



CENTER *for* GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES  
*solutions for democracy*

---

Local Public Financing Charts  
2007

---

Prepared by Steven M. Levin & Tiffany S. Mok

November 2007

10951 W. Pico Blvd., Suite 120  
Los Angeles, CA 90064-2184  
tel: 310.470.6590 • fax: 310.475.3752  
center@cgs.org • www.cgs.org

## Introduction

The following charts, prepared by the Center for Governmental Studies (CGS), provide detailed descriptions of local public financing programs in the United States. The charts show that:

- Fifteen local jurisdictions in the United States have some form of public financing on the books;
- Two cities [Portland (OR) and Albuquerque (NM)] provide full public financing to qualified candidates for City Council, Mayor and some citywide candidates;
- Thirteen local jurisdictions [Austin (TX), Boulder (CO), Long Beach (CA), Los Angeles (CA), Miami-Dade County (FL), New Haven (CT), New York (NY), Oakland (CA), Richmond (CA), Sacramento (CA), San Francisco (CA), Suffolk County (NY), and Tucson (AZ)], including six cities of varying sizes in California, provide partial public financing to qualified candidates running for some local offices.
- Spending limits per resident range from \$0.13 (in Long Beach, CA) to \$2.42 (in New Haven, CT).

The local public financing charts describe the key features of various types of public financing programs, as follows:

**Local Chart 1** - Population, Date Enacted, Maximum Public Funds Available

**Local Chart 2** - Qualifying Threshold, Residency Restrictions, Funding Mechanism, Spending Limits

**Local Chart 3** - Spending Limits Per Resident, Contribution Limits, Candidate Personal Contributions

**Local Chart 4** - High Spending Opponent Trigger, Independent Expenditure Trigger, Debate Requirement

The *Public Financing in American Elections* project is made possible by generous grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, JEHT Foundation and Rockefeller Brothers Fund. As part of this series, CGS published detailed, jurisdiction-specific analyses of public financing programs in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Suffolk County, NY, New York City and Tucson. Copies of these and other CGS reports on campaign finance reform and public campaign financing are available on the CGS website, [www.cgs.org](http://www.cgs.org).

For more information about these charts or public financing programs, please contact Steve Levin, Political Reform Project Director, at [slevin@cgs.org](mailto:slevin@cgs.org) or (310) 470-6590, ext. 115.

# CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

## LOCAL CHART 1: POPULATION, DATE ENACTED, PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION, MAXIMUM AMOUNT

This chart summarizes the laws of 15 local jurisdictions in the United States that have public financing programs.<sup>1</sup>

JURISDICTION	POPULATION <sup>2</sup>	ENACTED	PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION <sup>3</sup>	MAXIMUM PUBLIC FUNDS AVAILABLE
Albuquerque, NM	504,949	2005	City Council: \$1 per registered district voter per participating candidate Mayor: \$1 per registered City voter per participating candidate <sup>4</sup>	City Council and Mayor: \$450,000 per candidate (overall amount in program equals 1% of the City's general fund) <sup>5</sup>
Austin, TX	709,893	1992	City Council and Mayor: Equal distribution of available funds among qualifying candidates in a runoff election. The public funds are distributed as a lump-sum grant. If no eligible candidate is in a runoff election, the funds are reserved for future elections <sup>6</sup>	No maximum is established by law
Boulder, CO	94,673	2000	City Council: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions <sup>7</sup>	City Council: A candidate may receive no more than 50% of the spending limit in public funds. <sup>8</sup> In 2007, a candidate could receive a maximum of \$6,437 in public funds
Long Beach, CA	472,494	1994	City Council, Mayor, Citywide Offices: \$1 in public funds for every \$2 in contributions (primary); \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions (runoff) <sup>9</sup>	A candidate may receive no more than 33% of the primary spending limit and 50% of the runoff election spending limit in public funds, which equals: City Council: \$17,207 (primary); \$13,036 (runoff) Mayor: \$86,037 (primary); \$65,180 (runoff) Other Citywide Office: \$65,180 (primary); \$32,590 (runoff) <sup>10</sup>
Los Angeles, CA	3,849,378	1990	City Council: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions from individuals, up to \$250 (primary); lump-sum grant of one-fifth of the maximum matching funds available, plus a \$1-to-\$1 match for individual contributions, up to \$250 (general) Mayor and Citywide Offices: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions from individuals, up to \$500 per contributor (primary); lump-sum grant of one-fifth of the maximum matching funds available, plus a \$1-to-\$1 match for individual contributions, up to \$500 (general) <sup>11</sup>	City Council: \$100,000 (primary); \$125,000 (general); up to \$25,000 more to match non-candidate and non-participating candidate expenditures in the general election Mayor: \$667,000 (primary); \$800,000 (general); up to \$200,000 more to match non-candidate and non-participating candidate expenditures in the general election Controller: \$267,000 (primary); \$300,000 (general); up to \$60,000 more to match non-candidate and non-participating candidate expenditures in the general election City Attorney: \$300,000 (primary); \$350,000 (general); up to \$70,000 more to match non-candidate and non-participating candidate expenditures in the general election
Miami-Dade County, FL	2,402,208	2001	County Commission: A qualified candidate receives a lump-sum grant of either \$50,000 or \$75,000 for the general election, depending on which qualification threshold is met. A qualified candidate receives an additional \$50,000 if a runoff election is held Mayor: A qualified candidate receives a lump-sum grant of \$300,000 for the general election, and an additional \$200,000 if a runoff election is held <sup>12</sup>	County Commission: \$75,000 (general); \$50,000 (runoff) Mayor: \$300,000 (general); \$200,000 (runoff) <sup>13</sup>
New Haven, CT	124,001	2006	Mayor: A qualified candidate receives matching funds as follows: For contributions over \$25: \$50 (until the candidate reaches the expenditure ceiling) For contributions under \$25: \$2-to-\$1 match <sup>14</sup>	Mayor: \$125,000 in matching funds (primary); \$125,000 (general); \$15,000 lump-sum grant (one for primary and one for general) <sup>15</sup>

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 1: POPULATION, DATE ENACTED, PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION, MAXIMUM AMOUNT

