

Date of Hearing: January 9, 2012

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING

Paul Fong, Chair

AB 1148 (Brownley) – As Amended: January 4, 2012

AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED

SUBJECT: Political Reform Act of 1974: advertisements: disclosure.

SUMMARY: Makes significant changes to required disclosures on campaign advertisements and slate mailers. Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Defines the following terms, for the purposes of this bill:
 - a) "Advertisement" to mean any general or public advertisement which is authorized and paid for by a person or committee for the purpose of supporting or opposing a candidate for elective office or a ballot measure or measures. Provides that the term "advertisement" does not include a communication from an organization other than a political party to its members, a campaign button smaller than 10 inches in diameter, a bumper sticker smaller than 60 square inches, or any other advertisement as determined by the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC).
 - b) "Committee disclosure Internet Web site" to mean the Internet Web site for a committee identifying the top identifiable contributors to that committee.
 - c) "Cumulative contributions" to mean the cumulative amount of contributions received by a committee during a period of time determined by the FPPC by regulation, but in no event less than the period commencing 18 months prior to the date the committee made its first expenditure to qualify, support, or oppose a candidate for elective office or a ballot measure or measures and ending seven days after the advertisement is sent to the printer or broadcast station or uploaded to the Internet.
 - d) "Identifiable contributor" to mean a person or committee that has made cumulative contributions of at least \$10,000 to a committee.
- 2) Requires the FPPC to adopt regulations that establish the time used to calculate cumulative contributions for the purposes of this bill. Provides that a regulation adopted pursuant to this provision shall be adopted as an emergency regulation.
- 3) Requires a radio advertisement that supports or opposes a candidate or ballot measure or solicits contributions in support of that purpose, to include the following:
 - a) If the advertisement is authorized by a candidate or an agent of the candidate, an audio statement in which the candidate identifies himself or herself and states that the candidate has approved the message; or,
 - b) If the advertisement is not authorized by a candidate or agent of a candidate, a disclosure at the end of the ad read in a clearly spoken manner in a pitch and tone substantially

similar to the rest of the advertisement that reads as follows:

"Top three funders are [names in descending order of identifiable contributors who made the three largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement]. Full funding details at [Internet Web site address of the committee disclosure Internet Web site]."

- 4) Requires a television or video advertisement that supports or opposes a candidate or ballot measure or solicits contributions in support of that purpose, to include the following:
 - a) If the advertisement is authorized by a candidate or an agent of the candidate, a statement in which the candidate identifies himself or herself and states that the candidate has approved the message; or,
 - b) If the advertisement is not authorized by a candidate or agent of a candidate, a full-screen disclosure without audio on black background for a minimum of three seconds that includes all of the following:
 - i) The text "Top Funders for This Ad" located on the top of the screen and centered horizontally. Requires the text to be white in color and the font size to be at least 5 percent of the height of the screen.
 - ii) Immediately below the text detailed above, the logos, if any, as they appear on the Internet Web site homepage of the identifiable contributor, for the identifiable contributors who have made the three largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement. Requires each logo to occupy at least 15 percent of the width or height of the screen, and to be displayed from left to right in descending order beginning with the largest identifiable contributor.
 - iii) Immediately below the logos, if any, the names of the identifiable contributors who made the three largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement. Requires each contributor to be disclosed on a separate vertical line, in descending order, beginning with the identifiable contributor who made the largest cumulative contribution on the first line. Requires the names of the identifiable contributors to be centered horizontally, the text to be white in color, and the font size to be at least 5 percent of the height of the screen.
 - iv) The text "Full Funding Details At [Internet Web site address of the committee disclosure Internet Web site]." Requires the text to be white in color, the font size to be equivalent to 4 percent of the height of the screen, and to be located in a position that is at vertically 4 percent above the bottom of the screen.
- 5) Requires a mass mailing or print advertisement, other than a slate mailer or an advertisement that is authorized by a candidate or an agent of a candidate, that supports or opposes a candidate or ballot measure or solicits contributions in support of that purpose, and that is paid for by a committee or by any person spending over \$1,000 cumulatively on mass mailing or print advertising during an election, to include a disclosure area on the largest page of the mass mailing or print advertisement that meets all of the following criteria:

