

OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAMS - Prepared by The Illinois Campaign for Political Reform - www.ilcampaign.org

| Municipality w/ population 2013 population estimate www.census.gov | Date of Program Creation | Offices and Elections Covered | Open or Closed? | Candidate Qualification | Funding Source | Disbursement Mechanism |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| NEW YORK, NY 8,405,837 | 1988 | Mayor, Public Advocate, Comptroller, Borough President, City Council (primary, general, and special elections) | Open, but subject to overall expenditure limits | <u>threshold fundraising</u> Mayor: \$250,000 from at least 1,000 contributions Public Advocate/Comptroller: \$125,000 from 500 contributions Borough President: at least 100 contributions from borough residents, overall amount depends on borough size City Council: \$5,000 from at least 75 district residents | City Council appropriations and donations | 6:1 match on the first \$175 of a contribution |
| NEW HAVEN, CT 130,660 | 2007 | Mayor (primary and general election) | Partially-Closed, may contribute up to \$19,000 in personal funds | <u>threshold fundraising</u> 200 contributions of \$10-\$370 from city voters (for primary, and again for general election) <u>expenditure limit</u> \$368,000 per election | Board of Aldermen appropriations and voluntary individual contributions | \$19,000 grant upon qualifying, per election; 2:1 match of contributions under \$25; \$50 match for contributions of \$25 or more |
| ALBUQUERQUE, NM 556,495 | 2005 | City Council and Mayor (regular municipal election or run-off election) | Closed | <u>threshold fundraising</u> Mayor: \$5 each from at least 1% of registered city voters City Council: \$5 each from at least 1% of registered district voters | 1/10 of 1% of General Fund, qualified contributions, unspent money, seed money exceeding 10% of expenditure limit, voluntary contributions | \$1 per registered city/district voter, minus seed money and qualified contributions |
| LONG BEACH, CA 469,428 | 1994 | Mayor, City Council, City Attorney, City Prosecutor, City Auditor | Open, but subject to overall expenditure limits | <u>threshold fundraising</u> City Council: \$5,000 in contributions of \$250 or less City Attorney, Auditor, Prosecutor: \$10,000 in contributions of \$350 or less Mayor: \$20,000 in contributions of \$500 or less <u>expenditure limit</u> City Council: varies by district City Attorney, Auditor, Prosecutor: \$115,000 in primary, \$58,000 in general election* Mayor: \$230,000 in primary, \$115,000 in general election* | City Council appropriations | primary: \$1 public : \$2 private general election: 1:1 match |
| LOS ANGELES, CA 3,884,307 | 1991 | Mayor, City Council, City Attorney, City Controller | Open, but subject to overall expenditure limits and the following limits on use of personal funds: Citywide Office: \$124,500 City Council: \$31,100 | City Council \$25,000 counting only the first \$250 of a contribution City Attorney and Controller \$75,000 counting only first \$500 Mayor \$150,000 counting only first \$500 of contributions Starting in 2015, contributors must be city residents Starting in 2015, candidates must raise at least \$5 from 200 city or district residents <u>expenditure limit</u> City Council: \$480,000 in primary, \$400,000 in general election Controller: \$1,119,000 in primary, \$840,000 in general election City Attorney: \$1,259,000 in primary, \$979,000 in general election Mayor: \$2,798,000 in primary, \$2,237,000 in general election | City Council appropriations of at least \$2 million | Starting in 2015, if a candidate has 1,000 signatures on a nominating petition, or 500 signatures and has paid a filing fee, then 2:1 match in primary and 4:1 match in general election If these criteria have not been met, then 1:1 match |
| OAKLAND, CA 406,253 | 2010 | City Council | Open, but subject to overall expenditure limits, and cannot use personal funds for more than 10% of the expenditure limit | <u>threshold fundraising</u> 5% of the expenditure limit, from contributions originating within the City of Oakland <u>expenditure limit</u> varies by district (For example, District 1: \$127,000 and District 4: \$121,000) | City Council appropriations | A candidate can be reimbursed for expenditures up to 30% of the expenditure limit |

*Dollar amounts are from before 2013 and will likely be adjusted for inflation based on changes in the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor and Statistics

OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAMS - Prepared by The Illinois Campaign for Political Reform - www.ilcampaign.org

