

# MULTISTATE

Lobbying | Tracking | Compliance | Consulting

## Weekly Lobbying Articles

March 1, 2018

Bluefield Daily Telegraph

February 28, 2018

### Prosecutors don't have photo at heart of Greitens case

[http://www.bdtonline.com/news/prosecutors-don-t-have-photo-at-heart-of-greitens-case/article\\_7651e111-706b-5f65-acd1-56b031ee4ef2.html](http://www.bdtonline.com/news/prosecutors-don-t-have-photo-at-heart-of-greitens-case/article_7651e111-706b-5f65-acd1-56b031ee4ef2.html)

St. Louis prosecutors do not have the photo at the heart of the indictment of Missouri Gov. Eric Greitens but told a judge Wednesday that they plan to get it.

Circuit Attorney Kim Gardner and assistant prosecutor Robert Steele were in court along with Greitens' lawyers for a hearing in which Circuit Judge Rex Burlison set a May 14 trial date for Greitens on a felony invasion-of-privacy charge.

The Republican governor was indicted last week, accused of taking an unauthorized photo of a woman with whom he was having an affair during a sexual encounter in the basement of his St. Louis home in March 2015, before he was elected.

Greitens has admitted to the affair but denied criminal wrongdoing. In a January interview with The Associated Press and in subsequent interviews and news conferences, he has declined to say if he took a photo of the woman.

During the court hearing, defense attorney Jim Bennett told the judge he was informed by prosecutors "that the photo in the indictment doesn't exist."

Steele told Burlison that Bennett's characterization was wrong. He said prosecutors don't have the photo "yet."

"I did not tell them the picture doesn't exist. I told them we don't have it in our possession at this time," Steele said. "We plan to get that picture."

Steele did not elaborate. Attorneys from both sides declined comment after the hearing. Gardner's spokeswoman, Susan Ryan, would not discuss the photo but said Greitens' attorneys continue to "mischaracterize the statements we make regarding the facts of this case, and that's disappointing."

The trial scheduling comes as members of the Missouri House have launched their own bipartisan investigation that could determine whether to initiate impeachment proceedings against Greitens, once considered a rising star in national Republican politics.

All that is swirling around Greitens was part of the reason Burlison agreed to a May trial, not the November date requested by prosecutors. Steele cited a need for further investigation before the trial begins, noting that the pre-indictment investigation was rushed because the statute of limitations for invasion of privacy would have run out in March.

Burlison said the earlier date is necessary in part because the case has ripples in the state Capitol. A May 14 trial would come during the final week of the annual legislative session.

"This case affects the course of business for the state of Missouri," Burlison said.

Missouri Ethics Commission records show that Republican consultant Aaron Baker registered Wednesday to lobby on behalf of Greitens at the Missouri Capitol. Baker had registered last week to lobby on behalf of the Dowd Bennett law firm. Baker also registered as a lobbyist Wednesday for Joplin businessman David Humphreys, a major contributor to Greitens' campaign committee.

Greitens, his lawyers and the state Republican Party have said the investigation and indictment are politically motivated. Greitens called Gardner, a Democrat, a "reckless liberal prosecutor" in a statement last week.

Gardner's office submitted a court filing Tuesday listing evidence it was supplying to Greitens' defense team, including a photo of the woman and emails between Greitens and the woman. Another attorney for Greitens, Edward L. Dowd Jr., said that photo was "a publicly posted professional headshot" and not the compromising photo the indictment alleges Greitens took.

Gardner on Tuesday confirmed that her office hired a private company, Enterra LLC of Michigan, to perform the investigation that led to the indictment, rather than relying on St. Louis police.

Ryan said the office first asked St. Louis police for help but was directed to the FBI, which in turn said the investigation was out of its jurisdiction. But police department spokeswoman Schron Jackson said in an email Wednesday that the department "was not asked then or now to investigate Eric Greitens." St. Louis Mayor Lyda Krewson, through a spokesman, declined comment.