- a) Requires the disclosure area to be set apart from the rest of the page on which it is located by a line framing the disclosure area in the shape of a square or rectangle and in a color that is darker than the background color of the remainder of the disclosure area. Requires the disclosure area within the border line to have a solid background color that establishes a contrast to the color of the disclosure text that is equivalent to or greater than the text and background color contrast in other areas of the mass mailing or print advertisement.
 - b) The text "Top Funders for This Ad" located at the top of the disclosure area and centered horizontally in the disclosure area. Requires the text to be in a font size of at least 14-point for pages smaller than 8.5 inches by 11 inches and at least 16-point for pages that are equal to or larger than 8.5 inches by 11 inches.
 - c) Immediately below the text detailed above, the logos, if any, as they appear on the Internet Web site homepage of the identifiable contributor, for the identifiable contributors who have made the three largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement. Requires each logo to occupy at least 8 percent of the width or height of the page on which the disclosure area is located, and to be displayed from left to right in descending order beginning with the largest identifiable contributor.
 - d) Immediately below the logos, if any, the names of the identifiable contributors who made the three largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement. Requires each contributor to be disclosed on a separate vertical line, in descending order, beginning with the identifiable contributor who made the largest cumulative contribution on the first line. Requires the names of the identifiable contributors to be centered horizontally, and requires the text to be in a font size of at least 10-point for pages smaller than 8.5 inches by 11 inches and at least 12-point for pages that are equal to or larger than 8.5 inches by 11 inches.
 - e) The text "Full Funding Details At [Internet Web site address of the committee disclosure Internet Web site]." Requires the text to be located at the bottom of the disclosure area, and to be in a font size of at least 10-point for pages smaller than 8.5 inches by 11 inches and at least 12-point for pages that are equal to or larger than 8.5 inches by 11 inches.
- 6) Requires a committee that pays for an advertisement for which a disclaimer would have to be included under this bill to establish and maintain a committee disclosure Internet Web site. Provides that if the committee has an Internet Web site home page, that Internet Web site may also serve as the committee disclosure site. Requires the committee disclosure Internet Web site and any other Web sites maintained by the committee to include a disclosure statement area that complies with all of the following:
- a) The disclosure statement area is at least 250 pixels wide, with a white background and a border that is dark in color.
 - b) A title that reads "Top Funders of This Committee" in black text of at least 10-point font size.
 - c) Immediately below the text identified above, the names of the identifiable contributors who made the five largest cumulative contributions to the committee that paid for the advertisement. Requires each contributor to be disclosed on a separate vertical line, in

descending order, beginning with the identifiable contributor who made the largest cumulative contribution on the first line. Requires the text to be black in color, and the font size to be at least 10-point.

