

Date of Hearing: April 29, 2015

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING

Sebastian Ridley-Thomas, Chair

AB 1494 (Levine) – As Amended April 22, 2015

**SUBJECT:** Political Reform Act of 1974: independent expenditure report annual fee.

**SUMMARY:** Imposes a fee on specified independent expenditures made in connection with candidates for elective state office or state measures. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires any committee that is required to file campaign reports online or electronically, and that makes independent expenditures of \$1,000 or more in the last 90 days before an election in connection with a candidate for elective state office or a state ballot measure, to pay an annual reporting fee to the Secretary of State (SOS). Requires the fee to be charged as follows:
  - a) \$100 for a committee filing a report and declaring that it will spend less than \$100,000 per two-year election cycle;
  - b) \$1,000 for a committee filing a report and declaring that it will spend less than \$250,000 per two-year election cycle;
  - c) \$2,000 for a committee filing a report and declaring that it will spend less than \$500,000 per two-year election cycle;
  - d) \$10,000 for a committee filing a report and declaring that it will spend less than \$1 million per two-year election cycle; and,
  - e) \$50,000 for a committee filing a report and declaring that it will spend less than \$10 million per two-year election cycle.
- 2) Requires the annual reporting fee to be paid within five days of filing the report disclosing the expenditure.
- 3) Provides that if a committee expends more than the declared amount, in the report filed in which the committee discloses that fact, it shall make a new declaration and pay the increased fee less the amount of the fee or fees already paid.
- 4) Provides that for the purposes of this bill, the term "two-year election cycle" means the period of time between the immediately preceding statewide general election and the next statewide general election.
- 5) Creates the Civic Engagement Fund (Fund) in the State Treasury. Provides that the purpose of the Fund is to provide oversight of committees filing the independent expenditure reports detailed above and to increase transparency in political campaigns, civic engagement, and voter registration and turnout. Requires the SOS to deposit the revenues received under this bill into the Fund. Requires the SOS, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to allocate those funds for the costs of oversight of committees filing independent expenditure reports, as

specified, to the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) for the purposes of increasing transparency in political campaigns, and to local elections offices, through a competitive grant program, to increase voter registration and turnout. Requires the SOS to report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance by March 31 of every year on the allocation and use of these funds, and requires the SOS to post that information on his or her website.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Creates the FPPC, and makes it responsible for the impartial, effective administration and implementation of the Political Reform Act (PRA).
- 2) Defines the term "committee," for the purposes of the PRA, to include any person or combination of persons who directly or indirectly makes independent expenditures totaling \$1,000 or more in a calendar year.
- 3) Defines the term "independent expenditure," for the purposes of the PRA, as an expenditure made by any person in connection with a communication which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, or the qualification, passage, or defeat of a clearly identified measure, or taken as a whole and in context, unambiguously urges a particular result in an election, but which is not made to or at the behest of the affected candidate or committee.
- 4) Requires all candidates and committees who are required to file campaign reports in connection with a state elective office or state measure to file those reports online or electronically if the cumulative amount of contributions received, expenditures made, loans made, or loans received is \$25,000 or more.
- 5) Requires general purpose committees, including political party committees and small contributor committees, that cumulatively receive contributions or make expenditures of \$25,000 or more to support or oppose candidates for any elective state office or state measures, to file campaign reports online or electronically.
- 6) Allows any committee or other person who is required to file a campaign report to file that report online or electronically, even if he or she is not required to do so. Provides that once a person or entity files a campaign report or lobbying disclosure report online or electronically, that person or entity shall file all subsequent reports online or electronically.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown. State-mandated local program; contains a crimes and infractions disclaimer.

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Purpose of the Bill:** According to the author:

This bill is intended to create a regulatory fee for independent expenditure committees for the purpose of regulatory oversight of these committees and to fund programs that will increase civic engagement, voter registration, and voter turnout. Fees collected under this bill will help ensure that adequate enforcement

mechanisms will be provided to public officials and private citizens so that the Political Reform Act will be vigorously enforced. These fees will help to fully inform voters and inhibit improper practices.

The turnout of eligible voters in the 2014 General Election was the lowest in California's history. According to the United States Elections Project, California had the fourth lowest turnout in the nation. California has 24.4 million eligible voters, yet only 7.5 million Californians cast a ballot. Approximately 7 million eligible California voters are not even registered.