Dowd said an open records request revealed the company has already been paid at least \$10,000. Ryan said she did not immediately have updated information on the amount paid to Enterra.

The Missouri House has formed a seven-member committee to investigate the allegations that led to Greitens' indictment. The panel would be allowed to compel testimony and evidence using subpoenas. In some cases, information could be redacted to protect the identity of witnesses, a resolution says. The committee also would be able to hire independent investigators, special counsel, court reporters and other personnel with House funds. The panel would have 40 days to produce a report but could take longer.

**The Atlanta Journal-Constitution**  
**February 28, 2018**

**Georgia House votes to punish lobbyists for sexual harassment**

<https://www.myajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/house-votes-punish-lobbyists-for-sexual-harassment/MKj19wy7EH5Aa4a3BAqEEM/>

The Georgia House voted unanimously Wednesday to make lobbyists obey a new sexual harassment policy for conduct at the state Capitol.

Lobbyists would be required to sign an annual statement that they'll comply with the sexual harassment policy, according to House Bill 973, which passed on a 171-0 vote.

Lobbyists who violate the harassment policy would face fines of up to \$1,000 per violation and have their registration revoked by the Georgia Government Transparency and Campaign Finance Commission.

Sexual harassment includes derogatory statements, sexually related comments, unwelcome advances, patting, pinching, intentionally brushing against someone's body, making unwelcome visits to someone's home or hotel room, or making sexually suggestive posts online, according to the policy.

The Legislative Services Committee already approved the policy to cover lawmakers and employees, but legislation was required for it to apply to lobbyists.

The bill now advances to the state Senate.

**KXAN**  
**February 27, 2018**

**Texas lawmakers, judges, attorneys owe \$1.3 million in unpaid ethics fines**

<https://kxan.com/investigative-story/dozens-of-texas-lawmakers-arent-filing-their-finance-records-on-time/>

The Texas Ethics Commission is now complying with a state law that requires the agency to tell prosecutors when someone fails to file campaign finance records. Our analysis of years worth of candidate filings shows the commission can't provide records to show it's held hundreds of candidates accountable.

That's helped to contribute to nearly \$2 million in unpaid ethics fines, owed by current and former candidates, as well as, dozens of lobbyists.

In Texas, lawmakers and lobbyists can face criminal charges for not timely filing Personal Financial Statements and campaign finance records. The forms are the only way the public knows how a candidate earns his money, who is funding their campaigns and how that campaign cash is being spent.

According to state records, 263 candidates failed to file campaign finance reports since 2005. They also failed to pay the fines associated with the violations. In total, those debtors owe the state \$1,145,487 in unpaid fines. Another 174 candidates failed to timely file a Personal Financial Statement (PFS), and then failed to pay the fine for that violation leaving an additional \$114,500 in unpaid fines. Lobbyists who've broken the law owe another \$74,500 in unpaid ethics fines.

State law mandates the Texas Ethics Commission refer late PFS filers to a prosecuting attorney. However, the law doesn't require the commission to refer those who fail to timely file campaign finance reports (reports that show political contributions and campaign expenditures), but it doesn't prevent them from proactively doing so.

A KXAN analysis of years of Texas Ethics Commission (TEC) records shows the commission hasn't fully followed the mandatory reporting law, which has kept some lawmakers from being held accountable, one of whom is State Rep. Ron Reynolds, D-Missouri City.

#### Rep. Ron Reynolds' Case

Reynolds currently owes \$52,000 in ethics fines—the most of any lawmaker—for failing to file campaign finance and his PFS on time; with some of those filings more than two years past the deadline.

Reynolds isn't the only Texas lawmaker on the Ethics Commission's debtors list. KXAN's analysis of the list shows two other Texas House of Representatives members with unpaid, delinquent ethics fines: Austin-area Democrat Rep. Dawnna Dukes and Fort Worth Democrat Rep. Nicole Collier. Both Collier and Dukes each owe the state \$500 for missing a deadline and neither has paid, records show.