- d) Immediately below the text detailed above, the logos, if any, as they appear on the Internet Web site homepage of the identifiable contributor, for the identifiable contributors who have made the five largest cumulative contributions to the committee. Requires each logo to occupy at least 75 horizontal or vertical pixels, and to be displayed from left to right in descending order beginning with the largest identifiable contributor.
 - e) A link to the Internet Web site maintained by the Secretary of State that contains campaign finance disclosures made by the committee pursuant to existing law. Requires the link to be labeled "Full Funding info at the Secretary of State's Internet Web site." Requires the link to be a standard hyperlink that is displayed as blue underline text in Arial equivalent font in at least 9-point size.
- 7) Requires, if an entity that is disclosed as an identifiable contributor pursuant to this bill is an individual, that the disclosure of that individual also include the occupation and employer of the contributor in addition to the contributor's name if the committee receiving the contribution is supporting or opposing a candidate.
- 8) Requires, if an entity that is disclosed as an identifiable contributor pursuant to this bill is an individual, that the disclosure of that individual also include the occupation and employer of the contributor in addition to the contributor's name if the committee receiving the contribution is supporting or opposing a ballot measure and the passage or defeat of the ballot measure directly benefits or harms the employer of the identifiable contributor. Provides that if an employer of an identifiable contributor is also an identifiable contributor, that the contributions of the employee shall be deemed to be contributions by the employer for the purposes of determining the total cumulative contributions made by the employer in order to determine which identifiable contributors are disclosed.
- 9) Provides that if a committee does not have any identifiable contributors, as defined by the bill, the name of that committee shall be included in the advertisement in the place of the identifiable contributors if the committee has received cumulative contributions of at least \$10,000.
- 10) Requires a slate mailer to include an asterisk (*) next to each candidate and ballot measure for which the slate mailer organization or committee primarily formed to support or oppose one or more ballot measures has received payment to include the candidate or ballot measure in the slate.
- 11) Repeals a requirement that an advertisement for or against a ballot measure include a disclosure statement identifying the two highest cumulative contributors of \$50,000 or more to the committee funding the advertisement. Repeals a requirement that a broadcast or mass mailing advertisement supporting or opposing a candidate or ballot measure that is paid for by an independent expenditure (IE) must include a disclosure statement identifying the name of the committee making the expenditure and the names of the persons from whom the committee making the IE received its two highest cumulative contributions of \$50,000 or more during the 12-month period prior to the expenditure. Repeals a requirement that an

advertisement supporting or opposing a candidate that is paid for by an IE must include a statement that it was not authorized by a candidate or a committee controlled by a candidate.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires an advertisement for or against any ballot measure to include a disclosure statement identifying any person whose cumulative contributions are \$50,000 or more. Provides that if there are more than two donors of \$50,000 or more, the disclosure only needs to include the highest and second highest donors in that order.
- 2) Requires a committee that supports or opposes one or more ballot measures to name itself using a name or phrase that identifies the economic or other special interest of its major donors of \$50,000 or more. Provides that if the major donors of \$50,000 or more share a common employer, the identity of the employer must also be disclosed.
- 3) Requires a broadcast or mass mailing advertisement supporting or opposing a candidate or ballot measure that is paid for by an IE to include a disclosure statement identifying the name of the committee making the expenditure and the names of the persons from whom the committee making the IE received its two highest cumulative contributions of \$50,000 or more during the 12-month period prior to the expenditure.
- 4) Provides that when a disclosure of the top two donors is required on an advertisement pursuant to either of the above provisions, only the largest donor needs to be disclosed on an advertisement that is an electronic broadcast of 15 seconds or less or a print advertisement of 20 square inches or less.

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

COMMENTS:

- 1) Author's Amendments: The author has proposed a number of amendments to address drafting errors in the current version of the bill and to make other changes. This analysis reflects those proposed author's amendments. The proposed author's amendments are as follows:
 - a) The current version of the bill proposes to repeal Sections 84504, 84505, 84509, 84510, and 84511 of the Government Code. This is a drafting error, and it was not the author's intent to repeal these sections of code. The author's amendments reinstate these code sections. Additionally, it is the author's intent that the provisions of subdivision (c) of Section 84504 apply only to advertisements that are not subject to other disclaimer requirements under this bill. The author's amendments make that change.
 - b) The current version of the bill requires a "Top Funder" disclosure to be included on certain radio, television, video, mass mailing, and print advertisements. Similarly, the bill requires certain committees that must include "Top Funder" disclosures on advertisements to have a "committee disclosure Internet Web site." It is the author's intent that these requirements only apply to advertisements that are not authorized by candidates, and to committees that are not controlled by candidates. Additionally, it is

the author's intent that the "Top Funder" disclosure requirement apply only to mass mailing and print advertisements if the committee that is paying for the ad has spent over \$1,000 cumulatively on mass mailings or print advertising during the election. The author's amendments make those changes.