JURISDICTION	POPULATION <sup>2</sup>	ENACTED	PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION <sup>3</sup>	MAXIMUM PUBLIC FUNDS AVAILABLE
New York, NY	8,214,426	1988	City Council, Mayor and Citywide Offices: \$4 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions of \$250 or less from natural persons, up to \$1,000 in public funds per contributor <sup>16</sup>	<p>Under normal circumstances, a candidate may not receive public funds that exceed 55% of spending limit,<sup>17</sup> which in 2005 will equal:</p> <p>City Council: \$82,500 per election                      Borough President: \$708,950 per election                      Mayor: \$3,150,400 per election                      Public Advocate and Comptroller: \$1,969,550 per election</p> <p>However, if a high spending opponent spends 50% over the spending limit ("Tier One"), the participating candidate is eligible to receive matching funds in a 5:1 ratio in the following maximum amounts (2005):</p> <p>City Council: \$100,000 per election                      Borough President: \$859,333 per election                      Mayor: \$3,818,667 per election                      Public Advocate and Comptroller: \$2,387,333 per election</p> <p>Additionally, if a high spending opponent spends 300% over the spending limit ("Tier Two"), the participating candidate is eligible to receive matching funds in a 6:1 ratio in the following maximum amounts (2005):</p> <p>City Council: \$187,500                      Borough President: \$859,333                      Mayor: \$7,160,000                      Comptroller: \$4,476,250                      Public Advocate: \$4,476,250</p>
Oakland, CA	397,067	1999	City Council: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions, up to \$100 in public funds per contributor <sup>18</sup>	<p>Candidates may not receive public funds exceeding 30% of the applicable spending limit,<sup>19</sup> which equals:</p> <p>City Council: \$30,300-\$35,100 per election (depending on the population of the district)                      School Board: \$20,100-\$23,400 per election (depending on the population of the district)</p>

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 1: POPULATION, DATE ENACTED, PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION, MAXIMUM AMOUNT

JURISDICTION	POPULATION <sup>2</sup>	ENACTED	PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION <sup>3</sup>	MAXIMUM PUBLIC FUNDS AVAILABLE
Portland, OR <sup>20</sup>	537,081	2005	Commissioner, Mayor, Auditor: Candidates receive the maximum amount of funds for contested primary and general elections, minus the total amount of qualifying contributions <sup>21</sup> and seed money <sup>22</sup> received by the candidate in a pre-determined schedule before each election <sup>23</sup>	Contested primary elections: Mayor: \$200,000 Commissioner: \$150,000 Auditor: \$150,000  general elections: Mayor: \$250,000 Commissioner: \$150,000 Auditor: \$150,000 <sup>24</sup>
Richmond, CA	96,648	2003	City Council and Mayor: When \$15,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$20,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$25,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$30,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$35,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed	City Council and Mayor: \$25,000 in matching funds per election
Sacramento, CA	453,781	2003	City Council and Mayor: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions received within 88 days of the election, up to \$250 in public funds per contributor <sup>25</sup>	City Council: \$32,800 per election Mayor: \$109,600 per election <sup>26</sup>
San Francisco, CA	744,041	2000	Board of Supervisors: \$50,000 on certification of eligibility, then \$4 in public funds for each of the first \$5,000 raised in individual contributions, then \$1 in public funds for each \$1 in individual contributions raised, up to a maximum of \$43,750  Mayor: \$50,000 on certification of eligibility, then \$4 in public funds for each of the first \$100,000 raised in individual contributions, then \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in individual contributions raised up to \$400,000 or a maximum of \$850,000 in total public funds <sup>27</sup>	Board of Supervisors: \$43,750 Mayor: \$850,000
Suffolk County, NY <sup>28</sup>	1,469,715	1998	Upon reaching the threshold for eligibility, a candidate receives the following amount of public funds per election, in a lump-sum grant: County Legislature: \$10,000 Executive: \$200,000 Comptroller, Treasurer, District Attorney: \$70,000 <sup>29</sup>	County Legislature: \$10,000 Executive: \$200,000 Comptroller, Treasurer, District Attorney: \$70,000 <sup>30</sup>
Tucson, AZ	518,956	1985	City Council and Mayor: \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in contributions <sup>31</sup>	There is no maximum amount established explicitly by law, but under the matching funds formula, it would be impossible for a candidate to receive more than 50% of the spending limit in public funds. Consequently, the maximum public funds available to a candidate would be:  City Council (for 2007 elections): \$45,090 per election cycle Mayor (for 2007 elections): \$90,194 per election cycle <sup>32</sup>

## CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

### LOCAL CHART 1: POPULATION, DATE ENACTED, PUBLIC FUNDS ALLOCATION, MAXIMUM AMOUNT

- 1 This chart contains information only for jurisdictions with public financing laws on the books. Public financing programs in six local jurisdictions – Cincinnati (OH), King County (WA), Petaluma (CA), Sacramento County (CA), Seattle (WA), and Cary (NC) – have been terminated or suspended, three by statewide ballot measure, one by local ballot measure, one by city council repeal, and one by suspension under legal settlement.
- 2 Based on estimated 2006 census figures from the U.S. Census Bureau, which can be found at the American Factfinder website: <http://factfinder.census.gov>, unless otherwise indicated.
- 3 In jurisdictions that use a matching funds system, as opposed to a lump-sum grant system, the amount of public funding a candidate may receive per contributor is typically limited by the size of the jurisdiction's contribution limit. For example, in Boulder, a candidate may receive \$1 in public funds for every \$1 in private contributions up to the jurisdiction's \$100 contribution limit. Therefore, a candidate in Boulder could not receive more than \$100 in public funds per contributor. In an effort to encourage candidates to solicit smaller contributions from a larger number of donors, some jurisdictions place a limit on the size of a contribution that will be matched which is lower than the general contribution limit (e.g., Los Angeles and New York City). For the purposes of interpreting this column, assume that contributions up to the contribution limit are matchable unless otherwise noted.
- 4 Albuquerque, N.M., City Charter Article XVI, § 12 (2007).
- 5 Id. at § 10.
- 6 Austin, Tex., City Code § 2-2-34(A) (2007).
- 7 Boulder, Colo., Revised Code § 13-2-20(a) (2007).
- 8 Id.
- 9 Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.01.410(D) (2007).
- 10 Id. at §§ 2.01.410(A) (3), (B) (2) and (C) (2).
- 11 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code §§ 49.7.20 and 49.7.19(B) (2007).
- 12 Miami-Dade, Fla., County Code § 12-22(f) (3) (2007).
- 13 Id.
- 14 New Haven, Conn., Code of general Ordinances, Title II, Article XVII, § 2-253 (2007).
- 15 Id.
- 16 New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 3-705(2) (2007). See also id. at § 3-702 (definition of “matchable contribution”).
- 17 Id. at § 3-705(2).
- 18 Oakland, Cal., Municipal Code § 3.13.110 (2007).
- 19 Id.
- 20 In May 2005, Portland, Oregon became the first U.S. city to enact a full public financing program for local candidates. After raising a certain number of qualifying contributions of \$5, candidates become eligible to receive all of the money necessary to run a campaign, up to a pre-determined spending limit.
- 21 A “qualifying contribution” is defined as a contribution of no more than \$5 in cash, or in the form of a check or money order made payable by any resident to the candidate or principal campaign committee of the candidate. See Portland, Or., City Code § 2.10.010(T) (2007).
- 22 A “seed money contribution” is defined as a contribution of no more than \$100 made by a person to a political committee or candidate. Id. at § 2.10.010(W).
- 23 Id. at § 2.10.100.
- 24 Id. at § 2.10.110.
- 25 Sacramento, Cal., City Code § 2.14.140 (2007).
- 26 Id.
- 27 San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.144.5 (2007).
- 28 Although the law is still officially on the books, the Suffolk County public financing program has been consistently under-funded and virtually inoperable since its inception. For a more in-depth analysis of the problems with the Suffolk County program, see Center for Governmental Studies, *Dead On Arrival? Breathing Life into Suffolk County's New Campaign Finance Reforms* (2002).
- 29 Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter § C41-4(C) (2007).
- 30 Id.
- 31 Tucson, Ariz., Charter, Chapter XVI, Subchapter B, § 5(a) (2005).
- 32 Id.

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 2: QUALIFYING THRESHOLD, RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS, SPENDING LIMITS

JURISDICTION	QUALIFYING FUNDRAISING THRESHOLD <sup>1</sup>	RESIDENCY RESTRICTION ON MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS	FUNDING MECHANISM	SPENDING LIMITS <sup>2</sup>
Albuquerque, NM	To become eligible for public financing, candidates must raise \$5 qualifying contributions from City residents as follows: City Council: 1% of registered City voters in district Mayor: 1% of registered City voters	Yes, for qualifying contributions	Qualifying contributions; unspent moneys; seed money; appropriations equal to one tenth of 1% of the approved general fund; voluntary contributions from members of the public	City Council: \$1.00 per registered voter in the district (approximately \$55,000) Mayor: \$1.00 per registered City voter (approximately \$495,000)
Austin, TX	None <sup>3</sup> (Public financing program candidates receive funds if in a runoff)	N/A	Lobbyist registration fees; donations from individuals and business entities; liquidated damages and criminal fines for campaign violations; voluntary check-off on utility bills; candidate filing fees <sup>4</sup>	City Council <sup>5</sup> : \$75,000 (general), an additional \$50,000 for a runoff Mayor: \$120,000 (general), an additional \$80,000 for a runoff
Boulder, CO	10% of spending limit in contributions of \$25 or less: \$1,287 (2007) <sup>6</sup>	No	City Council allocation <sup>7</sup>	\$0.18 per registered voter: \$12,873 (2007) <sup>8</sup>
Long Beach, CA	City Council: \$5,000 in contributions of \$100 or less Mayor: \$20,000 in contributions of \$200 or less Other Citywide Office: \$10,000 in contributions of \$150 or less <sup>9</sup>	No	City Council allocations "from time to time" <sup>10</sup>	City Council: \$52,144 (primary); \$26,072 (runoff) Mayor: \$260,720 (primary); \$130,360 (runoff) Other Citywide Office: \$130,360 (primary); \$65,180 (runoff) <sup>11</sup>
Los Angeles, CA	City Council: \$25,000 in contributions of \$250 or less Mayor: \$150,000 in contributions of \$500 or less <sup>12</sup> City Attorney and Controller: \$75,000 in contributions of \$500 or less	No	The City Charter mandates \$2 million in annual appropriations to fund the public financing program. The annual appropriations are held in a trust fund, the balance of which may never exceed \$8 million. Both the annual appropriation and the total balance amounts are adjusted for changes in the cost of living <sup>13</sup>	City Council: \$330,000 (primary); \$275,000 (general) Mayor: \$2,251,000 (primary); \$1,800,000 (general) Controller: \$900,000 (primary); \$676,000 (general) City Attorney: \$1,013,000 (primary); \$788,000 (general) <sup>14</sup>

# CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

## LOCAL CHART 2: QUALIFYING THRESHOLD, RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS, SPENDING LIMITS

JURISDICTION	QUALIFYING FUNDRAISING THRESHOLD <sup>1</sup>	RESIDENCY RESTRICTION ON MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS	FUNDING MECHANISM	SPENDING LIMITS <sup>2</sup>
Miami-Dade County, FL	<p>County Commission: 300 contributions between \$100 and \$500 from 200 registered voter residents of Miami-Dade County for a total of at least \$300,000, in order to receive \$50,000 in public funds for the primary election. If total qualifying contributions exceed \$50,000, the candidate is eligible for \$75,000 in public funds for the primary election</p> <p>Mayor: 1,500 contributions between \$100 and \$500 from 1,500 registered voter residents of Miami-Dade County<sup>15</sup></p> <p>runoff: A candidate who was not a participant in the primary election may receive public funds in a runoff without meeting the threshold requirement, provided that the candidate did not exceed the spending limit in the primary and agrees to abide by the runoff spending and personal contribution limits<sup>16</sup></p>	Miami-Dade County uses a lump-sum grant program, rather than a matching funds program. However, the contributions that a candidate must receive in order to qualify for a public funding grant must be made by registered voter residents of the County <sup>17</sup>	Appropriations from general revenues "in an amount sufficient to fund qualifying candidates" <sup>18</sup>	<p>Commissioner: \$200,000 (general); \$150,000 (runoff)</p> <p>Mayor: \$650,000 (general); \$450,000 (runoff)<sup>19</sup></p>
New Haven, CT	Mayor: 200 contributions from separate individuals who are electors of no less than \$25 and no more than \$300 <sup>20</sup>	Yes, for qualifying contributions and matching funds <sup>21</sup>	Annual budget appropriation <sup>22</sup>	Mayor: \$300,000 (primary); \$300,000 (general)
New York, NY	<p>In order to reach the following threshold requirements, the contributions must be between \$10 and \$250 and made by natural persons who are residents of New York City.</p> <p>City Council: at least 75 contributions from Council residents totaling \$5,000</p> <p>Borough President: at least 100 contributions totaling an amount equal to \$0.02 multiplied by the resident population of the borough</p> <p>Mayor: at least 1,000 contributions totaling \$250,000</p> <p>Public Advocate and Comptroller: at least 500 contributions totaling \$125,000<sup>23</sup></p>	Yes, for matching funds <sup>24</sup>	Annual budget appropriation <sup>25</sup>	<p>Election year limits through 2009:</p> <p>City Council: \$150,000 per election<sup>26</sup></p> <p>Borough President: \$1,289,000 per election</p> <p>Mayor: \$5,728,000 per election</p> <p>Public Advocate and Comptroller: \$3,581,000 per election</p> <p>Additional spending limits apply to the two years preceding the election year</p>
Oakland, CA	Contributions of \$100 or less totaling at least 5% of the applicable spending limit <sup>27</sup>	No	City Council appropriation "sufficient to fund all candidates for the city office eligible to receive limited matching funds" <sup>28</sup>	<p>2007 Election year limits:</p> <p>District City Councilmember: \$101,000 to \$117,000 (depending on the population of the district)</p> <p>School Board Director: \$67,000 to \$78,000 (depending on the population of the district)<sup>29</sup></p>

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 2: QUALIFYING THRESHOLD, RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS, SPENDING LIMITS

JURISDICTION	QUALIFYING FUNDRAISING THRESHOLD <sup>1</sup>	RESIDENCY RESTRICTION ON MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS	FUNDING MECHANISM	SPENDING LIMITS <sup>2</sup>
Portland, OR	To become eligible for public financing, candidates must raise \$5 qualifying contributions from city residents as follows: Mayor: 1,500 residents Commissioner: 1,000 residents Auditor: 1,000 residents <sup>30</sup>	Yes, for qualifying contributions <sup>31</sup>	City Council appropriation; civil penalty fund revenues; voluntary private contributions <sup>32</sup>	Commissioner: \$150,000 (primary); \$200,000 (general) Mayor: \$200,000 (primary); \$250,000 (general) Auditor: \$150,000 (primary); \$200,000 (general) <sup>33</sup>
Richmond, CA	Mayor and City Council: When \$15,000 total in matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$20,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$25,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$30,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed When \$35,000 in total matchable contributions are received, \$5,000 is disbursed	No	Annual budget appropriation	None
Sacramento, CA	City Council: Candidates must raise at least \$7,500 in contributions of \$250 or less Mayor: Candidates must raise at least \$10,000 in contributions of \$250 or less <sup>34</sup>	No	City Council appropriation <sup>35</sup>	City Council: \$82,000 Mayor: \$548,000 <sup>36</sup>
San Francisco, CA	Board of Supervisors: Candidate must raise \$5,000 in contributions between \$10 and \$100 from at least 75 residents of the city, and be opposed by another eligible candidate who has either established eligibility or has raised or spent 5,000 or more <sup>37</sup> Mayor: Candidates must raise \$25,000 in qualifying contributions from at least 250 residents of the city, and be opposed by another eligible candidate who has raised or spent \$50,000 or more <sup>38</sup>	Yes, for matching funds <sup>39</sup>	Election Campaign Fund established by ordinance. Ordinance directs the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to appropriate an amount sufficient to provide funding to all eligible candidates <sup>40</sup>	Board of Supervisors: \$86,000 <sup>41</sup> Mayor: \$1,375,000
Suffolk County, NY	The following thresholds must be met by contributions from natural person residents of the County of between \$10 and \$500: County Legislature: 50 contributions totaling at least \$5,000 Executive: 500 contributions totaling at least \$75,000 Comptroller, Treasurer, District Attorney: 300 contributions totaling at least \$30,000 <sup>42</sup>	Yes, for matching funds <sup>43</sup>	Voluntary taxpayer donations to the campaign finance fund <sup>44</sup>	County Legislator: \$17,000 (primary); \$34,000 (general) <sup>45</sup> Executive: \$338,000 (primary); \$563,000 (general) Other Countywide Offices: \$113,000 (primary); \$225,000 (general) Additional spending limits apply to the year preceding the election year <sup>46</sup>

# CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

## LOCAL CHART 2: QUALIFYING THRESHOLD, RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS, SPENDING LIMITS

JURISDICTION	QUALIFYING FUNDRAISING THRESHOLD <sup>1</sup>	RESIDENCY RESTRICTION ON MATCHABLE CONTRIBUTIONS	FUNDING MECHANISM	SPENDING LIMITS <sup>2</sup>
Tucson, AZ	The following thresholds must be met with contributions from city residents: City Council: 200 contributions of \$10 or more Mayor: 300 contributions of \$10 or more <sup>47</sup>	Contributions received toward meeting the matching funds qualification threshold must be from Tucson residents. Once a candidate exceeds the qualification threshold, non-resident contributions are matchable <sup>48</sup>	Mayor/City Council annual budget appropriations <sup>49</sup>	City Council: \$0.20 (may be adjusted using the CPI annually) per registered voter in the city per election cycle: \$90,181 (2007) Mayor: \$0.40 (may be adjusted using the CPI annually) per registered voter in the city per election cycle: \$180,388 (2007) No candidate may spend more than 75% of these limits prior to the primary election <sup>50</sup>

