

EXHIBIT N



CITY OF RIVERSIDE

COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM



CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

DATE: February 12, 2004

ITEM NO: 4

SUBJECT: ELECTIONS

BACKGROUND:

Charter Provisions

Section 400 of the Charter provides that Councilmembers shall be elected from their respective Wards and that the Mayor shall be elected at large for four-year terms. Further if no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, a runoff election shall be held. The section further defines the timing for seating of successful candidates.

Section 500 declares that regular municipal elections for the election of Mayor and Councilmembers shall be held in November of odd-numbered years. As such, they are consolidated with the Countywide elections held on that day and the Registrar of Voters is requested to perform certain services for the City. Terms are staggered with the Mayor and Wards 2, 4, and 6 appearing on the same ballot followed two years later with Wards 1, 3, 5, and 7 on the ballot. All other elections are called "special" elections. Run-off elections are held the second week of January, if required.

Section 502 offers flexibility to the City Council in determining the voting system to be used. Municipal elections that are consolidated with the County must by law and as a matter of practicality use the same voting system being employed Countywide on that same day. The Elections Code precludes two systems being used on the same day. For instance, the City could not conduct a mail-in ballot election simultaneously with a polling place election being conducted by the County which would create voter confusion, duplicity of effort, and significant loss of efficiency and cost effectiveness. This section left as written, offers the potential of a City Council ordinance to permit instant runoff voting.

Section 503 ensures the electorate the opportunities provided under the Elections Code for initiative (measure proposed by voter petition), referendum (City Council ordinance referred to the voters during the 30 days following adoption), and recall of local elected officials.

Currently, 20 qualified electors of the City nominate the Mayor at large. Councilmembers are nominated by 20 qualified electors from their respective Wards. Measures may be placed before the voters at any regular or special municipal election either by direction of the City Council or by petition of registered voters.

Voting Systems

All regular municipal elections are consolidated with the County and are conducted as polling place elections using touch screen voting equipment. For special stand-alone elections, which include runoff elections, the City Council has the option of directing the elections to be conducted as polling place or by mail-in ballot. Any change in a voting system for the regular municipal election would require a change in the regular municipal election day or software modification and State certification of the new voting system. Instant run-off voting would require both software modification for touch screen equipment as well as State certification of the system.

In recent past, runoff elections have been conducted by mail-in ballot. Should instant runoff voting be implemented, runoff elections would be moot as the elections results would be finalized at the regular municipal election in November.

Mail-In Ballot vs. Polling Place Elections

Those that favor mail-in ballot elections cite voter convenience, cost savings, security from fraud as every voter's signatures is checked against the registration files, increased voter turnout, and it's acknowledgement of the growing popularity of absentee voting.

Others who support the tradition of "going to the polls" on election day and fear fraud potential as ballots could be marked by other than the voter favor polling place elections using electronic voting equipment. Ballots for run-off elections become part of the holiday mail rush and increased voter turnout is not always realized. Mailed ballots are at times not counted for reasons which include missing signatures, two ballots in one envelope, address does not match the file, signature does not match, etc.

Riverside has experienced mixed results with respect to voter turnout for mail-in ballot elections. Wards that traditionally have lower voter turnout see a dramatic increase with mail-in ballot elections. However, those with traditionally high voter turnout see little difference between mail-in ballot and polling place elections.

Community Proposals

Two proposals that have been presented to the Charter Review Committee are instant runoff voting and nomination of Councilmembers by Ward with election at large. The committee will receive a presentation from the League of Women Voters at this meeting providing further information on instant runoff voting wherein voters indicate a preference for first choice, second choice, third choice, and so on. In the event no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast as first choice, the candidate with the least number of votes is dropped from consideration and those votes are recounted using the voter's second choice, and so on until one candidate receives the required majority.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Cost for the November 4, 2003, regular municipal election for Wards 1, 3, 5, and 7 were \$181,809 compared to the November 2001 election for the Mayor and Wards 2, 4, and 6 which was billed at \$250,636. The January 13, 2004, mail-in ballot runoff election is estimated at \$50,000. Mail-in ballot elections generally represent a savings of 1/3 over polling place elections.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Committee may request additional information on these or other election-related topics for further consideration.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee receive the information provided and continue its deliberation.