- c) Delete the requirement that a candidate state that his or her contributions helped pay for a broadcast advertisement if the candidate would be considered an "identifiable contributor" under this bill.
- d) Provide that if a committee does not have any identifiable contributors, as defined by the bill, the name of that committee shall be included in the advertisement in the place of the identifiable contributors if the committee has received cumulative contributions of at least \$10,000.
- e) Make the following technical changes:
 - i) On page 18, line 19, strike out "on the page" and insert "in the disclosure area";
 - ii) On page 19, line 18, strike out "committee disclosure Internet", strike out line 19, on line 20, strike out "Web site" and insert: "home page of the committee disclosure Internet Web site and any other Web sites maintained by the committee shall include a disclosure statement area".

2) Purpose of the Bill: According to the author:

Campaign spending has reached unprecedented levels in recent years. During the November 2010 election in California, nearly \$200 million was spent on ballot measures alone. Although there are limits on the amount of direct contributions candidates can receive, funders can make unlimited contributions to candidates through independent expenditure committees and to ballot measure committees that have significantly shaped the way California is governed. However, many of these committees are purposely established to hide who exactly is funding the campaign messages that voters see and hear. For example, Field Poll recently conducted a survey that found that while Californians are still supportive of statewide ballot proposition elections, they believe reforms can be made to weaken the influence special interests have asserted over direct democracy intended to empower the average citizen. It found that 84% of voters believe that public disclosure requirements of initiative sponsors must more clearly identify who are its major funders.

While it is essential in a democracy for individuals and organizations to be able to communicate effectively and efficiently with voters, it is equally important that voters are not intentionally deceived and elections are not decided upon misinformation. AB 1148 will help cast light on spending in elections by disclosing major funding sources directly on advertisements. At a time when public confidence in its elected officials is unequivocally low, strengthening disclosure requirements on political advertisements is necessary to help Californians be better informed and feel more represented by their government.

- 3) 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.

In Talley v. California (1960), 362 US 60, the United States Supreme Court struck down a Los Angeles City ordinance that required any handbill that was distributed in the city to contain the name and address of the person who printed, wrote, compiled, or manufactured the handbill. The Court found the ordinance to be void on its face, because it believed that the ordinance would restrict freedom of expression, in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. In its opinion, the Court wrote that there could be "no doubt" that the Los Angeles ordinance requiring disclosure on a handbill "would tend to restrict the freedom to distribute information and thereby freedom of expression." The court continued to note that "[a]nonymous pamphlets, leaflets, brochures and even books have played an important role in the progress of mankind. Persecuted groups and sects from time to time throughout history have been able to criticize oppressive practices and laws either anonymously or not at all. The obnoxious press licensing law of England, which was also enforced on the Colonies was due in part to the knowledge that exposure of the names of printers, writers, and distributors would lessen the circulation of literature critical of the government. . . . Even the Federalist Papers, written in favor of the adoption of our Constitution, were published under fictitious names. It is plain that anonymity has sometimes been assumed for the most constructive purposes."

Building on its holding in Talley, the Court more recently considered, in McIntyre, an Ohio law that prohibited the distribution of campaign literature that did not contain the name and address of the person or campaign official issuing the literature. The United States Supreme Court, in reviewing the case, found that the Ohio law unconstitutionally restricted the freedom of speech in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. In attempting to justify the Ohio law in light of the Court's decision in Talley, the Ohio Elections Commission argued that the two laws were distinguishable because the Ohio law applied only to documents designed to influence voters in an election, whereas the law in question in Talley applied to all handbills. While the Court recognized that the two laws were different in this respect, it nonetheless found that "the category of speech regulated by the Ohio statute occupies the core of the protection offered by the First Amendment," and concluded that "the speech in which Mrs. McIntyre engaged – handing out leaflets in the advocacy of a politically controversial viewpoint – is the essence of First Amendment expression."