- 1 In order to be eligible to receive public financing, candidates must first demonstrate a modicum of public support. Various qualification thresholds are used to ensure that public funds are not allocated to candidates with no support base. Most jurisdictions require candidates to raise a minimum amount of campaign funds in small contributions. Some jurisdictions (e.g., Austin) require that candidates receive enough votes in a general election to proceed into a runoff election before becoming eligible to receive public funds.
- 2 The spending limits in these jurisdictions are binding only on candidates who voluntarily agree to abide by such limits in exchange for public financing. The U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted the First Amendment of the federal Constitution to prohibit mandatory spending limits. See *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 49 (1976). The Buckley Court did rule, however, that Congress may "condition acceptance of public funds on an agreement by the candidate to abide by specified expenditure limitations." Id. at 57 n. 65. The local governments included in this chart have relied on this rationale to implement voluntary public financing programs with spending limits. The following jurisdictions apply a cost of living adjustment ("COLA") to the spending limits: Boulder, see Boulder, Colo., Revised Code § 13-2-21(b)(1) (2007); Long Beach, see Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.01.1210 (2007); Miami-Dade County, see Miami-Dade, Fla., County Code § 12-22(e)(3) (2007); New York City, see New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 3-706(1)(e) (2007); Oakland, see Oakland, Cal., Municipal Code § 3.12.200 (2007); San Francisco, see San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.130(f) (2007); Suffolk County, see Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter § C41-5(A)(4) (2007); and Tucson, see Tucson, Ariz., Charter, Chapter XVI, Subchapter B, § 3(c) (2007). The spending limits listed in this chart are the most current adjusted limits. The original limits can be found in the cited ordinances and charters.
- 3 Austin, Tex., Code § 2-2-34 (2007).
- 4 Id. at § 2-2-32.
- 5 Austin, Tex., Code § 2-2-7.
- 6 Boulder, Colo., Revised Code § 13-2-21(a) (2007).
- 7 Id. at 13-2-20(a).
- 8 Id. at § 13-2-21(b) (1) (2007). The actual spending limit in 2007, when adjusted for the cost of living, was \$0.183 per registered voter. When multiplied by 70,218 registered voters, the total spending limit per candidate was \$12,873.
- 9 Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.01.410 (2007).
- 10 Id. at § 2.01.910.
- 11 These limits are current as of January 2006 and will be adjusted again in January 2008 to reflect changes in the cost of living. Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.02.410 (2007).
- 12 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code § 49.7.19(A)(1) (2007).
- 13 Los Angeles, Cal., City Charter, Art. IV §§ 471(c) (1) and (2) (2007).
- 14 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code § 49.7.13 (2007).
- 15 Code of Miami-Dade County, Fla. § 12-22(c) (5) (2007).
- 16 Id. at § 12-22(d). Limits are adjusted quadrennially with the Consumer Price Index starting 2005.
- 17 Id. at § 12-22(c) (5).
- 18 Id. at § 12-22(b).
- 19 Id. at § 12-22(e).
- 20 New Haven, Conn., Title II, Article XVIII, § 2-253 (2007).
- 21 Id. at § 2-253.
- 22 Id. at § 2-245.
- 23 New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 3-703(2) (a) (2007).
- 24 Id. at § 3-702(3).
- 25 Id. at § 3-709.
- 26 The spending limits given here are the limits that apply to the 2003 city council elections and the 2005 citywide office elections. Id. at § 3-706(1) (a).
- 27 Oakland, Cal., Municipal Code § 3.13.080(C) (2007).
- 28 Id. at § 3.13.060.
- 29 Id. at § 3.12.200. The statute specifies the spending limit amount per resident, adjusted for changes in the cost of living. The city's limits are based on the City Clerk's resident population count of 399,484.
- 30 Portland, Or., City Code § 2.10.070 (2007).
- 31 Id.; see also § 2.10.010(V).
- 32 Id. at § 2.10.040.
- 33 Id. at § 2.10.110.
- 34 Sacramento, Cal., City Code § 2.14.130 (2007).
- 35 Id. at § 2.14.215.
- 36 Id. at § 2.14.050.
- 37 San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.140 (2007).

## CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

### LOCAL CHART 2: QUALIFYING THRESHOLD, RESIDENCY RESTRICTIONS, SPENDING LIMITS

- 38 San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.140.5 (2007).
- 39 Id. at § 1.104(k).
- 40 Id. at § 1.138.
- 41 Because San Francisco implemented Ranked Choice Voting (also known as “instant runoff voting”) in the 2004 elections, there was no runoff election. Therefore, the public financing provisions relating to runoff elections were not applicable.
- 42 Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter §§ C41-1 (definition of “Threshold Contribution”) and C41-2(A) (8) (a) (2007).
- 43 Id. at § C41-1 (definition of “Matchable Contribution”).
- 44 Id. at § C41-8(J).
- 45 Id. at §§ C41-5(A) and (B) (2007).
- 46 Figures updated quadrennially. Will be updated again in 2008.
- 47 City of Tucson, Ariz., Charter, Chapter XVI, Subchapter B, § 4(a) (2007).
- 48 Id. at §§ 4(b) and 5(a).
- 49 Id. at § 6.
- 50 Id. at § 3.