Dukes never responded to messages asking about her unpaid fine. Collier responded, disputing the \$500 unpaid fine showing on the commission's site, "A review of my Texas Ethics online account does not reveal an unpaid \$500 fine, in my name at, the Texas Ethics Commission, for filing a 2017 campaign finance report late. However, if there is a valid balance due, it will be paid," Collier wrote in an emailed response to KXAN.

A closer look at Reynolds' case shows he's missed one-third of the filing deadlines since he first ran for office in 2008. Commission records show he never filed nine campaign finance reports between January

2015 and July 2017. Records show he failed to file his PFS for 2016 and 2017, which could have subjected him to mandatory criminal referral but records show the Texas Ethics Commission never forwarded his case to a prosecutor.

KXAN made multiple attempts to interview Reynolds about his investigation but he never returned any of our calls to his capitol and district legislative offices. He also never returned emails to his legislative and business email addresses.

In January, KXAN Investigator Jody Barr found him at a public meeting at the capitol. When asked about his past due filings, Reynolds responded: "Now is not a good time right now. I have to review my notes for the next hearing. If you would have scheduled it with me, I would have been able to get a time where I could have met with you."

When Barr told him we've reached out to him numerous times with no response, Reynolds said, "Obviously, you're trying to ambush me and it's not a good time, so thank you," as he walked towards the committee room. Before he left out the door, we asked if he was planning to pay his fines and files his reports and he replied with a "Yes."

Reynolds filed the two late PFS documents 20 days after we questioned him at the Capitol. The TEC confirms Reynolds still has never filed seven other campaign finance report forms.

"To disregard that, to me, is a disregard for democracy," Austin-area state Rep. Celia Israel told KXAN. "If you don't adhere to the guidelines, you don't believe in following the rules, and if you don't believe in following the rules, then why would you want to be a public official that we should all trust?" Israel asked.

Israel shares a seat on the House Elections Committee with Reynolds--the committee that helps write the campaign finance laws Reynolds violated when it levied fines against him. She's also a member of the same political party.

"It is ironic, it is unfortunate. I would think that it would be perceived as embarrassing, but ultimately the voters have also got to see that it's embarrassing," Israel said, "It puts a stain on the honor of those of us who are simply trying to do the best we can for our constituents and for the state of Texas."

*Top 5 Debtors Statewide*

	<b>Status when Fined</b>	<b>Fine Amount</b>
<b>1. Rep. Ronald Reynolds</b>	State Representative	\$48,486
<b>2. Joe A. Foster Jr.</b>	Candidate for District Judge	\$30,500
<b>3. Christopher D. Christal</b>	Candidate for State Senator	\$22,500
<b>4. Jesus A. Mendoza</b>	Candidate for State Representative	\$22,500
<b>5. Wesley Shane Nelson</b>	Candidate for State Representative	\$22,000

*Top 5 Debtors Austin-area*

	<b>Status when Fined</b>	<b>Fine Amount</b>
<b>1. David Palmquist</b>	Candidate for Agricultural Commissioner	\$12,500
<b>2. Colin J. Guerra</b>	Candidate for State Representative	\$5,600
<b>3. Leonard M. Martinez</b>	Candidate for District Judge	\$4,100
<b>4. George E. Emery</b>	Candidate for State Representative	\$3,500
<b>5. Kevin P. Ludlow</b>	Candidate for State Representative	\$2,400

'Holes' in Ethics Commission Records

Texas law requires the commission to report anytime someone “knowingly and willfully” violates the law when it comes to timely filing a Personal Financial Statement. Finding out whether the TEC had met that requirement was impossible to answer because of the commission’s recordkeeping.

