippling legal costs, costs for which the official is personally liable. Just like citizens, public officials are entitled to defend themselves. Often, the defense results in significant legal costs and public officials are left personally responsible for the payment, regardless of the outcome. The establishment of a legal defense fund would help to allay such litigation costs and encourage more participation in all levels of state government.

Discussion

1. Donations to a legal defense fund do not fall under Amendment 41's gift ban.

When Colorado citizens passed Amendment 41, they did so out of concerns about public officials realizing improper personal gain.¹ In adopting the amendment, however, the people did declare that “there are certain costs associated with public office” that public officials should not be expected to bear themselves.² In defending themselves in actions brought against them, public officials are not realizing any personal gain above and beyond their normal compensation; rather, the defense fund merely defrays a cost inherent in public service.

The Independent Ethics Commission (the “Commission”) has previously opined that “although public employees should not be rewarded because of their status as public employees,

¹ Colo. Const. Art. XXIX, sec. (1) (d)

² Colo. Const. Art. XXIX, sec. (2)

neither should they be penalized.”³ Currently, public officials who are targeted by special-interest groups are penalized in that they must expend their own money to defend actions taken in their official capacity. The establishment of a legal defense fund would allow public officials to serve without penalty, an ideal the Commission has embraced on several previous occasions.

In Advisory Opinion 10-18, the Commission approved the creation of a non-profit organization and the solicitation and acceptance of private donations for a gubernatorial transition.⁴ Though the Commission expressed some initial misgivings, it ultimately ruled that “no covered individual will receive personal benefit from the contributions.”⁵ As such, the Commission ruled the donations were not gifts under the meaning of Amendment 41. Private donations to a legal defense fund would be no different than the donations described in Advisory Opinion 10-18. That is, no public official would receive any personal benefit from the contributions. Rather, any monies in the fund would be paid directly to licensed attorneys who have incurred actual litigation costs in the course of defending a public official.

For the above reasons, the Commission should find that the establishment of, and donations to, a legal defense fund does not fall under Amendment 41’s gift ban: as expressed by the Commission in Advisory Opinion 10-04, public officials should not be penalized merely because they are public officials; and, donations to a legal defense fund are no different than the donations to a gubernatorial transition nonprofit that the Commission approved in Advisory Opinion 10-18.

³ IEC Advisory Opinion 10-04, citing IEC Position Statement 08-01

⁴ IEC Advisory Opinion 10-18

⁵ *Id.* at 4.

2. Even if donations to a legal defense fund do fall under the general gift ban, they are exempt as components of usual compensation or incentives given in the normal course of business.

Even if the Commission finds that donations to a legal defense fund are technically prohibited by Amendment 41's gift ban, the donations are still allowable under an exception that allows for things of value that are a "component of the compensation paid or other incentive given to the recipient in the normal course of employment."⁶ In Advisory Opinion 10-04, the Commission approved the creation of a financial assistance project where people may donate money to an employee association, which would in turn make donations or grants to state employees experiencing financial difficulties due to mandatory furloughs and budget reductions.⁷ The Commission found that the project fit squarely within the gift-ban exception allowing other incentives given in the normal course of employment. In approving the donations, the Commission stated its belief that the "situation does not give rise to the undue influences or appearance of impropriety that Article XXIX is designed to prevent."⁸

Donations to a legal defense fund are analogous to the donations in Advisory Opinion 10-04 in that their purpose is to help a public official whose finances are negatively impacted because he or she holds office. And, the donations to a legal defense fund would not give rise to undue influence because the public official would never receive the monies; any monies in the fund would be paid directly to the public official's legal counsel. Because the establishment of a legal defense fund is no different than the establishment of the financial assistance project in Advisory Opinion 10-04, the Commission should find that donations to such a fund are specifically exempted as incentives given in the normal course of employment.

⁶ Colo. Const. Art. XXIX, sec. (3) (h)

⁷ IEC Advisory Opinion 10-04

⁸ *Id* at 3.

Additionally, legal defense funds can be, and often are, considered a component of compensation. Indeed, many other states, and even the federal government, recognize legal defense funds as necessary aspects of public service. Many states, including Michigan and California, have detailed laws and rules regarding legal defense funds. A number of states, such as Florida, Maryland, and Ohio have recently addressed the funds through advisory opinions of ethics commissions. Legal defense funds are being recognized as a necessity even at the local government level. Like their colleagues around the country, Colorado's public officials should be free to serve the people of Colorado without incurring penalties.