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 3: SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT, CONTRIBUTION LIMITS, CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

JURISDICTION	SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT <sup>1</sup>	CONTRIBUTION LIMITS <sup>2</sup>	CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS <sup>3</sup>
Albuquerque, NM	City Council: \$1.00 per registered voter in the district (approximately \$55,000) Mayor: \$1.00 per registered City voter (approximately \$495,000)	No candidate shall allow total contributions from any one person with the exception of the contributions from the candidate himself or herself of more than 5% of the total annual salary for such office <sup>4</sup>	\$500 in seed money allowed
Austin, TX	City Council: \$0.63 (general), an additional \$0.14 for a runoff. <sup>5</sup> Mayor: \$0.28 (general), an additional \$0.17 for a runoff	Contributions from person to: City Council: \$1,000 per election <sup>6</sup> Mayor: \$500 per election <sup>7</sup>	May not exceed 5% of spending limit <sup>8</sup>
Boulder, CO	\$0.18 per registered voter: \$12,873 (2007) <sup>9</sup>	\$100 per election <sup>10</sup>	May not exceed 20% of spending limit. For 2007, the personal contribution limit for candidates receiving matching funds was \$2,575 <sup>11</sup>
Long Beach, CA	City Council: \$0.99-\$1.50 (primary); \$0.14 (runoff) <sup>12</sup> Mayor: \$0.55 (primary); \$0.28 (runoff) Other Citywide Office: \$0.28 (primary); \$0.13 (runoff) <sup>13</sup>	Contributions from persons to: City Council: \$350 per election Mayor: \$650 per election Other Citywide Office: \$450 <sup>14</sup>	Limited only by the total spending limit
Los Angeles, CA	City Council: \$1.29 (primary); \$1.07 (general) <sup>15</sup> Mayor: \$0.85 (primary); \$0.47 (general) Controller: \$0.23 (primary); \$0.18 (general) City Attorney: \$0.26 (primary); \$0.20 (general) <sup>16</sup>	Contributions from persons to: City Council: \$500 per election Mayor, City Attorney, Controller: \$1,000 per election PACs which support or oppose any candidate (includes PACs that make IEs): \$500 per calendar year Total contributions made "in connection with all candidates" in any single election: the greater of \$1,000 or (\$500 multiplied by the number of City Council offices on the ballot + \$1,000 multiplied by the number of City-wide offices on the ballot). A candidate may not accept contributions from PACs which combined exceed: City Council: \$150,000 City Attorney or Controller: \$400,000 Mayor: \$900,000 <sup>17</sup>	City Council: \$25,000 Mayor, City Attorney, Controller: \$100,000 <sup>18</sup>
Miami-Dade County, FL	Commissioner: \$1.08 (general); \$0.81 (runoff) Mayor: \$0.27 (general); \$0.19 (runoff) <sup>19</sup>	\$500 per election <sup>20</sup>	May not exceed \$25,000 <sup>21</sup>
New Haven, CT	Mayor: \$2.42 (primary); \$2.42 (general)	Mayor: \$300 per election	\$15,000 per primary or general election

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 3: SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT, CONTRIBUTION LIMITS, CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

JURISDICTION	SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT <sup>1</sup>	CONTRIBUTION LIMITS <sup>2</sup>	CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS <sup>3</sup>
New York, NY	Election year limits through 2009: City Council: \$0.93 per election <sup>23</sup> Borough President: \$0.78 per election <sup>22</sup> Mayor: \$0.70 per election Public Advocate and Comptroller: \$.44 per election Additional spending limits apply to the two years preceding the election year	City Council: \$2,750 per election cycle <sup>24</sup> Citywide office: \$4,950 per election cycle Borough President: \$3,850 per election year Participating candidates may not accept contributions from PACs unless the PAC voluntarily registers with the Campaign Finance Board and the contribution does not exceed the contribution limit applicable to the office <sup>25</sup>	May not exceed three times the applicable contribution limit <sup>26</sup>
Oakland, CA	2007 Election year limits: District City Councilmember: \$1.27 to \$1.47 (depending on the population of the district) School Board Director: \$0.17 to \$0.19 (depending on the population of the district) <sup>27</sup>	Contributions from persons to: Non-participating candidates and PACs that make IEs: \$100 per election Participating candidates: \$600 per election <sup>28</sup> Contributions from "broad-based political committees" <sup>29</sup> to: Non-participating candidates: \$300 per election Participating candidates: \$1,200 per election <sup>30</sup>	May not exceed 5% of the spending limit <sup>31</sup>
Portland, OR	Commissioner: \$1.12 (primary); \$1.49 (general) <sup>32</sup> Mayor: \$0.37 (primary); \$0.46 (general) Auditor: \$0.27 (primary); \$0.37 (general)	Participating candidates may not accept campaign contributions, except for qualifying contributions and seed money. Non-participating candidates are bound by state law, which does not impose any contribution limits on local candidates	Limited only by the total spending limit. Can only contribute \$100 in seed money
Richmond, CA	None	Individuals to candidates or Committees that make Independent Expenditures: \$2,500 per election cycle	Unlimited
Sacramento, CA	City Council: \$1.45 <sup>33</sup> Mayor: \$1.21	Individuals to Mayoral Candidates: \$1,150 Individuals to City Council Candidates: \$900 PACs to Mayoral Candidates: \$5,850 PACs to City Council Candidates: \$3,500 <sup>34</sup>	City Council: \$7,500 <sup>35</sup> Mayor: \$30,000
San Francisco, CA	Board of Supervisors: \$1.27 <sup>36</sup> Mayor: \$1.21	general election: \$500; contributions from corporations prohibited Aggregate limit for general election: \$500 multiplied by the total number of offices being elected, per contributor Contributions to PACs (includes PACs that make IEs): \$500 per year per committee and \$3,000 total to all committees per year <sup>37</sup>	Limited only by the total spending limit. (Note however, there is a preliminary injunction granted regarding the enforcement of these limitations)
Suffolk County, NY	County Legislator: \$0.20 (primary); \$0.42 (general) <sup>38</sup> Executive: \$0.23 (primary); \$0.38 (general) Other Countywide Offices: \$0.08 (primary); \$0.15 (general) Additional spending limits apply to the year preceding the election year <sup>39</sup>	The following contribution limits apply only to public financing program candidates: County Legislator: \$1,100 per election Executive: \$2,750 per election Comptroller, Treasurer, District Attorney: \$1,650 per election <sup>40</sup> Participating candidates are prohibited from accepting contributions from PACs, lobbyists or firms doing business, or proposing to do business with the County <sup>41</sup>	May not exceed the contribution limit applicable to the office <sup>42</sup>

# CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

## LOCAL CHART 3: SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT, CONTRIBUTION LIMITS, CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