“We don’t know the referral rate,” Ethics Commission chairman Steve Wolens told KXAN. Citing “holes” in the commission’s internal recordkeeping, Wolens said there was no way to know between 2005 and 2013 who the TEC was supposed to have referred to prosecutors, or if the commission ever did. “We can’t figure it out.”

The commission hired its first-ever enforcement director in 2015.

However, commission records we received under the state’s open records act show the TEC has made criminal referrals before. Between 2013-2016, the TEC sent the Travis County Attorney’s Office a list of

26 people, seeking prosecution for failing to file campaign forms. The agency only filed 10 criminal charges--eight of those were dismissed and two are still pending today.

On Jan. 28, the commission, using the new "paperless" criminal referral system, sent three more candidates names to the county attorney's office for prosecution: Wanda C. Rohm, Jay Winter, and Sharon Breckenridge Thomas. That same day, the commission sent two lobbyists over for prosecution: Jayne Lawler and Steven Ray.

"It was a trial run," TEC's general counsel Ian Steusloff told KXAN when asked whether the commission had finalized a system for referring lawbreakers. The commission was still meeting with prosecutors in late January working out the details of a referral system. Commission records show a "permanent, paperless" criminal referral system was finalized and put into place on January 28.

The commission's failure to prosecute these cases means some lawmakers have gotten away with it. State law sets a statute of limitation on the prosecution of these cases at 24 months. If the charges aren't filed within that time, the crime can never be prosecuted.

Reynolds, for example, hadn't filed one of his PFS reports in two years and the other was one year late before Reynolds filed it earlier this month.

"Some would look at this and say: how serious is the Texas Ethics Commission on criminal referrals," Barr asked Wolens, pointing to the Reynolds example.

"I just don't know any of the facts of that and any matters regarding complaints like this, initially, are confidential. So, I can't comment on whether this has been taken up or not taken up by the commission," Wolens explained.

Wolens said he only learned about the lapse in prosecution through KXAN's request for an interview for this investigation. "We've done our best because you raised the issue when you called me at my office in Dallas. We discussed it on the phone. You raised these questions and because of that we were happy to have it briefed today and thank you so much for bringing it to our attention, it was very nice of you," Wolens told KXAN.

The commission does not have a plan to refer any of the people who violate the law when it comes to failing to file any other form that's not a PFS, Wolens said. "We only send what the state authorizes us to send. The legislature would have to tell us to do that," Wolens said of any referrals dealing with non-PFS campaign finance forms.

State records show the commission is referring those cases to the Texas Attorney General's office for collections. The AG's office does not handle prosecution of these cases, but is acting as a collections agency to collect the unpaid ethics fines; fines connected to violating the state's campaign finance reporting law.

Attorney General collections records show between Jan. 1, 2013-Jan. 1 2018, the TEC submitted \$1.2 million in unpaid fines to be collected but the AG has only collected slightly less than \$300,000--a 24 percent collection rate.

State law doesn't prevent any of the people on the Ethics Commission's unpaid fine list from running for re-election. In fact, Reynolds is currently on the ballot for the Primary Election.

Israel believes the committee she and Reynolds hold seats on might have to draft a bill to address ethics fines and reelection.

"One angle might be you don't get to be on the ballot again until you clear this—and not just clear it—but back to my point, it's not the fine so much as it is the reports," said Israel.

**Al.com**  
**February 27, 2018**

### **Ethics bill would authorize legal defense funds for public officials**

[http://www.al.com/news/index.ssf/2018/02/ethics\\_bill\\_would\\_authorize\\_le.html](http://www.al.com/news/index.ssf/2018/02/ethics_bill_would_authorize_le.html)

The Alabama attorney general's office is proposing sweeping changes to the state ethics law in a bill sponsored by Senate President Pro Tem Del Marsh.

The work that produced the 119-page bill started under former Attorney General Luther Strange and continued under Attorney General Steve Marshall.

The Legislature substantially changed the ethics law in 2010 after Republicans won majorities in the State House.