Nonetheless, the State of Ohio argued that even under the strictest standard of review, the statute should have been upheld in recognition of two important state interests—preventing fraudulent and libelous statements, and providing the electorate with relevant information. The Court found that neither interest was sufficient to justify the restrictions that the Ohio law imposed on the freedom of expression.

With respect to the interest in preventing fraudulent and libelous statements, the court noted that Ohio already had prohibitions against making or disseminating false statements during political campaigns, and as such, "Ohio's prohibition of anonymous leaflets plainly is not its principal weapon against fraud." The second state interest offered by Ohio was the interest

of "providing the electorate with relevant information" – an interest that is similar to the author's stated reason for seeking to require disclosure on advertisements as required by this bill. Here too, however, the McIntyre court found that such an interest was not sufficient to justify the restrictions that the Ohio statute placed on freedom of speech and expression, stating that "[i]nsofar as the interest in informing the electorate means nothing more than the provision of additional information that may either buttress or undermine the argument in a document, we think the identity of the speaker is no different from other components of the document's content that the author is free to include or exclude. . . . The simple interest in providing voters with additional relevant information does not justify a state requirement that a writer make statements or disclosures she would otherwise omit."

Finally, the McIntyre court made an important distinction between a requirement that a person file a report with a government agency to disclose money expended for a campaign advertisement and a requirement that a person must disclose his or her identity on the advertisement itself, noting that while requiring a report to be filed with a government agency "undeniably impedes protected First Amendment activity, the intrusion is a far cry from compelled self-identification on all election-related writings." The court continued, "[a] written election-related document—particularly a leaflet—is often a personally crafted statement of a political viewpoint. . . . As such, identification of the author against her will is particularly intrusive; it reveals unmistakably the content of her thoughts on a controversial issue. Disclosure of an expenditure and its use, without more, reveals far less information. It may be information that a person prefers to keep secret, and undoubtedly it often gives away something about the spender's political views. Nonetheless, even though money may 'talk,' its speech is less specific, less personal, and less provocative than a handbill - and as a result, when money supports an unpopular viewpoint it is less likely to precipitate retaliation."

Subsequent to the Tally and McIntyre rulings, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has rejected arguments that the Supreme Court's holdings in those two cases apply only to materials created and distributed by individuals who are acting alone. In ACLU v. Heller (2004), No. 01-15462, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals struck down a Nevada law that required any published material concerning a campaign to identify the person paying for the publication. In an effort to save the law after the Supreme Court's decision in McIntyre, Nevada amended its law to include an exception for campaign materials that were paid for by "a natural person who acts independently and not in cooperation with or pursuant to any direction from a business or social organization, nongovernmental legal entity, or governmental entity." The Court rejected the state's argument that this amendment was sufficient to save the statute in light of McIntyre. In its decision, the Court wrote, "[t]he Court in McIntyre did stress the particular harshness of Ohio's punishment of McIntyre as the sole advocate for her cause. But nothing in the decision indicates that if she had been allied with other individuals, or with a 'business or social organization,' the result would have been different. The anonymity protected by McIntyre is not that of a single cloak." The Court continued to note that all of the concerns that applied to an advertisement distributed or paid for by an individual also applied to an advertisement that was distributed or paid for by an organization. Citing McIntyre, the court wrote, "[s]imilarly, just as a lone 'advocate may believe her ideas will be more persuasive if her readers are unaware of her identity,' because readers may otherwise 'prejudge her message simply because they do not like its proponent,' so, too, groups or individuals working in cooperation with groups may be concerned about readers prejudging the substance of a message by associating their names with the message. In fact, groups are more likely to be associated with a certain viewpoint than are individuals