JURISDICTION	SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT <sup>1</sup>	CONTRIBUTION LIMITS <sup>2</sup>	CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS <sup>3</sup>
Tucson, AZ	<p>City Council: \$0.20 (may be adjusted using the CPI annually) per registered voter in the city per election cycle: \$90,181 (2007)</p> <p>Mayor: \$0.40 (may be adjusted using the CPI annually) per registered voter in the city per election cycle: \$180,388 (2007)</p> <p>No candidate may spend more than 75% of these limits prior to the primary election<sup>43</sup></p>	<p>From individuals: \$390 per election</p> <p>From PACs: \$390 per election</p> <p>From Small Donor PACs:<sup>44</sup> \$2,000 per election</p> <p>Total from Political Party Committees: \$10,020 per election</p> <p>Total contributions from non-party PACs: \$10,020 per election</p> <p>Total contributions to candidates or PACs who contribute to other candidates: \$3,740<sup>45</sup></p>	<p>May not exceed 3% of the applicable spending limit in any election cycle<sup>46</sup></p>

- 1 Most jurisdictions have enacted spending limits in the form of total dollar amounts, but a few have enacted spending limits on the basis of the number of voters or residents in the jurisdiction. This column was included to provide a standard unit for comparison between the programs of different jurisdictions. The figures given are based on estimated 2006 census figures from the U.S. Census Bureau, which can be found at the American Factfinder website: <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- 2 The limits listed in this column are limits on contributions from persons to candidates, unless otherwise noted. The term "person" is defined broadly in most jurisdictions to include humans, corporations, partnerships, political committees and other organizations. The term "PAC" is used as an abbreviated reference to a political committee. The following jurisdictions apply a COLA to the contribution limits: Cincinnati, see Cincinnati, Ohio, City Charter, Art. XIII § 4(f)(2) (adopted by voters Nov. 2001); Long Beach, see Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.01.1210 (2007); New York City, see New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 703(7) (2007); Oakland, see Oakland, Cal., Municipal Code §§ 3.12.050(G) and 3.12.060(G) (2007); Suffolk County, see Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter § C41-2(F) (2007); and Tucson, see Arizona Revised Statutes § 16-905(J) (2007). The contribution limits listed in this chart are the most current adjusted limits. The original limits can be found in the cited ordinances and charters.
- 3 Applies only to candidates voluntarily participating in the public financing program.
- 4 Albuquerque, N.M., Code of Ordinances, Article XIII, § 4(e) (2007).
- 5 Based on total population, divided by six city council districts.
- 6 Austin, Tex., Code § 2-2-8 (A)(1).
- 7 Austin, Tex., Code § 2-2-8 (A)(2).
- 8 Austin, Tex., Code § 2-2-7 (C) (2007).
- 9 Boulder, Colo., Rev.Code §13-2-21(a) (2007)
- 10 Id. at § 13-2-17.
- 11 Id. at § 13-2-21(b) (2).
- 12 City of Long Beach, CA. Adjusted Expenditure Ceilings Pursuant to Proposition M. Updated June 6, 2006.
- 13 These limits are current as of January 2006 and will be adjusted again in January 2008 to reflect changes in the cost of living. Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.02.410 (2007).
- 14 The contribution limits listed here are the COLA adjusted limits that take effect on Jan. 2, 2006. Long Beach, Cal., Municipal Code § 2.01.310 (2005).
- 15 Based on total population, divided by 15 City Council districts.
- 16 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code § 49.7.13 (2007).
- 17 Los Angeles, Cal., City Charter, Art. IV §470(c) (2007).
- 18 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code § 49.7.19(A)(3) (2007).
- 19 Based on total population, divided by 18 County Legislator districts.
- 20 Id. at §§ 12-22(c) (3) and (d) (3).
- 21 Id.
- 22 Based on total population, divided by five borough districts.
- 23 Based on total population, divided by 51 Council districts.
- 24 The contribution limits given here are the limits that apply to the 2007 City Council elections and the 2009 citywide office elections. New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 3-703(1) (f) (2007).
- 25 Id. at §§ 3-703(1) (k) and 3-707.
- 26 Id. at § 3-703(1) (h).
- 27 Id. Oakland, Cal. Muni. Code § 3.12.200. The statute specifies the spending limit amount per resident, adjusted for changes in the cost of living. The city's limits are based on the City Clerk's resident population count of 399,484.
- 28 Id. at § 3.12.050 (A) and (B).
- 29 A "broad-based political committee" is a committee of persons which has been in existence for more than six months, receives contributions from 100 or more persons, and acting in concert makes contributions to five or more candidates. Id. at § 3.12.040. See also id. at § 3.12.060(C).
- 30 Id. at §§ 3.12.060 (A) and (B).
- 31 Id. at § 3.13.090.
- 32 Based on total population, divided by four commissioners.
- 33 Based on total population, divided by eight council members.
- 34 Id. at § 2.13.050 .
- 35 Id. at § 2.14.165.
- 36 San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.114 (2005). Based on total population, divided by eleven Supervisorial districts.
- 37 Id. at § 1.114.

## CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

### LOCAL CHART 3: SPENDING LIMITS PER RESIDENT, CONTRIBUTION LIMITS, CANDIDATE PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

- 38 Based on total population, divided by 11 Supervisorial districts.
- 39 Figures updates quadrennially. Will be updated again in 2008.
- 40 Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter § C41-2(A) (6) (2005).
- 41 Id. at § C41-2(G).
- 42 Id. at § C41-2(A) (8).
- 43 Id. at § 3.
- 44 A "small donor PAC" is a committee that receives contributions of \$10 or more from at least 500 individuals. Arizona Revised Statutes § 16-905(I) (2005).
- 45 Id at §§ 16-905(A)-(E).
- 46 Tucson, Ariz., City Charter, Chapter XVI, Subchapter B, § 2 (2005).