| Municipality w/ population 2013 population estimate www.census.gov | Date of Program Creation | Offices and Elections Covered | Open or Closed? | Candidate Qualification | Funding Source | Disbursement Mechanism |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| RICHMOND, CA 107,571 | | Mayor, City Council | Partially-Closed, may raise up to \$20,000 in outside contributions* | <u>expenditure limit</u> \$75,000* file a public funding request | appropriations from city treasury | \$5,000 lump-sum at the following fundraising benchmarks: \$10,000; \$15,000; \$20,000; \$25,000; and \$30,000 |
| AUSTIN, TX 885,400 | 2008 | Mayor, City Council (run-off/general election only) | Open, but subject to additional contribution limits, overall expenditure limits, and cannot use personal funds for more than 5% of expenditure limit | <u>contribution limit from PACs:</u> Mayor: \$24,000 in regular election, \$16,000 in run-off election* City Council: \$15,000 in regular election, \$10,000 in run-off election* (these limits are not imposed on non-participating candidates) <u>expenditure limit</u> Mayor: \$120,000 plus \$80,000 for run-off election* City Council: \$75,000 plus \$50,000 for run-off election* | \$300 lobbyist registration fees, individual and business donations, fines for violating campaign finance laws, candidate filing fees, and, when feasible, \$1 vol. check-off utility bills | <u>equal distribution</u> To the extent such funds are available, money from the Austin Fair Campaign Finance Fund is distributed equally to all qualifying candidates |
| SACRAMENTO, CA 479,686 | 2004 city council 2008 mayoral | Mayor, City Council | Open, but subject to overall expenditure limits | <u>threshold fundraising</u> Mayor: \$10,000 in contributions of \$250 or less City Council: \$7,500 in contributions of \$250 or less (contributions must come from city residents) <u>expenditure limit</u> Mayor: \$585,000 City Council: \$88,000 | City Council appropriations | 1:1 match on the first \$250 of a contribution |
| BOULDER, CO 103,166 | 2001 | City Council | Open, but subject to expenditure limits, and cannot use personal funds for more than 20% of expenditure limit | <u>threshold fundraising</u> 10% of expenditure limit from individual contributors, counting only the first \$25 of each contribution <u>expenditure limit</u> \$.15 per registered city voter* | appropriations from city budget | 1:1 match |
| SAN FRANCISCO, CA 837,442 | 2000 2006 for mayoral | Mayor, Board of Supervisors | Open, but subject to expenditure limits, and cannot spend more than \$5,000 in personal funds | <u>threshold fundraising</u> Board of Supervisors: \$10,000 from at least 100 individuals Board of Supervisors incumbent: \$15,000 from at least 150 Mayoral candidate: \$50,000 from at least 500 individuals Mayoral incumbent candidate: \$75,000 from at least 750 <u>expenditure limit</u> Board of Supervisors: \$143,000 Mayoral candidate: \$1,475,000 | appropriations of \$2.75 per resident of the City and County of San Francisco | lump-sum upon qualifying (Mayor: \$100,000, Supervisor: \$20,000), then 2:1 match up to a certain amount, then 1:1 match |
| TUCSAN, AZ 526,116 | 1987 | Mayor, City Council | Open, but subject to expenditure limits, and cannot use personal funds for more than 3% of expenditure limit | <u>threshold fundraising</u> Mayoral: \$10 each from at least 300 individual city residents City Council: \$10 each from at least 200 individual city residents <u>expenditure limit</u> Mayoral: unknown City Council: \$114,627 (\$85,970 through primary)* | appropriations, gifts, and donations | 1:1 match of individual contributions, even from non-residents |

*Dollar amounts are from before 2013 and will likely be adjusted for inflation based on changes in the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor and Statistics

OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAMS - Prepared by The Illinois Campaign for Political Re

| Municipality w/ population 2013 population estimate www.census.gov | Disbursement Limit | Millionaire/PAC Trigger? | Total Program Expenditure | City Budget w/ % Spent on Program | Other Requirements |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| NEW YORK, NY 8,405,837 | Mayor: \$3,534,300 Public Advocate and Comptroller: \$2,209,900 Borough President: \$795, 300 City Council: \$92,400 | No | <u>2013</u> \$33,637,335 spent between the following candidates: 4 Mayor, 3 Public Advocate, 1 Comptroller, 9 Borough Presidents, 127 City Council | <u>FY 2013-2014</u> \$69.9 billion .05% | participate in at least one debate |
| NEW HAVEN, CT 130,660 | \$125,000 | Yes, a candidate can have the expenditure limit lifted, thereby opting-out of further matching | <u>2013</u> \$111,250 spent between three mayoral candidates | <u>FY 2013-2014</u> \$700,246,127 .016% | participate in at least one public forum |
| ALBUQUERQUE, NM 556,495 | \$1 per voter | No, provision to trigger matching funds was permanently enjoined by U.S. Supreme Court in <i>Arizona Free Enterprise v. Bennett</i> | <u>2011</u> \$134,974 spent between four City Council candidates | <u>FY 2011-2012</u> \$878,063,000 .015% | |
| LONG BEACH, CA 469,428 | primary: 33% of expenditure limit general election: 50% of expenditure limit | | <u>2014</u> \$121,490 spent so far between 1 Mayoral Candidate and 4 City Council Candidates <u>2006</u> \$160,997 spent between 1 Mayoral Candidate, 2 City Auditor Candidates, 4 City Council Candidates | <u>FY 2013-2014</u> \$3.1 billion .004% <u>FY 2005-2006</u> \$2 billion .008% | |
| LOS ANGELES, CA 3,884,307 | <u>primary</u> City Council: \$100,000 City Controller: \$267,000 City Attorney: \$300,000 Mayor: \$667,000 <u>general election</u> City Council: \$125,000 City Controller: \$300,000 City Attorney: \$350,000 Mayor: \$800,000 | Yes, limits are lifted if opposing candidate makes expenditures beyond the limit for participating candidates, or if there are independent expenditures, for or against any candidate, in excess of: City Council: \$77,000 City Attorney: \$155,000 City Controller: \$155,000 Mayor \$309,000 | <u>2013</u> \$9,655,301 spent between the following candidates: 5 Mayor, 2 City Attorney, 2 Controller, 25 City Council | <u>FY 2012-2013</u> \$20.6 billion .05% | participate in at least one debate for primary, and two debates for general election |
| OAKLAND, CA 406,253 | 30% of the expenditure limit | | <u>2012</u> \$50,529 | <u>FY 2012-2013</u> \$978,278,157 .005% | The candidate, campaign treasurer, or a designee must attend a Public Ethics Commission training program Public debates are strongly encouraged |

