

This plan...

- The proposal for election reform reduces the influence of big money in elections
- Makes sure that candidates can win by relying on small donations from a broad base of voters they wish to represent, instead of relying on big donations from a few wealthy donors
- Is part of a growing movement around the country to give everyday people a bigger voice in politics, as other cities and states have adopted similar systems

Goals of the proposal

Amplify voices of small donors

Increase the ability for every Portland voter to have an equal voice in the election system

Shift the candidates' focus from needing to spend their time talking to wealthy contributors to collect large contributions, to being able to spend their time connecting with Portlanders from all sorts of backgrounds

Improve our democracy and ensure everyone plays by the rules by strengthening the definitions around shadowy "independent expenditure" coordination, increasing penalties for those who break the rules, and enforcing the laws on the books

Create safeguards to protect our democracy, by establishing an independent Commission, strict audits, stronger protections on how we verify participants, and high penalties for those who violate the system

Make it easier for everyday Portlanders to participate in our political system and run for office

Commission oversight

- The proposal will create an independent, non-partisan Commission
- This Commission will be responsible for making recommendations and adjustments to improve the system
- The recommendations will be based on the City's budget capacity, lessons learned from other public campaign finance systems, and audits

The proposed system will be reliable and trustworthy

- Certification requirements for campaigns opting into the program, so that only candidates with a broad base of public support can receive public funds
- Routine audits
- High penalties, up to \$10,000, for those who violate the system
- Restrictions on how public money may be spent to ensure protection of tax payer dollars
- Strict and frequent reporting from all candidates

Based off Proven System

- New York City first established a matching program in 1988 as a response to corruption
- Maine has the most blue collar legislature in the country as a result of their matching program passed in 1996 which made it possible for people from all walks of life to run for office
- Matching programs have been shown to bring in new donors including people who would otherwise not donate to campaigns
- These reforms change candidate behavior by allowing them to spend their time seeking support from everyday voters
- Candidates may spend time talking to people that previously would have been cut out of the campaigning process, because small donations now have a bigger benefit
- Many jurisdictions across the country are looking to adopt similar systems

Empowering small donors

- The program would reign in the influence of big money donors by limiting allowable contributions
- Making a small donation, knowing it will become a much larger donation, increases the chance for civic engagement
- Empowering the smaller donations allows a participating candidates to be competitive in an election

How is this plan different from VOE?

- It's stronger. We have tougher penalties and better enforcement
- It's tested. We have seen this kind of approach work in other areas
- It's up to date. We have a plan that makes sense for our post *Citizens United* world

Community contacts

- Common Cause
- OSPIRG
- Sightline
- Every Voice