There are several reasons for this. One is the dramatic increase in independent expenditure committee spending. Several reports from regulatory agencies, academic researchers, and nonprofit watchdogs have been highly critical of independent expenditure committees.

According to California Common Sense, independent expenditure committees spent more than \$220 million on candidate races in California between 2000 and 2012. Additionally, in just the top 20 2014 legislative races, independent expenditure committees spent a staggering \$44 million.

This has resulted in a deluge of mail that voters receive from independent expenditure committees. Additionally, much of the mail is negative and there is no doubt that independent expenditure committee mailers often disenfranchise voters. This bill will require that the committees pay some of the cost of reengaging voters.

- 2) **Constitutional Issues:** This measure could be interpreted as a violation of the United States and California Constitutions' guarantees to free speech. While the right to freedom of speech is not absolute, when a law burdens core political speech, the restrictions on speech generally must be "narrowly tailored to serve an overriding state interest," *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission* (1995), 514 US 334.

State and federal courts have repeatedly held that the giving and spending of campaign money involves the exercise of free speech. The United States Supreme Court found in *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), 424 US 1, that any "restriction on the amount of money a person or group can spend on political communication during a campaign necessarily reduces the quantity of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depth of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached." The Supreme Court in *Buckley* ruled that expenditure limits during a campaign were unconstitutional for this reason. In the same case, however, the court upheld campaign contribution limits, noting that "[b]y contrast with a limitation on expenditures for political expression, a limitation upon the amount that any one person or group may contribute to a candidate or political committee entails only a marginal restriction upon the contributor's ability to engage in free communication."

One of the restrictions considered by the *Buckley* court was a provision that prohibited any person from making expenditures exceeding \$1,000 relative to a clearly identified candidate in a calendar year. The court noted that the effect of the provision was to "prohibit all

individuals, who are neither candidates nor owners of institutional press facilities, and all groups, except political parties and campaign organizations, from voicing their views 'relative to a clearly identified candidate' through means that entail aggregate expenditures of more than \$1,000 during a calendar year." The court found that restriction to be unconstitutional, finding that the restriction on independent expenditures "fails to serve any substantial governmental interest in stemming the reality or appearance of corruption in the electoral process," while "heavily burden[ing] core First Amendment expression."

This bill does not prohibit independent expenditures, nor does it limit the amount of money that a person or committee can spend on independent expenditures. Nonetheless, by imposing a fee on certain independent expenditures, this bill burdens First Amendment rights, and thus may be susceptible to a constitutional challenge.

- 3) **Proposition 34 and the Growth of Independent Expenditures:** In 2000, the Legislature passed and Governor Davis signed SB 1223 (Burton), Chapter 102, Statutes of 2000, which became Proposition 34 on the November 2000 general election ballot. The proposition, which passed with 60 percent of the vote, made numerous substantive changes to the PRA, including enacting new campaign disclosure requirements and establishing new campaign contribution limits, limiting the amount that individuals could contribute to state campaigns (ranging from \$3,000 to \$20,000 per election at the time, depending on the office).

A study done by this committee in 2006 and a subsequent report by the FPPC in 2010 found that since campaign contribution limits went into effect in California with the passage of Proposition 34, the amount of campaign spending done through independent expenditures increased by more than 6,000 percent in Legislative elections, and more than 5,500 percent in statewide elections. In hotly contested campaigns for seats in the Legislature, it is not uncommon for spending through independent expenditures to exceed the total amount of spending by all candidates in the race. On the other hand, prior to the enactment of contribution limits as a part of Proposition 34, independent expenditures were relatively rare. In the March 2000 and November 2000 elections, the last two elections that were not subject to the Proposition 34 campaign contribution limits, the total amount of money spent on independent expenditures for all legislative races was less than \$500,000. By comparison, more than \$47 million was spent on independent expenditures for legislative races in 2014.