*Dollar amounts are from before 2013 and will likely be adjusted for inflation based on changes in the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau

OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCE PROGRAMS - Prepared by The Illinois Campaign for Political Re

| Municipality w/ population 2013 population estimate www.census.gov | Disbursement Limit | Millionaire/PAC Trigger? | Total Program Expenditure | City Budget w/ % Spent on Program | Other Requirements |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| RICHMOND, CA 107,571 | matching funds limit: \$25,000* | | | | |
| AUSTIN, TX 885,400 | No disbursement limit, but as a practical matter there will not be unlimited funds available | | <u>2012</u> No publicly funded candidates | <u>FY 2011-2012</u> \$2.8 billion N/A | participate in specified debates <u>conspicuous disclosure on all ads:</u> candidate has/has not agreed to comply with Austin Fair Campaign Chapter |
| SACRAMENTO, CA 479,686 | Mayor \$117,000 City Council \$35,2000 | Yes, limits are lifted if an opponent raises or spends \$66,000 (City Council) or \$438,750 (Mayor); or if there are independent expenditures totaling \$44,000 (City Council) or \$292,500(Mayor) | <u>2010</u> \$7,795 spent on one City Council candidate Between 2004-2010, 9 candidates opted-into the program, but never qualified for matching funds | <u>FY 2009-2010</u> \$874,700,000 .001% | participate in at least one public forum |
| BOULDER, CO 103,166 | Candidates can receive up to 50% of the spending limit in matching funds. In 2013 the maximum amount was \$8,786 | | <u>2013</u> \$60,686 spent between nine City Council candidates | <u>FY 2013</u> \$254,693,000 .02% | |
| SAN FRANCISCO, CA 837,442 | Mayoral candidate: \$975,000 Mayoral incumbent: \$962,500 Board of Supervisors: \$155,000 B. of Super. Incumbent: \$152,500 | Yes, limits can get raised when the highest opponent spending, plus independent expenditures against the participating candidate, exceed the spending limit. | <u>2012</u> \$1,228,097 spent between 12 Board of Supervisors candidates | <u>FY 2012-2013</u> \$7.4 billion .02% | participate in at least three debates |
| TUCSAN, AZ 526,116 | 50% of expenditure limit | | <u>2013</u> \$170,420 spent between four City Council Candidates | <u>FY 2013-2014</u> \$1.3 billion .01% | |

*Dollar amounts are from before 2013 and will likely be adjusted for inflation based on changes in the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau

form - www.ilcampaign.org

Sources

Administrative Code of the City of New York §§ 3-701, *et seq.*
<http://www.nycfb.info>
<http://www.nyc.gov/html/omb>

New Haven, Connecticut, Code of Ordinances, Title III, Chapter 2
www.cityofnewhaven.com

Albuquerque Code of Ordinance – Charter of the City of Albuquerque,
Article XVI
www.cabq.gov

Long Beach, California Municipal Code, Vol. 1, Title 2, Chapter 2.01
www.longbeach.gov

Los Angeles Municipal Code §§ 49.7.1, *et seq.*
Los Angeles City Charter Vol. 1, Article IV, § 471
<http://cao.lacity.org/>
<http://ethics.lacity.org>

City of Oakland 2014 Limited Public Financing Guide
www2.oaklandnet.com

of Labor and Statistics

form - www.ilcampaign.org

Sources

Richmond, CA Code of Ordinances, Article II, Chapter 2.43

Austin, Texas, Code of Ordinances, Title 2, Chapter 2-2, Article 7
<https://austintexas.gov/>

Sacramento City Code, Title 2, Chapter 2.14
<http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/>

<https://bouldercolorado.gov>

San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, Article I,
Chapter 1, § 1.136-1.156; and Regulation 1.143
<http://openbook.sfgov.org/>

<http://clerks.tucsonaz.gov/>
<http://budget.tucsonaz.gov>

of Labor and Statistics