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 4: HIGH SPENDING OPPONENTS, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, DEBATE REQUIREMENTS

JURISDICTION	HIGH SPENDING OPPONENT TRIGGER PROVISION	INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE (“IE”) TRIGGER PROVISION	DEBATE REQUIREMENT <sup>1</sup>
Albuquerque, NM	When a participating candidate’s opposing funds <sup>2</sup> in aggregate are greater than the funds distributed plus seed money, the participating candidate is entitled to receive matching funds in the amount that the opposing funds exceed the funds distributed plus seed money	When a participating candidate’s opposing funds in aggregate are greater than the funds distributed plus seed money, the participating candidate is entitled to receive matching funds in the amount that the opposing funds exceed the funds distributed plus seed money	No
Austin, TX	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of the voluntary contribution and expenditure limits excuses participating candidates from further compliance with applicable limits <sup>3</sup>	If a person spends more than \$12,000 in one race, the spending limits are no longer binding on any candidates in the race <sup>4</sup>	Yes <sup>5</sup>
Boulder, CO	None	None	No
Long Beach, CA	None	None	No
Los Angeles, CA	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of the applicable spending limit eliminates the spending limit for all other candidates in the race, and makes participating candidates eligible to receive matching funds at a rate of 3:1 up to the maximum if the opponent exceeds the spending limit by 50% <sup>6</sup>	If an IE committee spends more than \$50,000 in a City Council race, \$100,000 in a City Attorney or Controller race, or \$200,000 in a Mayoral race, the spending limits are no longer binding on any candidate running for the office, and for the general election, participating candidates become eligible to receive matching funds at a rate of 3:1 up to the maximum <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>8</sup>
Miami-Dade County, FL	None	None	No
New Haven, CT	If opponent expenditures exceed the applicable spending limit, the participating candidate may apply for, receive and expend an additional \$25,000 bonus grant from the Fund or have the expenditure ceiling lifted <sup>9</sup>	None	No
New York, NY	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of 50% of the applicable spending limit increases the spending limit for all other candidates in the race to 150% of the original limit and triggers an increase of \$1 in the applicable matching fund rate <sup>10</sup>	None	Yes <sup>11</sup>
Oakland, CA	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of 50% of the applicable spending limit eliminates the spending limit for all other candidates in the race <sup>12</sup>	If an IE committee spends more than \$15,000 on a District City Council or School Board race, or spends more than \$70,000 on any other race, the spending limits are no longer binding on any candidate running for the office <sup>13</sup>	No <sup>14</sup>

CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

LOCAL CHART 4: HIGH SPENDING OPPONENTS, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, DEBATE REQUIREMENTS

JURISDICTION	HIGH SPENDING OPPONENT TRIGGER PROVISION	INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE (“IE”) TRIGGER PROVISION	DEBATE REQUIREMENT <sup>1</sup>
Portland, OR	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of the applicable spending limits eliminates the spending limit for all other candidates in the race and makes participating candidates eligible to receive matching funds in an amount equal to the amount of contributions or expenditures by or on behalf of the non-participating candidate that exceeds the spending limits <sup>15</sup>	If an IE committee supporting or opposing a candidate exceeds the applicable spending limit, the spending limits are no longer binding on any other candidates in the race and participating candidates become entitled to receive matching funds in an amount equal to the amount of independent expenditures that exceeds the spending limits <sup>16</sup>	No
Richmond, CA	None	None	No
Sacramento, CA	Opponent expenditures in excess of 75% of the applicable spending limit eliminates the spending limit for all other candidates in the race <sup>17</sup>	If an IE committee spends more than 50% of the applicable spending limit, the spending limits are no longer binding on any candidate running in the race <sup>18</sup>	No
San Francisco, CA	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of the applicable spending limits eliminates the spending limits for all other candidates in the race <sup>19</sup>	If an IE committee spends more than the applicable spending limits, the spending limits are no longer binding on any candidate in the race <sup>20</sup>	Yes <sup>21</sup>
Suffolk County, NY	Opponent expenditures or receipt of contributions in excess of 50% of the applicable spending limits eliminates the spending limits for all other candidates in the race <sup>22</sup>	None	No
Tucson, AZ	If an opponent makes expenditures or receives contributions in excess of \$11,840, a participating candidate is no longer bound by state law contribution limits until the candidate raises an amount equal to the opponent personal wealth expenditures. Instead, such candidate will be bound by the less stringent Tucson Charter contribution limits (\$500 from individuals and \$1,000 from PACs) during this period <sup>23</sup>	None	No

1 Some jurisdictions require candidates who participate in the public financing program to also participate in a set number of public debates with their opponents.

2 Opposing funds used against a participating candidate is calculated by totaling (1) the expenditures made by the opponent who has the highest total of expenditures and supportive independent expenditures; (2) the amount spent on independent expenditures in support of that candidate; and (3) the amount spent on independent expenditures in opposition to the participating candidate.

3 Austin, Tex., Code at § 2-2-12 (2005).

4 Id. at § 2-2-12(C).

5 Id. at § 2-9-35.

6 Los Angeles, Cal., Municipal Code §§ 49.7.14 and 49.7.22 (2005).

7 Id. at §§ 49.7.14 and 49.7.22.

8 Id. at § 49.7.19(C).

## CGS - LOCAL PUBLIC FINANCING CHARTS 2007

### LOCAL CHART 4: HIGH SPENDING OPPONENTS, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, DEBATE REQUIREMENTS

- 9 New Haven, Conn., Code of Ordinances, Title II, Special Laws, Article XVIII, § 2-249.
- 10 New York City, N.Y., Administrative Code § 3-706(3) (2005).
- 11 Id. at § 3-709.5.
- 12 Oakland, Cal., Municipal Code § 3.12.220 (2005).
- 13 Id.
- 14 While receipt of public funds is not conditioned on participation in a debate, candidates are strongly encouraged to take part in at least one nonpartisan debate. Id. at § 3.13.170.
- 15 Portland, Ore., City Code §§ 2.10.150 (A) and (D) (2005).
- 16 Id. at §§ 2.10.150(B) and (D).
- 17 Sacramento, Cal., City Code § 2.14.060.
- 18 Id.
- 19 San Francisco, Cal., Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.146(a) (2005).
- 20 Id.
- 21 Id. at §§ 1.140(a) (5) (D), 1.140.5(a) (5) (vii).
- 22 Suffolk County, N.Y., Charter § C41-5(D) (2005).
- 23 Arizona Revised Statutes § 16-905(F) (2005). See also Tucson, Ariz., City Charter, Chapter XVI, Subchapter A, § 2 (2005).