Prepared by:



COLLEEN J. NICOL
City Clerk

Attachments:

Charter Sections
Voter Turnout Chart

C:\nico\elections\sr.crc021204

CITY CHARTER

Sec. 400 Enumerated; number, term and manner of election; wards.

- A. The elective officers of the City shall consist of a City Council of seven members, elected from wards, and a Mayor elected from the City at large, at the times and in the manner provided in this Charter, who shall serve for a term of four years and until their respective successors qualify. The terms of all officials, so elected, shall be deemed to have commenced on the fifth Tuesday following the general municipal election.
- B. The members of the City Council shall be elected by wards by the registered voters of the respective wards only. One member of the City Council shall be elected by each ward, and only the registered voters of each ward shall vote for the member of the City Council to be elected by that ward. In those wards where there are more than two candidates, only a candidate receiving a majority of the total votes cast for the office shall be declared elected.
- C. If in an election for a member of the City Council for any ward, or for the office of Mayor, no candidate receives a majority of the total votes cast for the office, the City Council shall immediately upon the determination of that fact, call a special election to be held on the tenth Tuesday following the general municipal election. The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for the office in the general municipal election shall be declared the candidates for the special election.
- D. Officials elected at the general municipal election shall take office on the second Tuesday following completion of the canvass, but in no event later than the fifth Tuesday following the general municipal election. Officials elected at any other election shall take office on the second Tuesday following completion of the canvass, but in no event later than the fifth Tuesday following the election.
- E. The qualifications of candidates and electors and the procedure governing general municipal elections shall apply to any special election called pursuant to this section and the notice of election shall be published at least thirty days prior to the date of such special election.

Sec.500 General municipal elections.

Page 1 of 1

CITY CHARTER

Sec.500 General municipal elections.

General municipal elections for the election of officers and for such other purposes as the City Council may prescribe shall be held in the City on the first Tuesday following the first Monday of November of each odd numbered year.

CITY CHARTER

Sec.501 Special municipal elections.

All other municipal elections that may be held by authority of this Charter, or of any law, shall be known as special municipal elections.

CITY CHARTER

Sec.502 Compliance with State law.

Unless otherwise provided by ordinance hereafter enacted, all elections shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Elections Code of the State of California, as the same now exist or hereafter may be amended, for the holding of elections in cities so far as the same are not in conflict with the Charter.

CITY CHARTER

Sec.503 Initiative, referendum and recall.

There are hereby reserved to the electors of the City the powers of the initiative and referendum and of the recall of municipal elective officers. The provisions of the Elections Code of the State of California, as the same now exist or hereafter may be amended, governing the initiative and referendum and the recall of municipal officers, shall apply to the use thereof in the City so far as such provisions of the Elections Code are not in conflict with the provisions of this Charter.



ELECTIONS

Charter Review
Committee

Community Forum
February 12, 2004

Charter Provisions

- Section 400

- Councilmembers shall be elected from Wards
- Mayor shall be elected from City at large
- Four-year terms
- If no candidate receives majority (50% plus 1), then runoff between two highest candidates
- Date of runoff election
- Seating of successful candidates

Charter Provisions

- **Section 500**
 - General Municipal Elections shall be held in November of odd-numbered years

- **Section 501**
 - All other elections shall be “special municipal elections”

Charter Provisions

- Section 502

Unless otherwise provided by ordinance hereafter enacted, all elections shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Elections Code of the State of California, as the same now exist or hereafter may be amended, for the holding of elections in cities so far as the same are not in conflict with the Charter.