3. Donations to a legal defense fund are also exempt from the gift ban under the "special occasion" exemption.

The Commission could also find that donations to a legal defense fund are exempt from Amendment 41's gift ban because the donations would undoubtedly be "[g]iven by an individual who is a...personal friend of the recipient on a special occasion."⁹ In Advisory Opinion 11-08, the Commission approved disbursements from a blind trust to help defray the medical expenses of a public official's spouse.¹⁰ In approving the disbursements, the Commission highlighted language from an earlier Position Statement, stating, in essence, that the term "special occasion" should be broadly construed so as not to preclude public employees from enjoying certain benefits available to private citizens.¹¹ The Commission went on to state that "the term 'special occasion' should not be restricted to birthdays, anniversaries and holidays; nor should it necessarily mean events that are rare or unusual."¹²

To determine whether an event is a special occasion, the Commission laid out a two-part test.

⁹ Colo. Const. Art. XXIX, sec. (3) (g)

¹⁰ IEC Advisory Opinion 11-08.

¹¹ IEC Advisory Opinion 11-08 citing IEC Position Statement 08-01

¹² *Id.*

An event is a special occasion if:

1. It can be shown under all of the relevant circumstances that it is a family or personal relationship rather than the governmental position that is the controlling factor; and
2. The public official's or employee's receipt of the gift or other thing of value would not result in or create the appearance of:
 - a. Using his or her office for personal benefit;
 - b. Giving preferential treatment to any person or entity;
 - c. Losing independence or impartiality; or
 - d. Accepting gifts or favors for performing official duties.¹³

Here, donations to a legal defense fund meet both prongs of the Commission's test. The first prong is met because the controlling factor is the fact that a public official has to pay for legal defense out of his or her own pocket. Donors would contribute money to the legal defense fund to help the personal finances of the public official, not to influence the public official. The situation is no different than the medical expense fund approved by the Commission.

A legal defense fund meets the second prong of the test because there would be no appearance that official is receiving any personal gain, giving any person preferential treatment, losing any independence or impartiality, or accepting gifts or favors for performing official duties. Again, a legal defense fund is analogous to a medical expense fund under the "special occasion" exemption and, as such, should be approved by the Commission.

¹³ *Id.*

4. Without a legal defense fund, citizens are discouraged from seeking or accepting public office.

In Position Statement 08-01, the IEC observed that public officials should not be penalized for holding public office:

[g]overnment officials and employees should not be prohibited from accepting offers and benefits given to the general public or a class of people under circumstances where others receive the same opportunity. It would be unfair to penalize people because they are in government, any more than they should not be rewarded for being in government.

Similarly, a government official should not be placed in a position of expending significant personal funds to defend against complaints and actions brought against them solely because of their status as a public official. In the current political environment, government officials and employees, whether elected or not, are often easy targets for individuals and groups who disagree with policy positions. These individuals and groups have little disincentive to sue or otherwise accuse government officials, and this causes incredible personal and financial distress to government officials and their families. A public official should be allowed to defend him or herself without incurring crippling legal costs, costs for which the official is personally liable. Without this ability, many talented and driven citizens are deterred from seeking public office or government employment for fear that they too will be financially ruined for no other reason than they exercised their public duties in the manner they saw fit. A legal defense fund guards against such a situation without encroaching on any particular group's right to sue.

5. A properly structured legal defense fund avoids any appearance of undue influence.

The legal defense could be structured to avoid any appearance of undue influence on an elected official. There are three options for structuring the fund:

No regulation

If the Commission finds that the legal defense fund is not a gift under Amendment 41, there technically would be no need to subject the fund to regulations. Though this is an option, some regulation is certainly advisable to ensure that management of fund monies comports with the highest ethical standards. Some regulations would also alleviate any concerns of impropriety.

Blind trust

Next, the fund could be set up and administered as a blind trust. The Commission has found that timely public disclosure of contributions is one way to assure the public that donations will not unduly influence a public official.¹⁴ But the Commission has also permitted acceptance of money by way of a blind trust. In Advisory Opinion 10-18, the Commission “appreciate[d] that...the blind trust will be structured so that the member will not know who has given to this fund and in what amount, so that there is no possibility that these donations are made with the intent to influence the member in performance of his official duties.”¹⁵ By setting up and administering a blind trust legal defense fund, the public can be assured no individual can unduly influence a public official.

