



DETECTIVES' ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.

POLICE DEPARTMENT • CITY OF NEW YORK

26 THOMAS STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007 • (212) 587-1000

FAX (212) 732-4863 • E-MAIL info@nycdetectives.org

OFFICERS

MICHAEL J. PALLADINO
President

VICTOR R. CIPULLO
Vice President

KEN SPARKS
Secretary

PAUL DI GIACOMO
Treasurer

KEN CARDONA
*Borough Director
Manhattan/Bronx/Headquarters*

GEORGE FAHRBACH
*Borough Director
Brooklyn/Queens/Staten Island*

BRIAN HUNT
Chairman, Board of Trustees

SAMUEL T. MILLER
Sergeant at Arms

CECIL MARTINEZ
Executive Assistant to the President

TRUSTEES

JOSEPH T. CUSANELLI
Headquarters

WILLIAM F. McNEELY
Manhattan South

BRIAN HUNT
Manhattan North

PAUL E. MORRISON
Bronx

SAL BRAJUHA
Brooklyn North

JOE CALABRESE
Brooklyn South

JOHN LA PIERRE
Queens

JEFFREY WARD
Staten Island

WELFARE OFFICERS

JOHN F. McGUIRE
Headquarters

KEVIN McPARTLAN
Manhattan South

ERVIN URBINA
Manhattan North

DANIEL RIVERA
Bronx

ANTHONY CARDINALE
Brooklyn North

FRANK CICCONE
Brooklyn South

JOHN J. COMER
Queens

GREGORY W. SILVERMAN
Staten Island

LOU MATARAZZO
Legislative Director



New York City Campaign Finance Board
40 Rector Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10006

March 2, 2012

Dear Members of the Board:

In October of last year, we expressed significant concern with your proposed rules, drafted as a result of the amendment to the City Charter passed by New York City voters requiring the disclosure of independent expenditures by individuals and groups to persuade voters on candidates and referenda on the ballot.

We commend the Board for your work revising the October draft of the regulations to more accurately reflect the mandate and intent of the Charter amendment. However, after reviewing the revised regulations released earlier this month, we have two principal concerns that we feel must be addressed to avoid unintentionally decreasing citizen participation in the political process — an outcome that would run counter to your mission as a Board.

Our first concern is the inclusion of some internal union membership communications; the second is the broadening of the content definition of "electioneering communications," rather than deleting that communications category. (We and/or other labor organizations may also raise other specific concerns with the revised proposal in separate comments to the Board.)

The voters overwhelmingly voted to set up a system where individuals and organizations who were communicating to the *public* would have to disclose that spending. The Charter Revision Commission, the ballot question, and the official voter guide all spoke *only in terms of public communications*, and they did not suggest that internal membership communications would be affected by the amendment. We support a system of disclosure about public communications. However, regulation of membership communication is unnecessary and counterproductive. When our members communicate with each other about politics, it *increases* political participation, which is a stated goal of the Campaign Finance Board.

The Charter Amendment permits regulation of only communications that "are in support of or in opposition to" candidates and ballot proposals. But the revised definition of electioneering communications — any communication in the regulated time period which "refers to one or more clearly identified ballot proposals and/or

candidates" — clearly encompasses communications beyond the scope of the amendment. The result is an effective ban on such communications if they are in any way coordinated with a candidate since they will be considered "in-kind contributions" subject to the campaign contribution limitations of \$2,750, \$3,850 or \$4,950 (depending upon for which office the elected official runs). Moreover, each amount is cumulative per "candidate" throughout a four-year election cycle. For example, if two public officials who are opposing candidates attend a union contract rally within the 60-day primary window, a union leaflet announcing the event that mentions their attendance would be an in-kind contribution to both campaigns.

This proposal, then, treats membership organizations as if we are the same as political candidates in the current system. Under this rule, if our organizations spend as little as \$1,000 communicating with our members about an elected official's stand on legislative issues (if the elected official happens to be a candidate), we would have to file extensive financial reports and many of these communications would be limited to comply with the in-kind contribution limits.

There can be little question that given the high costs — both in the complexity of CFB filing and the need to retain accounting and legal counsel — and the risks of erroneous reporting, that many membership organizations would respond to the CFB's proposed rules by limiting their own speech, including to their own members. Such a result would be completely at odds with the CFB's broad goal of increasing participation in the democratic process. Smaller unions would be especially hard hit and deterred. That would be an unacceptable consequence of a City law that was designed to inform the general public about the identities and funders of secretive groups that are trying to persuade them how to vote.

The CFB can fulfill the City Charter Amendment's goal of bringing transparency and accountability to independent political expenditures without stifling speech that is critical to the democratic process. The solution is to limit its proposed rules to spending that targets the general public with speech that clearly supports or opposes candidates in elections. When organizations and wealthy people spend money communicating with the general public and say "Vote for Candidate X" or "Defeat Candidate Y," they should disclose who they are, how much they spent, and who else financed that advertising. That's at what the Charter Amendment was aimed.


In addition, reporting is not a simple process that our small staff can add to their current responsibilities. It would require a great deal of information and documentation. But failure to report, or reporting incorrectly, could lead to lengthy investigations, \$10,000 fines and even criminal prosecution.

Additionally, such disclosure is in many cases redundant, as organizations that spend money to influence policy decisions must already file lobbying disclosure reports (though such reports are far less complex and difficult to file than the proposed filing system).

These rules may be appropriate for the independent PACs and expressly political groups on whose spending the Charter amendment was meant to shine a light. But the same regulation becomes onerous when applied to groups whose clear intention is education, advocacy, or member service and representation.

Several recent studies have shown that when unions (and other organizations) communicate with their members about politics — and why elections matter — those members are more likely to participate in the electoral process. The CFB should not interfere with membership relationships, impose onerous and chilling requirements on legislative and issue advocacy, or force organizations to report irrelevant private and internal information in pursuit of exercising their First Amendment rights.

Sincerely,



Michael J. Palladino
President

Cc: The Hon. Michael Bloomberg, Mayor, City of New York
The Hon. Christine Quinn, Speaker, New York City Council
Ms. Amy M. Loprest, Executive Director, Campaign Finance Board