"Nearly a decade after its adoption there is a need to clarify portions of the law and address loopholes which have since been brought to light," Marshall said in an email. "The ethics reform bill is the product of over two years of hard work by the Attorney General's Office in gathering input from all affected parties and translating that feedback into a clearer, more effective ethics law."

The bill addresses, among other things, issues that surfaced during the prosecution and trial of former House Speaker Mike Hubbard, convicted of 12 felony ethics violations in 2016.

Just one of the many notable changes the bill proposes would change how public officials accused of wrongdoing can pay legal fees.

The bill would allow them to set up legal defense funds if they are under investigation or have been indicted or arrested for violations of the ethics law or campaign finance law or are the target of an ethics complaint.

They would have to file a written request with the Alabama Ethics Commission to establish the funds, including a sworn statement that they are under investigation or have been arrested or indicted. They would have to provide monthly public reports listing contributors to their legal defense fund and how much they gave, as well as expenditures.

The funds could not receive money from lobbyists or principals (people and companies that hire lobbyists) or from candidates' campaign accounts or political action committees. The bill would restrict spending from the defense funds to attorney fees and certain other costs that are directly part of the legal defense. It would require that legal defense funds be dissolved once the case is over and that the money be returned to contributors.

Under current law, public officials can use campaign finance funds for their legal defense, as Hubbard and others have done.

"This is an area which should have been addressed in the original ethics law," Marshall said. "There is widespread consensus that politicians should not be allowed to use funds raised in political campaigns for their legal defense. Such funds were never donated to pay a politician's court costs."

"We felt the law should be changed to call for the use of legal defense funds in which a politician could seek donations specifically for legal fees should they be the subject of an investigation. This process would provide greater transparency into the use of such funds."

Marsh, a Republican from Anniston who has led the Senate since 2010, said he was sponsoring the bill at the request of Marshall. Marsh said he encouraged senators to study the lengthy bill and provide him feedback. Marsh said he would meet with Marshall again after hearing from other lawmakers.

"There are about four or five ethics bills out there right now," Marsh said. "I'm told by the attorney general that this bill includes most of those issues in it. But there again, I'm waiting for my colleagues to give me feedback on that. At that point we'll decide whether to move forward with any of these bills."

The bill would amend about two dozen sections of the ethics law and add several new sections.

It would revise the definitions of many terms found in the law, including conflicts of interest, lobbying, minor violations, things of value, principals, and a friendship exception.

Public officials seeking informal advice from the Ethics Commission would be subject to new requirements, including submission of an affidavit saying they were disclosing all the material facts about the circumstances of their request.

The bill would substantially reduce the number of people who have to file statements of economic interests with the Ethics Commission. The statements disclose sources of income, debts, real estate holdings and other information, generally in broad ranges. Current law requires public officials to file the statements annually, as well as public employees who make at least \$75,000.

The attorney general's bill would exempt many education employees and law enforcement employees from having to file the annual statements.

"One of the biggest complaints about the original ethics law is its overly broad application of personal reporting requirements for public employees who are not in positions of policy making," Marshall said. "For example, school teachers and law enforcement officers were under the same blanket burden to file

income reports as the governor. Under our new ethics reform bill, nearly 50 percent fewer people would be required to file statements of economic interest."

Public officials, however, would be required to file more specific information on their statements of economic interests. Marshall said the current disclosure requirements are too vague.

"Broad categories of reporting effectively hid many potential conflicts," Marshall said. "Under the ethics reform bill, public officials and public employees would be required to disclose all entities for which they perform work and are paid more than \$1,500. Furthermore, tough, new enforcement provisions will be implemented to ensure compliance and public disclosure of those who do not."

The bill was introduced relatively late in the legislative session. Tuesday was the 15th day of the maximum 30 meeting days. Legislative leaders have said they hope to end the session early this year, possibly in late March.

Asked if the bill has a chance to pass this session, Marsh said he could not say until he got feedback from other lawmakers.