If a legal defense fund is established as a blind trust, lobbyists, contractors, and individuals with current business before the public official should be allowed to donate to the fund. The Commission has made clear that lobbyists¹⁶ and other individuals with business before the office should not contribute to a fund.¹⁷ The blind trust’s administrator could require donors to affirm they are not lobbyists, contractors, or other individuals with pending business before

¹⁴ Advisory Opinion 10-18

¹⁵ Advisory Opinion 11-08 at 4

¹⁶ Advisory Opinion 10-4

¹⁷ Advisory Opinion 10-18

the official. This will further ensure that no individual will donate to the fund in order to influence the behavior of the public official.

The fund could be administered using additional safeguards to ensure there is no influence, or the appearance of influence, over the public official. Specifically:

- The fund should be set up as a trust, administered by an independent trustee, who will oversee fund raising.
- The trustee will not have any family, business, or employment relationship with the trust's beneficiary.
- Trust funds will be used only for legal expenses (and expenses incurred in soliciting for and administering the trust). Any excess funds will be returned to contributors. Under no circumstances will the beneficiary of the fund convert the funds to any other purpose.
- The fund will not accept more than \$5,000 in a calendar year from any individual or organization.

Quarterly disclosure and reporting

Finally, in converse to a blind trust, a legal defense fund could be set up in such a manner that requires regular disclosure and reporting. There are currently two separate models for such a fund:

1. Connecticut Model

In Connecticut, legal defense funds are required to report quarterly. The reports must contain the following:

- The fund's officers and directors;
- An itemized accounting of each contribution to the fund, including the full name and complete address of each contributor and the amount of the contribution; and
- An itemized accounting of each expenditure, including the full name and complete address of each payee and the amount and purpose of the expenditure.

Such detailed disclosure lessens the any appearance of impropriety.

2. Federal Model

Legal defense funds are also allowed at the federal level. The U.S. House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct established the following guidelines for such funds:

- The officeholder should appoint a trustee to manage the account, who is charged with all responsibilities of administering the account, including the solicitation of contributions and the making of defense fund expenditures.
- The trustee should be a person with no authority over the employees of the executive agency of the government officeholder for whose benefit the fund is established.
- Contributions should not be received from “prohibited sources,” persons who have a vested interest in official actions by the officeholder or the officeholder’s agency.
- The officeholder of the executive branch should not personally solicit contributions to the account.
- The trustee should not solicit contributions specifically from employees of the officeholder’s agency.
- The government officeholder and the trustee of the account should make all reasonable efforts to keep the identities of the donors anonymous to the officeholder.
- Excess defense funds may not be transferred to any other account of the officeholder.

These two disclosure models, individually, do much to ensure the public official receives no personal gain. What’s more, the two models alleviate any public concerns about the administration of the fund.

Conclusion

For the reasons detailed above, the undersigned respectfully requests a determination that Amendment 41 permits the establishment of, and donations to, a legal defense fund. First, donations to a legal defense fund fall outside of Amendment 41’s gift ban because they do not result in any personal financial gain; rather, monies in such a fund would go directly to licensed attorneys to cover actual litigation costs. Second, even if donations to a legal defense fund did fall under the technical definition of gifts under Amendment 41, the donations are exempt as

components of usual compensation or incentives given in the normal course of business, just as they are in many other states and at the federal level. Third, the donations are exempted under the special occasion gift exemption because the donations are personal in nature and raise no appearance of impropriety. And last, disallowing the establishment of, and donations to, a legal defense fund discourages bright and driven people from seeking or accepting public office.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Suzanne Staiert', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large initial 'S' and a long, sweeping underline.

Suzanne Staiert

Deputy Secretary of State for the state of Colorado

COLORADO INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMISSION
January 7, 2013 Meeting
1300 Broadway, First Floor
Denver, CO
9 am

AGENDA

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes of meeting of December 7, 2012.
3. Executive Director's Report
4. Update on enforcement research
5. Update on Complaint 12-06
6. Update on Complaint 12-07 (Motions to Dismiss and for F)
7. Advisory Opinion 12-12 (Travel to a Conference)
8. Advisory Opinion 13-01 (Legal Defense Fund)

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION BUSINESS

The Commission will enter into Executive Session to receive legal advice pursuant to C.R.S. §24-6-402(3)(a)(II) and §13-90-107(b) on:

1. Specific legal questions related to the Colorado Open Records Act and the Colorado Sunshine Law.
2. Specific legal questions related to the Response, Motions to Dismiss and for a Frivolous Determination filed by Respondent in Complaint 12-07.