Charter Provisions

- Section 503

Electors are reserved the powers of:

- Initiative
- Referendum
- Recall

Election Dates

- November of odd-numbered years
 - Wards 2, 4, 6 and Mayor
 - Wards 1, 3, 5, and 7
- Run-off elections
 - January of even-numbered years

Nominations

- Councilmembers:
 - 20 signatures of qualified electors from the Ward
- Mayor:
 - 20 signatures from qualified electors of the City

Measures

- Regular municipal election
- Special municipal election
- Placed on ballot by:
 - City Council
 - Citizen petition

Voting Systems – Current Practice

- Regular Municipal Election
 - Consolidated with County-wide election
 - Polling place – touch screen equipment
- Special Stand-Alone Elections
 - Run off, measures
 - Mail Ballot
 - Polling Place

Voting Systems – Options

- Regular Municipal Elections (Mayor and Councilmembers)
 - Consolidated ballot with County-polling place
 - Any change in voting system would require regular election day move and/or software modification
- Special Municipal Elections (Runoff)
 - Instant Runoff Voting
 - Mail in Ballot vs Polling Place

Voting Systems - Options

- Special Municipal Elections (Measures)
 - Mail-in ballot
 - Polling Place

Costs – Regular Municipal Elections

- November 4, 2003, Regular municipal election
 - Wards 1, 3, 5, 7
 - \$181,809
- November 2001, Regular municipal election
 - Mayor and Wards 2, 4, and 6
 - \$250,636



Costs – Special Municipal Elections

- January 13, 2004, run-off (Wards 1, 3, and 7)
- Mail-in ballot election
- Estimate: \$50,000

Mail-In Ballot Elections

- Those that favor mail-in ballot:
 - Convenient
 - Less expensive
 - Less fraud – signatures of all voters checked
 - Increased voter turnout
 - Acknowledges popularity of absentee voting

Mail-In Ballot Elections

- Those that favor polling place elections:
 - Tradition of “going to the polls”
 - Greater fraud potential with mail-in ballots
 - Run-off ballots lost in holiday mail
 - Do not always see increased voter turnout
 - Every vote counts at the polls – no disqualified ballots for missing signature, address does not match, two ballots in one envelope, etc.

Voter Turnout-Mail Ballot vs Polls

- Mixed results
- Low voter turnout Wards – Increase with mail-in ballot
- High voter turnout Wards – Virtually no difference with mail-in ballot

Community Proposals

- Instant Runoff Voting
 - Voting system qualification
 - Costs unknown
- Nomination of Councilmembers by Ward with election at large



Office of the City Clerk

Colleen J. Nicol, MMC

City Clerk

City of Riverside

(909) 826-5557

Colleen@RiversideCa.gov

VOTER TURNOUT 1990 TO 2004

ELECTION DATE	TYPE OF ELECTION	VOTER TURNOUT
1-9-1990	Mayor, Wards 4 and 6 - Runoffs	20.0% - Mayor 40.0% - Ward 4 17.9% - Ward 6
6-5-1990	Ward 7 - Special Election	30.9%
7-24-1990	Ward 7 - Runoff	14.1%
11-5-1991	Wards 1, 3, 5, 7	21.1% - Ward 1 23.7% - Ward 3 21.1% - Ward 5 19.8% - Ward 7
1-14-1992	Ward 3 - Runoff	14.1%
11-2-1993	Mayor; Wards 2, 4, 6; Charter Review Committee (Measure J)	34.4% - Mayor/Charter Review Committee 31.6% - Ward 2 45.0% - Ward 4 26.8% - Ward 6
1-11-1994	Mayor, Ward 2 - Runoffs	22.3% - Mayor 19% - Ward 2
6-7-1994	Ward 1 Vacancy	37.1%
11-8-1994	Public Safety Measure (consolidated with State-wide election)	60.2%

ELECTION DATE	TYPE OF ELECTION	VOTER TURNOUT
11-7-1995	Wards 1, 3, 5, 7, Charter Amendment	16.9% - Charter 15.9% - Ward 1 16.2% - Ward 3 20.9% - Ward 5 21.5% - Ward 7
1-9-1996	Ward 7 - Runoff (mail-in ballot)	32.9%
6-17-1997	Measure EE- Street Light Assessment District (mail-in ballot)	31.2%
11-4-1997	Mayor, Wards, 2, 4, 6	25.4% - Mayor 27.6% - Ward 2 36.1% - Ward 4 17.3% - Ward 6
1-13-1998	Wards 4, 6 - Runoff (mail-in ballot)	36.9% - Ward 4 18.6% - Ward 6
11-2-1999	Wards 1, 3, 5, and 7	20.6% - Ward 1 22.5% - Ward 3 21.2% - Ward 5 18.0% - Ward 7
1-11-2000	Wards 5, 7- Runoff (mail-in ballot)	33.0% - Ward 5 33.1% - Ward 7