Marshall said the reform bill would clarify the law and improve enforcement.

"I believe our ethics reform bill will encourage truly dedicated people to serve in public office by clearly defining the lines between legal and illegal behavior, by providing a clear process for Ethics Commission review of individual questions, and by ensuring that every person who violates the public trust will be held accountable," Marshall said.

**Montgomery Advertiser**  
**February 26, 2018**

**Senate bill backed by AG would revise Alabama ethics laws**

<https://www.montgomeryadvertiser.com/story/news/politics/southunionstreet/2018/02/27/senate-bill-backed-ag-would-revise-alabama-ethics-laws/374326002/>

A Senate bill would make significant revisions to Alabama's ethics laws, some in response to the trial of former House Speaker Mike Hubbard, R-Auburn.

The leader of the Alabama Senate Thursday filed legislation that would make significant revisions to the state's ethics law for public employees and officials.

The bill from Senate President Pro Tem Del Marsh, R-Anniston, has the backing of the Alabama attorney general's office and appears in some cases aimed at strengthening or clarifying provisions of the law.

In the last two years, former Gov. Robert Bentley; former House Speaker Mike Hubbard, R-Auburn and former Reps. Micky Hammon, R-Decatur and Oliver Robinson, D-Birmingham, have either been convicted of or pleaded guilty to state or federal ethics charges.

But the bill also includes some new provisions — including the ability of legislators to create legal defense funds and a lobbying exemption for “economic development professionals” — that makes Tom Albritton, executive director of the Alabama Ethics Commission, uneasy.

“I don't agree with that portion of the revision, and I do think that part is a significant step backward,” he wrote in an email Monday. “That being said, there's a good bit in there that I think is a step forward for ethics.”

Mike Lewis, a spokesman for the Alabama attorney general's office, wrote in an email Monday that Attorney General Steve Marshall and attorneys in the office drafted the document.

“Prosecutors, who worked on the former Speaker Hubbard ethics case, assisted in writing the new bill to ensure that it would not be disruptive to that case,” the statement said. “In fact, our ethics reform legislation closes loopholes that were brought to light during the Hubbard case and others.”

A message seeking comment was left with Marsh Monday.

“Senator Marsh introduced the bill on behalf of the Attorney General and encourages his colleagues to review the bill and offer feedback,” Will Califf, a spokesman for Marsh, wrote in an email Monday.

A Lee County jury convicted Hubbard, who oversaw the passage of the current ethics law in his first session as speaker in 2010, of 12 felony ethics violations in 2016, involving Hubbard using his office to solicit jobs and investments in firms in which he held an interest. The conviction forced him out of the Legislature. Hubbard, who maintains his innocence, has appealed the verdict to the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals.

Hubbard's attorneys based their defense largely on exemptions in the law, which allows public officials to conduct some prohibited transactions with people they consider friends and some legitimate business transactions.

The bill in some respects seems to be a response to arguments raised by Hubbard's defense. There are minor points, such as a formal definition of “mantle of office” that formed part of Hubbard's indictment, but also language that makes it more difficult to invoke a friendship defense.

The legislation would also limit the number of public employees who have to file Statement of Economic Interest reports, and make the definition of principal — someone who hires a lobbyist — more specific.

“Having a discussion about the definition of principal has simply got to occur,” Albritton said. “I think that's a good attempt at that.”

The legislation would also allow legislators facing a complaint, under an investigation or charged with violating the state's ethics laws to create a legal defense fund. The fund would have to disclose its donors each month. The law would forbid lobbyists and principals from offering or contributing to a fund. The law would also ban legislators from using campaign finance funds for legal defense.

The definition of "lobbyist" also includes an exemption for "economic development professionals." The bill forbids public officials from holding that job, which it defines as a fulltime professional who works "to advance specific, good-faith economic development or trade promotion projects or related objectives for his or her employer."