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

9. Tour of the Ralph Carr Building



COLORADO INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMISSION

**January 23, 2013 Meeting
1300 Broadway, 12th Floor**

Denver, CO

10 am

(Telephonic Only)

AGENDA

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Public Comment
2. Review of Draft Order on Complaint 12-07
3. Advisory Opinion 13-01 (Establishment of a Legal Defense Fund)

COLORADO INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMISSION
February 4, 2013 Meeting
1300 Broadway, First Floor
Denver, CO
9 am

AGENDA

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes of meetings of January 7 and January 23, 2013
3. Executive Director's Report
4. Hearing on Complaint 12-06

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION BUSINESS

The Commission will enter executive session to receive legal advice pursuant to C.R.S. §24-6-402(3)(a)(II) and §13-90-107(b) concerning disputes that are the subject of pending or imminent court action and/or for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions regarding litigation entitled Scott Gessler v. Independent Ethics Commission filed in Denver District Court.

III GENERAL BUSINESS.

5. Update on Complaint 12-07
6. Advisory Opinion 13-01 (Legal Defense Fund)
7. Advisory Opinion 13-02 (Travel to a Conference)
8. Advisory Opinion 13-03 (Attendance at Political Events)

COLORADO INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMISSION
February 15, 2013 Meeting
1300 Broadway, 12th Floor
Denver, CO
9 a.m.
(Telephonic Only)

AGENDA

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Public Comment
2. Review of Draft Order on Complaint 12-06
3. Preliminary Investigation Report Complaint 12-07
4. Advisory Opinion 13-02 (Acceptance of Travel Expenses)
5. Advisory Opinion 13-01 (Establishment of a Legal Defense Fund)

COLORADO INDEPENDENT ETHICS COMMISSION
March 4, 2013 Meeting
1300 Broadway, First Floor
Denver, CO
9 am

AGENDA

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes of meetings of February 4 and February 15, 2013
3. Executive Director's Report
4. Advisory Opinion 13-05 (Conflict of Interest)

II. EXECUTIVE SESSION BUSINESS

a. The Commission will enter executive session to receive legal advice pursuant to C.R.S. §24-6-402(3)(a)(II) and §13-90-107(b) concerning disputes that are the subject of pending or imminent court action and/or for the purpose of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions regarding litigation entitled Scott Gessler v. Independent Ethics Commission filed in Denver District Court and regarding specific legal issues involving Complaint 12-07.

b. The Commission will enter into Executive Session to discuss complaints 13-01, 13-02, and 13-03 filed with the Commission which are required to be kept confidential pursuant to Article XXIX, Section 5(3)(b) of the Colorado Constitution.

III GENERAL BUSINESS.

5. Update on Complaint 12-07
6. Advisory Opinion 13-01 (Legal Defense Fund)
7. Advisory Opinion 13-03(Travel and Conferences)
8. Advisory Opinion 13-04 (Mileage Reimbursement)

Independent Ethics Commission
1300 Broadway, 12th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203

January 22, 2013

Via email jane.feldman@state.co.us

RE: REQUEST FOR AN ADVISORY OPINION REGARDING TRAVEL
REIMBURSEMENT

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Colorado Department of State, I respectfully request an advisory opinion in accordance with Article XXIX, section 5 (5) of the Colorado Constitution, section 24-18.5-101 (4) (b), C.R.S., and Rule 5 of the Independent Ethics Commission (“IEC”). This request regards expenses for travel and educational seminars anticipated by covered members of the Department.

Facts

1. The Department of State oversees election administration in the State of Colorado.
2. Because the Department oversees elections, the Department’s stakeholders include political parties and other partisan and non-partisan groups interested in the election process.
3. Covered employees in the Department are commonly asked to participate in events sponsored by political parties and other partisan and non-partisan groups.
4. To further professional development, the Department has a long-standing policy of reimbursing employees for training, including relevant continuing legal education (CLE) for Department attorneys.
5. Covered employees within the Department have asked to attend events sponsored by the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS), National Association of State Election Directors (NASSED), and Elections Center training.
6. Covered employees within the Department have asked to attend CLE’s relevant to election law, legal writing, legal drafting, and government ethics.
7. Covered employees within the Department have asked to attend CLEs and other election-administration-related events sponsored by various political parties and other partisan and non-partisan groups interested in the election process. Examples include events sponsored by groups such as (a) the American Constitution Society (ACS); (b) The



Federalist Society; (c) Common Cause; (d) Republican National Lawyers Association (RNLA); (e) League of Women Voters; (f) Colorado Democratic Party; (g) Republican Party of Colorado; and (h) various local political parties.