ELECTION DATE	TYPE OF ELECTION	VOTER TURNOUT
11-6-2001	Mayor, Wards 2, 4, 6	27.09% - Mayor 26.71% - Ward 2 38.05% - Ward 4 17.39% - Ward 6
1-15-2002	Wards 4, 6 - Runoff (mail-in ballot)	45.5% - Ward 4 23.9% - Ward 6
3-5-2002	Library Bond Measure C (consolidated with State-wide election)	29.78%
11-5-2003	Charter Amendments - Measures Q, R, and S (consolidated with State-wide election)	43.47%
11-14-2003	Wards 1, 3, 5, 7, Measure G	21.28% - Measure G 25.74% - Ward 1 26.22% - Ward 3 20.01% - Ward 5 20.30% - Ward 7
1-15-2004	Wards 1, 5, 7 - Runoff (mail-in Ballot)	36.8% - Ward 1 36.6% - Ward 3 32.8% - Ward 7

g:\cik\election\turnout

How Instant Runoff Voting Works

Instant runoff voting (IRV) is a method of voting that determines a majority winner in a single election, no matter how many candidates are running. It combines a regular election and a runoff election between the top candidates into one election.

Each voter has the option of ranking candidates in order of choice (1, 2, 3, etc.). They select their favorite candidate as their first choice, and their runoff choices as their subsequent choices, in case their favorite candidate doesn't make the runoff.

	1 ST choice	2 ND choice	3 RD choice
Paul T. Carston	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Carolyn P. Nash	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thomas G. Webb	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If no candidate is the first choice of at least half of the voters, a runoff count is conducted. The counting of ballots simulates a series of runoff elections, eliminating the candidates from the bottom who have the least support. In each round, every voter's ballot counts as a single vote for his or her top-ranked candidate who is still in the running, as indicated on that voter's ballot. Candidates with the least support are eliminated until there are just two remaining. The finalist with the highest number of votes is elected by a majority.

The count can be simplified by immediately reducing the field to two candidates after the initial ballot count and determining a winner in the second round of counting.

The value of majority winners.

Runoffs seek to assure that in single-seat elections the winning candidate has the support of the majority of voters, rather than a mere plurality. In a majority system, candidates must gain the support of more than 50% of voters, while a plurality system can reward extreme candidates who couldn't gain 50% support, but might win the most votes in a fractured field. Runoffs indeed can be valuable in determining the community consensus and protecting voters from unrepresentative leaders. But requiring two elections can undermine the majority principle due to lower voter turnout.

Why waste money on two elections?

By using instant runoff voting, the goal of majority winners can be achieved in just one election. By eliminating an unnecessary trip to the polls, IRV saves significant tax dollars, reduces candidates' need to raise money and maximizes voter turnout. If desired, it is even possible to fold primary elections into the general election.

The Center for Voting and Democracy is a non-partisan, non-profit educational organization that studies the American electoral process and the impact of proposed reforms on voter participation, representation and governance. The Center is supported by individuals and foundations, including the Ford Foundation, the Joyce Foundation and the Open Society Institute. Former Congressman John B. Anderson is its president.

The Center for Voting & Democracy

6930 Carroll Ave., Suite 610
Takoma Park, MD 20912
301-270-4616
info@fairvote.org
www.fairvote.org

© 2004

Lett CEC 2-12-04
#5

*Faster...
Cheaper...
Better...
Elections*

Instant Runoff Voting

✓

Majority Rule

with
a single
runoff election

www.fairvote.org

Why not settle for plurality winners?

When three or more candidates are in a race, the majority of voters may split such that the plurality "winner" (the one with the most votes) is actually the candidate a majority of voters consider to be the worst choice. There is no need to suffer the "spoiler" problem in multi-candidate races, or settle for undemocratic winners, when a majority voting system such as instant runoff voting can be used.



Why is IRV better than two-election runoffs?