The bill does not define "economic development."

With legislators hoping to finish the session by the end of March — and trying to avoid anything smacking of controversy — the bill may face a difficult road ahead. Albritton said Thursday there was "a lot of room for improvement" in the bill.

"It is my belief this bill will spark a necessary discussion of Alabama's ethics laws," he said. "What we have got currently is good, but there is always room for improvement."

**Chicago Tribune**  
**February 23, 2018**

#### **Lincolnshire man sues village over use of tax dollars to lobby against labor unions**

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/suburbs/lincolnshire/news/ct-lsr-lincolnshire-federal-anti-labor-lawsuit-tl-0301-20180222-story.html>

A Lincolnshire man and labor union member is suing the village, claiming officials' use of tax dollars to pay state lobbyists promoting anti-organized labor policies violates his First Amendment rights.

Dixon O'Brien, a professional engineer, and his union, International Union of Operating Engineers Local 150, are plaintiffs in the federal lawsuit, which was filed Wednesday.

In the lawsuit, O'Brien, 60, and Local 150 claim Lincolnshire officials use tax dollars to pay for the village's membership to the Springfield-based Illinois Municipal League, which uses the fees to fund lobbying efforts to "limit collective bargaining rights, reduce pension benefits and slash wages on publicly funded construction projects."

"As a union member, the IML's lobbying efforts not only conflict with my personal beliefs, but in many instances would directly harm me," O'Brien said Thursday in an email. "I should not be forced to fund attacks on my values, well-being and paycheck. This is a violation of my free speech, and I will fight to put a stop to it."

Lincolnshire Mayor Liz Brandt was not immediately available for comment Thursday.

A spokeswoman with The Liberty Justice Center, the legal arm of the Illinois Policy Institute, a Chicago-based conservative think tank, which has represented Lincolnshire in previous lawsuits involving labor unions, declined to comment Thursday since officials had not yet seen the federal lawsuit.

As relief, the plaintiffs in the lawsuit are requesting an injunction that would prevent the village from using tax revenue on political or lobbying activities. The plaintiffs also are asking for "a judgment that Lincolnshire's taxpayer-funded support of the IML is unconstitutional," the lawsuit stated.

In addition, O'Brien is seeking a refund of any portion of his tax dollars that have been spent on political or lobbying activities.

The lawsuit comes more than a year after a federal judge in January 2017 struck down a controversial right-to-work ordinance aimed at organized labor that was approved by Lincolnshire officials, ruling that federal law preempted the local ordinance.

Lincolnshire's ordinance, which was passed in 2015, did not apply to public-sector jobs like police officers and firefighters.

So-called "right-to-work" legislation allows employees to work for a company in union-protected positions without having to join the union or pay the full share of union dues.

Since taking office, Republican Gov. Bruce Rauner has promoted right-to-work zones as part of his turnaround agenda that he campaigned on before the 2015 election, asking Illinois municipalities like Lincolnshire to take up the cause within their own borders.

Several other states that border Illinois — including Wisconsin — have passed similar legislation in recent years.

On Thursday, Local 150 spokesman Ed Maher said that since Lincolnshire was the only municipality to pass a local right-to-work ordinance, which ultimately was struck down, it shouldn't be surprising that O'Brien "rightly believes they are taking his money for the governor's turnaround agenda, which would impact him negatively."

"Should a local government be using a taxpayer's money to pay a third party to lobby against the resident's interests?" Maher said. "We'd say, 'no.'"

In his 2017 ruling on the right-to-work ordinance, Judge Matthew Kennelly, of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, wrote that only states have the power to enact laws prohibiting union security agreements.

Kennelly also ruled the National Labor Relations Act exemption for states and territories didn't apply to Lincolnshire, meaning the village lacked the authority to enact its local law.

The judge issued a summary judgment in the case, siding with the four unions that filed the federal lawsuit in early 2016 challenging Lincolnshire's ordinance.