8. The Department has not yet provided funding for the costs associated with these activities and seeks an advisory opinion regarding the payment of direct and indirect costs described in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7.
9. As Deputy, I seek guidance as to whether I can participate in events and approve funding for the Department employees who participate in such events described in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7.

Previous IEC Interpretations

In Position Statement 12-01, the IEC stated “if the travel is paid for by local government or by the state of Colorado, (or another state), travel is permissible.”

This position is consistent with the conflict of interest principles and definitions established by the General Assembly after the passage of Amendment 41.¹ It is further consistent with the position of the Colorado Attorney General:

When article XXIX [Amendment 41] is read as a whole and the provisions harmonized, it requires a nexus between the gifts or activities and the covered persons’ public responsibilities. That is, the amendment limits or prohibits only those gift and activities that would cause the covered official to breach the public trust for private gain.²

Despite these established principles, the IEC has asserted jurisdiction over much broader conduct, under Amendment 41’s “other standards of conduct.”

The IEC has not defined these standards, nor has it provided guidance as to its definition of the terms “partisan” and “political.” The IEC has not clarified whether participation by a covered official in activities sponsored by political or partisan organizations (1) falls within the IEC’s jurisdiction; and (2) if so, whether such political or partisan activity is a violation of Amendment 41.

Because the conferences and trainings are election-related and, therefore, could be (mis)construed as political or partisan, the Department seeks this advisory opinion to clarify whether covered employees can participate in activities described in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7. Moreover, the Department seeks clarification as to whether, as the Deputy Secretary of State, I

¹ C.R.S. 24-18.5-105(1).

² Governor’s Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction, *Developmental Pathways v. Ritter*, Case No. 07CV1353, 2007 WL 5794312 (Denver District Court, filed April 26, 2007).

can participate in these activities or approve funding for the Department employees who attend such activities.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Staiert
Colorado Deputy Secretary of State

Independent Ethics Commission
1300 Broadway, 12th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203

February 15, 2013

Via email jane.feldman@state.co.us

RE: REQUEST FOR AN ADVISORY OPINION REGARDING REIMBURSEMENT

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Colorado Department of State, I respectfully request an advisory opinion in accordance with Article XXIX, section 5 (5) of the Colorado Constitution, section 24-18.5-101 (4) (b), C.R.S., and Rule 5 of the Independent Ethics Commission ("IEC"). This request regards expenses for travel and related expenses incurred by me in the performance of my duties as Deputy Secretary of State

Facts

1. The Department of State oversees election administration in the State of Colorado.
2. During the 2012 election I traveled to various locations in the State on election related activities.
3. Because of the uncertainty of the IEC's position on the ethics of such activities I have not sought reimbursement.
4. On June 8, 2012, I attended the Logic and Accuracy testing in Saguache County. Political parties and watchers were in attendance. While in Saguache I had lunch with an unaffiliated candidate for County Commissioner. At the lunch we discussed concerns she had regarding the voting equipment being used in Saguache County. I contributed \$20 cash to the lunch and because of the time constraints I left the lunch early and I do not have a receipt. Is it ethical to request reimbursement of the meal without a receipt?
5. On June 26, 2012, I went to Douglas County to observe the ballot tabulation of the Primary Election. The purpose of the trip was to observe and interact with election judges and county staff. Election judges are recommended by political parties and appointed by an elected Clerk and Recorder. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
6. On July 2, 2012, I attended a Boulder County Canvass Board meeting. The Canvass Board consisted of the elected County Clerk and Recorder, two members of the Republican Party, two members of the American Constitution Party and two members of the Democrat Party. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
7. On July 25 and 26, 2012, I attended a recount in Douglas County. The recount was conducted by the canvass board appointed by the political parties. While in Douglas County I had numerous meetings and conversations with the elected County Clerk, the Elections Director and watchers of various political candidates. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?