It saves both taxpayers and candidates money, and eliminates hassles for both voters and election administrators by having one election instead of two. Traditional runoffs also typically result in significantly fewer voters participating in one of the elections. A drop in turnout of over 50% is not uncommon. IRV maximizes voter participation. The countries with the highest voter turnout in the world use instant runoff voting.



Is IRV simple for voters to use?

Yes. Millions of voters have used this system for decades without problems. Mock elections in a large number of schools and senior citizen centers prove that people have no difficulty with rank-order voting, and most actually prefer it. An initial voter education campaign is recommended, but all evidence suggests that voter error will not increase and may even decrease.



What impact would IRV have on campaigns?

IRV eliminates the need for a second round of campaign fund-raising. Since second election runoff campaigns are so short, candidates with quick access to large contributors have an advantage. Also, experience in jurisdictions using instant runoff voting suggests it tends to reduce negative campaigning. Since candidates want to also win the second choice votes from voters who favor another candidate, mudslinging can backfire by alienating these voters. IRV elects candidates with both strong core support and also broad

appeal. IRV can avoid some of the extreme polarization that can occur in a traditional runoff between candidates who characterize their opponent as dishonorable.



Is instant runoff voting constitutional?

Yes. Because every voter gets one vote in each round of counting, American courts have consistently ruled that IRV complies with the one-person, one-vote mandate of the U.S. Supreme Court. Likewise, there are no federal laws that would prevent any state from adopting instant runoff voting for electing their congressional delegation or presidential electors. IRV is recommended by Robert's Rules of Order (called "preferential voting"), and is used by the American Political Science Association (political science professors) for electing their own national president.



Where has IRV been adopted?

IRV is used for government elections in several English-speaking countries, such as: Australia, Ireland and the U.K. In the U.S. instant runoff voting has been adopted in places such as: Louisiana (for overseas absentee ballots), the Utah Republican Party (for U.S. Congressional nominations at conventions), and the city of San Francisco for its most important offices.



Are current voting machines able to handle IRV?

This depends on the voting machine. Older punch-card and lever-style machines are incompatible. Ranked-choice elections have been administered on optical scan, and touchscreen equipment, as well as with hand-counted paper ballots. New Federal Elections Commission standards require voting machine vendors to disclose which of their machines can handle ranked ballots. Federal lawmakers are likely to make more than \$3 billion available for upgrading voting machines. Even jurisdictions with some older machines can implement IRV for a fraction of the cost of a new election, by simply modifying the ballot design, and treating the occasional IRV runoff count like a recount using

Typical two-election runoff	Instant runoff voting
STEP # 1	
Voters go to the polls and mark their favorite candidate on their ballot.	Voters go to the polls and mark their favorite candidate on their ballot as their first choice. At the same time they can also indicate their runoff choices by ranking candidates in order of preference - 1, 2, 3.
STEP # 2	
If no candidate receives a majority, a second election is called.	If no candidate receives a majority, the ballots simply need to be retabulated.
STEP # 3	
Candidates resume fund raising and campaigning. New ballots must be quickly printed. Polling stations must be set up again. Typically some voters don't make two trips to the polls, resulting in lower turnout.	Skip step 3.
STEP # 4	
If your favorite candidate makes it into the runoff election, you mark a new ballot for your favorite candidate again. If your favorite has been eliminated, you mark your ballot for your next choice among the remaining candidates.	If your favorite candidate makes it into the runoff count, your original ballot counts for your favorite candidate again. If your favorite has been eliminated, your ballot counts for your next choice among the remaining candidates.
STEP # 5	
The candidate with the majority of the votes (of those voting in the second election) wins.	The candidate with the majority of the votes wins.
SUMMARY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">★ wastes tax money★ extends campaign season★ inconvenient for voters and election administrators★ lower voter turnout	<ul style="list-style-type: none">★ saves tax money★ one election instead of two★ more convenient for voters and election administrators★ higher voter turnout

Spencer C. C. 5-12-04
#6

Do you feel your vote can't compete with big campaign contributions from special interests?

There's a solution called "Clean Money, Clean Elections". With your help, we'll bring it to California.