- 4) **Independent Expenditures and Turnout:** The author of this bill contends that the increase in independent expenditures in California elections is partially responsible for low voter turnout in recent elections. The degree to which independent expenditures affect voter turnout, however, is unclear. While some academic research has suggested that negative campaign advertising can depress turnout, other research has found that negative advertising has no effect, or even a positive effect, on voter turnout. Furthermore, not all independent expenditures are negative, and some academic research has found that messages designed to mobilize voters can have a positive effect on voter turnout.
- 5) **Fee Applies to Certain Independent Expenditures Only:** The fee imposed by this bill would not apply to all independent expenditures, but instead applies only to independent expenditures that are required to be reported pursuant to a specified provision of law. That disclosure requirement applies only to independent expenditures of \$1,000 or more that are

made (1) in connection with a candidate for state office or a state ballot measure, (2) in the last 90 days before the election, and (3) by a committee that is required to file campaign reports online or electronically. Independent expenditures of less than \$1,000, that are made in connection with local candidates or ballot measures, that are made more than 90 days before the election, or that are made by committee that is not required to file campaign reports online or electronically would not be subject to the fee imposed by this bill.

- 6) **Technical Issues:** There are a number of technical issues with this bill that should be addressed if this bill moves forward. Specifically, committee staff has identified the following technical issues with the current version of this bill:
- a) This bill does not currently specify the amount of the fee to be paid by a committee that declares that it will spend \$10 million or more on independent expenditures per two-year election cycle. This bill should be amended to specify the fee that is applicable to committees declaring that they will spend \$10 million or more on independent expenditures per two-year election cycle.
  - b) The categories that specify the amount of the fee to be imposed are described as applying to committees declaring that they will spend less than a specified amount (for example, spending less than \$100,000, or spending less than \$250,000). However, if a committee declares that it is spending less than \$100,000, then that committee has also effectively declared that it is spending less than \$250,000, so the categories are somewhat unclear. For the sake of clarity, committee staff recommends that the categories be described by ranges of amounts that the committee declares that it will spend (e.g., less than \$100,000; \$100,000 or more, but less than \$250,000; \$250,000 or more, but less than \$500,000; etc.).
  - c) The fee imposed by this bill is based on the amount that a committee "declares that it will spend" on an independent expenditure report that is filed pursuant to existing law. Committees do not, however, declare the amount of money that they will spend on those reports—instead, committees report the actual amount of money that they *have spent* on an independent expenditure when filing those reports. The bill should be amended to clarify this language.
- 7) **Arguments in Opposition:** All opposition received to this bill was to the prior version of the bill, which proposed a tax, rather than a fee, on specified independent expenditures. Nonetheless, the arguments made in opposition to the prior version of the bill appear to be applicable to the current version of the bill as well.

Among the arguments made in opposition to the prior version of this bill, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), AFL-CIO, wrote:

AFSCME appreciates Assembly Member Levine's endeavor to engage the electorate given the abysmal voter turnout in the past few elections. However, we oppose AB 1494. Though this bill is a creative attempt to engage the electorate, it does not address voter turnout because it limits the resources of those who communicate with voters in marginalized and disadvantaged communities while unintentionally, giving an advantage to the business interests and billionaires who

have the resources to pay a tax on the money they spend in independent expenditure campaigns. AB 1494 would establish a regressive tax that will harm the organizations, like organized labor, who advocate for greater participation in low-income and minority communities, and would continue to shift political power away from average working men and women to the business elites.

- 8) **Political Reform Act of 1974:** California voters passed an initiative, Proposition 9, in 1974 that created the FPPC and codified significant restrictions and prohibitions on candidates, officeholders and lobbyists. That initiative is commonly known as the PRA. Amendments to the PRA that are not submitted to the voters, such as those contained in this bill, must further the purposes of the initiative and require a two-thirds vote of both houses of the Legislature.
- 9) **Double-Referral:** At the time this bill was originally referred to policy committee, it was double-referred to the Assembly Revenue & Taxation Committee. Subsequent to that referral, this bill was amended to impose an independent expenditure report fee, instead of an independent expenditure tax. Based on those amendments, the Assembly Rules Committee has indicated that the bill no longer needs to be double-referred to the Revenue & Taxation Committee, but instead should be reported out to the Assembly Appropriations Committee if it is approved by this committee.

#### **REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

##### **Support**

None on file.

##### **Opposition**

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO (prior version)

California Labor Federation (prior version)

California School Employees Association, AFL-CIO (prior version)

California Taxpayers Association (prior version)

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association (prior version)

Service Employees International Union, California State Council (prior version)

**Analysis Prepared by:** Ethan Jones / E. & R. / (916) 319-2094