8. On August 3, 2012, I attended the summer County Clerk's conference. I had breakfast with the Denver County Clerk and Recorder. I paid \$5.00 for the breakfast, but did not request a receipt. While there I gave a presentation on the Department of State's status in negotiations with Homeland Security. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose? Is it ethical to request reimbursement of the cost of the meal without a receipt?
9. On October 19, 2012, I went to Boulder County to attend a Continuing Legal Education (CLE). The CLE was accredited by the Colorado Supreme Court. The information on the CLE is attached. Is it ethical to request reimbursement for costs associated with the CLE including mileage and parking?
10. On October 21, 2012, I attended a logic and accuracy testing in Arapahoe County. Both political parties had representatives at the testing. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
11. On October 24, 2012, I attended a test of the tabulation equipment in Arapahoe County. Both political parties had representatives at the testing. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
12. On October 29, 2012, I went to Boulder County as a witness in a lawsuit between Boulder County and the Independence Institute. While in Boulder, I had coffee with a citizen of Boulder active in election integrity issues. I am unaware of his party affiliation. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement of mileage for this purpose?
13. On October 30, 2012, I went to Pueblo and met with the Democrat elected Clerk and Recorder and the Secretary of State election observer. While in Pueblo I had lunch with the Pueblo County Republican Chair and a former Democrat State House member. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose? Is it ethical to request reimbursement of the cost of the lunch?
14. On November 1, 2012, I went to Boulder County and discussed canvass board and watcher issues with a number of Boulder citizens of various political affiliations. While in Boulder I also had coffee with the Chair of the Boulder County Republican party. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose? Is it ethical to request reimbursement of the cost of the coffee?
15. On November 5th, 2012 I went to Larimer County with a representative from the Attorney General's office regarding litigation brought by the Democratic Party against Larimer County. Our purpose was to offer testimony on behalf of Larimer County regarding a Colorado Open Records request. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
16. On November 29, 2012, I went to Douglas County District Court as an intervening party in a lawsuit between Douglas County and Citizen Center, an election integrity group. Is it ethical to request mileage reimbursement for this purpose?
17. On February 12, 2013, I renewed my Colorado Attorney Registration. Although my position does not require that I am a licensed attorney, many of my job duties overlap with my legal background. As the Deputy I oversee litigation, conduct rule-making hearings, Help America Vote Act (HAVA) hearings, issue declaratory orders and chair the Title Setting Board. Much of my professional development is through bar association CLE's and activities. It is the long standing practice of the Department of State to reimburse employees for attorney registration dues. Is it ethical to request reimbursement of \$225 for Attorney Registration fees?

Previous IEC Interpretations

In Position Statement 12-01, the IEC stated “if the travel is paid for by local government or by the state of Colorado, (or another state), travel is permissible.”

This position is consistent with the conflict of interest principles and definitions established by the General Assembly after the passage of Amendment 41.¹ It is further consistent with the position of the Colorado Attorney General:

When article XXIX [Amendment 41] is read as a whole and the provisions harmonized, it requires a nexus between the gifts or activities and the covered persons’ public responsibilities. That is, the amendment limits or prohibits only those gift and activities that would cause the covered official to breach the public trust for private gain.²

Despite these established principles, the IEC has asserted jurisdiction over much broader conduct, under Amendment 41’s “other standards of conduct” and “reporting requirements.” The IEC has not defined “other standards of conduct” or “reporting requirements”.

In supporting the Secretary’ request for a legal defense fund, the Colorado Attorney General reaffirmed the same position he took with the Denver District Court nearly six years ago: that the Commission’s jurisdiction under Amendment 41 (Article XXIX) is limited to influence peddling, as defined by C.R.S. § 24-18.5-101(5).

The IEC has not defined these standards, nor has it provided guidance as to its definition of the terms “partisan” and “political.” The IEC has not clarified whether participation by a covered official in activities sponsored by political or partisan organizations (1) falls within the IEC’s jurisdiction; and (2) if so, whether such political or partisan activity is a violation of Amendment 41.

Because the travel described was election-related and, therefore, could be (mis)construed as political or partisan, I seek an advisory opinion to clarify whether I can obtain mileage reimbursement for these activities.

I further seek an advisory opinion clearly defining the “other standards of conduct” and “reporting requirements”.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Staiert
Colorado Deputy Secretary of State

¹ C.R.S. 24-18.5-105(1).

² Governor’s Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction, *Developmental Pathways v. Ritter*, Case No. 07CV1353, 2007 WL 5794312 (Denver District Court, filed April 26, 2007).