Read this page to learn the basics about:

- **The Problem:** Too often politicians serve the needs of big money campaign contributors, instead of the voters. Good candidates can't run without big money support.
- **Clean Money is the Solution:** Clean Money replaces private campaign contributions with public funding so voters can once again take control of government.
- **How Clean Money Works:** Candidates demonstrating broad public support can choose to receive public funding to run competitive campaigns if they forgo private money.
- **Results In Other States:** Clean Money has been working in Arizona and Maine since the 2000 elections. It has led to more qualified and diverse candidates, increased voter turnout, and increased attention to voters' issues.
- **How we're Bringing Clean Money to California:** With a grassroots campaign to educate Californians and get it passed at the state level here in California.

Discussion

The Problem with the Current System

What chance do honest candidates without money have to be elected in California? Not much. Not if they don't want to accept money from special interests.

What chance do citizens have of voting for politicians who aren't wealthy or tied to special interests? Not much, either.

Sadly, no matter how qualified candidates may be, if they don't have money themselves or accept it from private interests, they don't really stand a fighting chance in California.

Not in a state in which \$130 million was spent by Gov. Gray Davis, Bill Simon and the other contenders in the 2002 governor's race, and over a million dollars a day was spent in the 2003 recall. Not in a state in which lobbyists looking for budget favors ply legislators with piles of \$1,000 checks at hundreds of campaign fund-raisers. Ours is now a government of big money special interests, not a government of the people. Is it any wonder ordinary citizens feel their voices aren't heard? Is it any wonder our state and country are in such a mess?

Clean Money is the Solution

Arizona and Maine are different. Their citizens got fed up with politicians chasing after special-interests' money and then voting in their favor. So they reclaimed their democracy.

Both states now have Clean Money Clean Elections systems in which qualified candidates may run for office using public financing. That gives all candidates a fighting chance to win. It also gives citizens a chance to vote for candidates who don't owe their campaign funds to big private interests.

How Clean Money Works



Advisory Board Member Ed Asner

See SCA 14 by California State Senators Vasconcellos, Albert, Kuehl, Scott and Speir Which includes a section setting up a Clean Campaign Fund.

Watch for California State Assembly woman Loni Hancock's bill which is about to be introduced. It will provide public financing to all state and statewide offices and is modeled after the California Clean Money draft initiative.

"Clean" candidates who qualify in Arizona and Maine receive enough public financing to run viable campaigns. If privately funded candidates outspend them, they receive extra public funding to match, up to a limit. They qualify by gathering a set number of individual \$5 contributions and agreeing not to accept any private money.

Results in Other States

It's a resounding success for both voters and candidates.

Voters had more choices at the polls, since more qualified candidates were able to run. More than 60 percent more candidates ran for statewide office than in 1998 in Arizona, the last non-presidential election year without Clean Money. The number of minority candidates tripled.

Legislators are now able to listen to the needs of the voters, rather than the interests that gave them money. Maine became the first state in the nation to pass a form of universal health care. Health care advocates and the public had been pushing for it for years, but had always been stopped by lobbyists. But after 77 percent of Maine's senate was elected "clean" in 2002, that all changed.

Voters have showed their approval in several ways. First, realizing that their vote counts again, they increased turnout at the polls by more than 10 percent.

Second, they elected "clean" candidates to seven of nine statewide offices in Arizona -- including Janet Napolitano, the first publicly financed governor ever elected.

Third, Arizona citizens approve of Clean Money more than ever, with an overwhelming 66 percent support in a June 2002 poll. Leah Landrum, a member of Arizona's House of Representatives, sums it up:

"Now the only interests I'm tied to are my constituents. And they feel a lot more connected to me. My constituent calls have tripled."

How We're Bringing Clean Money to California

Arizona and Maine show how it can be done. Both states passed Clean Money initiatives after a lot of research, coalition building and grassroots organizing. Public education campaigns spoke directly with citizens in countless forums and explained plainly how Clean Money would strengthen their voices. These efforts laid the groundwork for their successes.

Now it's California's turn. Our goal is either pass Clean Money in the legislation or, if required, go directly to the people and pass an initiative.

We, too, deserve a government that's more responsive to its citizens than to big-money special interests.

We, too, can restore our lost democracy by electing candidates to public office who owe their allegiance to voters rather than to private interests.

CALIFORNIA CLEAN MONEY CAMPAIGN <http://www.caclean.org/faq/basics.php>

1. What is "Clean Money Campaign Reform?"

Clean Money Campaign Reform is a movement to provide qualified candidates who can prove a strong base of support a set amount of public funds to run for office. Candidates who choose to qualify agree to limit their spending and reject contributions from private sources.

2. How Would It Work?

In California, our goal is to establish this system for those running for State Assembly, State Senate, and Statewide offices (Gov., Lt. Gov., Attorney General, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Board of Equalization). Candidates will qualify as "Clean Money Candidates," or "participating" candidates, and receive a public grant for the primary and general elections. If they are successful raising a required number of \$5 contributions and signatures of support from residents within the district they hope to represent. Candidates have a choice NOT to run as "Clean Money candidates" as well, and may run as "non-participating" candidates who commit to the more "traditional" approach of raising only private sources of funds to run for office.

3. Doesn't McCain-Feingold Solve most of the Problems with our Campaign Finance System?

There is no question the CONGRESSIONAL legislation, which bans "soft money" contributions - unregulated funds spent on behalf of candidates through political parties - are a step in the right direction. However, even the sponsors will tell you it won't solve the crisis in our campaign finance system. First of all, their rules only affect FEDERAL races - for the U.S. House and Senate - NOT for State of California offices or Legislature. Second, both bills DOUBLE the amount of "hard money," or direct contributions to candidates allowed. As these limits are "per election," a typical candidate for the House of Representatives can still receive \$4,000 from a single individual per election cycle - \$2,000 for the primary election, and \$2,000 for the general election. Therefore, the link between special interest donors and candidate/elected leaders will not be severed, and ultimately access will still be granted to these larger donors and special interests.

4. Would "Clean Money" completely overhaul the current campaign finance system in California?

Clean Money Campaign Reform is a voluntary system of public finance, providing not an overhaul - but an alternative - to the more traditional system of campaigns funded by wealthy individuals and large private interests. Candidates can choose to try and qualify for Clean Money public funds, or opt to follow the more "traditional" system of raising private funds.

5. Will candidates who qualify for Clean Money receive sufficient funds to run a competitive campaign?

Candidates who qualify for Clean Money funding will get the average dollar amount spent by those seeking that office in recent elections. One great advantage to the system is that participating candidates will no longer have fundraising expenses. So, Clean Money Campaign Reform will help hold down the overall cost of campaigns, as the grant given to qualifying candidates can go directly to getting their message to voters.

6. Won't participating "Clean Money candidates" still get outspent by wealthy, self-financed candidates who can spend as much as they want?

Under Clean Money Campaign Reform, participating candidates will get a dollar-for-dollar match, up to a set limit, if a non-participating opponent spends more than the basic public financing grant, or if said participating candidate is the target of an independent expenditure. This won't mean an unlimited amount of money, but non-participating candidates will have to think twice before deciding they want to surpass the Clean Money cap, and be responsible for additional public funds going to their opponent. Further, recent history shows there is a limit to how much buying of an election the public will tolerate in California.

7. Will candidates be willing to adopt a Clean Money System?

There are strong incentives for candidates to try and qualify as "Clean Money candidates." No elected official should have to spend the vast amounts of time raising money that the current system demands. No challenger looks forward to the task of trying to raise the huge sums of money required to mount a viable campaign against an incumbent. In fact, these obstacles discourage many good candidates from running for office. Moreover, what candidate or elected official enjoys the public perception that they are compromised by their acceptance of large contributions from special interests?

8. Won't the "usual suspects" run for and win political office under Clean Money Campaign Reform?

Clean Money Campaign Reform encourages more competitive elections, especially because it provides funding for Party primaries as well as general election campaigns. It empowers candidates with no personal wealth or access to big financial contributors - but who have a proven base of public support - the means to compete for office with the "usual suspects." In their defense, incumbents and the more familiar faces who decide to run as "Clean Money candidates" will be freed of the pressures to grant access to large donors and special interest contributors that they have faced in the past, which is, after all, one of the major objectives of Clean Money Campaign Reform.

9. Would I still be able to give money to my favorite candidates?

Under Clean Money Campaign Reform, people can still donate money to candidates they support. During the pre-primary period, they can give not only the small \$5 qualifying contribution, but also up to \$100 during a short "seed money" period – the total sum of which is capped – to help their favorite candidate get the word out that they are in fact trying to qualify as a participating, Clean Money Reform candidate.

10. Would a Clean Money system undermine the strength of, and need for, political parties in the electoral process? Californians will still be allowed to make a financial contribution to a political party under the Clean Money system. Further, it is our belief that under a Clean Money system, political parties can and should remain active in the nomination and endorsement of candidates, identifying, researching, and developing the Party's positions on issues; and carrying out non-candidates specific voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives and other "party building activities." Clean Money reform allows political parties to play a vital role within the political process as long as they do not serve as a conduit through which special-interest campaign contributors can gain access to elected officials, which our current system under Proposition 34 allows them to do.

11. Does Clean Money Campaign Reform Suppress First Amendment Rights to Free Speech?

If anything, Clean Money Campaign Reform would finally grant political speech to those who never really feel they've had it. It is a voluntary system designed to give a voice to those potential candidates who do not have personal fortunes or instant access to special interest contributions. Our political and policy debate, as well as our democracy itself, will only be revitalized and diversified by this system. In addition, according to the U.S. Supreme Court, public financing of election campaigns is constitutional as long as the system is voluntary.

12. Are There Any Examples That This Works?

Versions of Clean Money Reform have passed in Arizona, Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont. In Arizona and Maine, who have now experienced full elections cycles using Clean Money Reform, there has been an increase in qualified candidates for office, more competitive elections, and a decrease in private money in the political system.

13. Will Clean Money Campaign Reform in California enable "fringe candidates" to run for office with public money?

While the public certainly has a right to support whichever candidates it chooses, the qualifying requirements for Clean Money campaign funds are stiff enough to deter fringe candidates with little or no support from getting public funds. Some form of public financing already exists in 22 states and a number of municipalities. Where these systems are in place, fears about public money spurring fringe candidates have proven to be unfounded.

14. Will the Clean Money system open the ballot up to so many people that the reform will "break the bank?"

One of the goals of Clean Money Campaign Reform is to open up the system to as many qualified people as possible, and to help establish a more level campaign playing field. But, again, the qualifying requirements are stiff enough so that anybody considering a run for office will think long and hard about the seriousness of their efforts before embarking on a campaign to qualify for funds. It is therefore unlikely that "too many" candidates will qualify for Clean Money funds. Moreover, the required number of qualifying contributions can always be raised if experience shows us that it was set too low.

15. Does the public really support taxpayer funding of campaigns?

Clearly, the public distrusts politicians, and taxpayers are wary of new public expenditure. However, Clean Money Campaign Reform will save California taxpayers money in the form of voter, well thought out public policy decisions. The wealthy individuals and powerful corporations and special interests who supply most of the money for political campaigns are the recipients of millions of dollars in "corporate welfare" subsidies, unnecessary tax breaks, and regulatory exemptions. By eliminating Clean Money candidates' dependence on these big-money donors, Clean Money Campaign reform in California will give elected leaders more freedom to say "NO" to these kinds of costly giveaways without feeling like they're putting a source of funds for their next election at risk. One needs to look no further than our energy crisis in California to see the kind of access to the State Capitol the power companies and special interests were able to purchase. Their contributions gave them the kind of blanket access and influence that allowed them to orchestrate a UNANIMOUS vote of the Legislature to deregulate our electric utilities industry.

16. How will a Clean Money system be funded in California?

Revenue for a State Clean Money System will come from a combination of the \$5 qualifying contributions collected by participating candidates, and a direct appropriation of just 2 cents per day, per eligible voter, by the State Legislature. For the cost of a meager movie a year, California taxpayers will take back control of their elections with Clean Money Reform as public policy in this state.

17. Learn the Basics
from the website of the California Clean Money Campaign
<http://www.caclean.org/faq/>

-Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)