(e.g., Greenpeace, ACLU, the National Rifle Association). So a particular group's concern that its message may be prejudged based on its association with the group could be even more well-founded than an individual's similar concern. Anonymity may allow speakers to communicate their message when preconceived prejudices concerning the message-bearer, if identified, would alter the reader's receptiveness to the substance of the message. Like other choice-of-word and format decisions, the presence or absence of information identifying the speaker is no less a content choice for a group or an individual cooperating with a group than it is for an individual speaking alone." (Internal citations omitted)

In light of the Talley, McIntyre, and ACLU cases, this bill could be susceptible to challenge on the grounds that it violates the First Amendment's rights to freedom of speech and freedom of expression by compelling a person to include speech in an advertisement that he or she may otherwise choose to omit. It is also possible, however, that existing state law that requires certain disclosure statements to be included in political advertisements could be equally susceptible to challenge.

- 4) Legislative Authority & Emergency Regulations: One provision of this bill requires the FPPC to adopt regulations that establish the time used to calculate cumulative contributions for the purposes of this bill, and requires those regulations to be adopted as emergency regulations. The committee may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to remove the discretion of setting the standard for determining the timeline for calculating cumulative contributions from the Legislature, and to give that authority to the FPPC. If this bill becomes law, and the Legislature subsequently decides that the timeline for calculating cumulative contributions established by this bill was insufficient, nothing in this bill or in existing law would prevent the Legislature from revisiting that policy decision.

Furthermore, the rationale for requiring the FPPC to adopt these regulations as emergency regulations is unclear. In fact, allowing the FPPC to adopt these regulations as emergency regulations could create problems if the FPPC amended regulations or adopted new regulations in the middle of a campaign.

The committee may wish to consider removing this provision of the bill and retaining the authority of the Legislature to revise this timeline as it sees fit.

- 5) Third Party Payment for Slate Mailer Placement: Under existing law, a slate mailer must have an asterisk next to a ballot measure or candidate that appears in the slate mailer if that candidate or ballot measure has paid to appear in the slate mailer. However, if someone other than the candidate or ballot measure committee pays the slate mailer organization to include a candidate or ballot measure committee in the slate mailer, no asterisk or other designation is included in the mailer. So, for instance, if a general purpose committee makes an independent expenditure by paying a slate mailer to include a candidate that the general purpose committee has endorsed, the slate mailer itself would have no indication that the slate mailer organization had been paid to include that candidate in the mailer.

This bill would require a slate mailer to include an asterisk next to a candidate or ballot measure if the slate mailer received payment to include that candidate or measure, regardless of who paid the slate mailer organization.

- 6) Technical Issue: The definition of the term "cumulative contributions" that currently appears in the bill includes a drafting error. To correct this drafting error, committee staff recommends the following technical amendment: On page 16, line 1, strike out "after" and insert: "before".
- 7) Arguments in Support: The sponsor of the bill, the California Clean Money Campaign, writes the following in support of the bill:

Full and complete disclosure in political advertising is needed now more than ever. The Supreme Court's 5-4 *Citizens United v. FEC* decision unleashed the floodgates of anonymous spending on campaigns by ruling there could be no limits on outside spending by corporations, unions, or individuals. At the same time, the Court in *Citizens United* specifically noted the problems that result when groups run ads "while hiding behind dubious and misleading names".

Over \$235 million was spent on California ballot measures in 2010 alone, almost all of it by veiled actors hiding behind innocuous sounding names that hide their real funders.

AB 1148 addresses these problems by requiring the three largest funders of political ads to be clearly identified with their names and logos on the ads themselves, so voters know who is actually paying for them. It applies to all television ads, radio ads, print ads, mass mailers, and websites for or against state and local ballot measures, and to independent expenditures for and against candidates. It applies whether ads are paid for by corporations, unions, millionaires, or anybody else.

AB 1148 is constitutional and reasonable. It in fact reduces the time required for disclosure in typical radio ads from 10-14 seconds in many cases under current law down to only 6-7 seconds in most cases, while at the same time being far clearer about who is actually paying for the ads.

Required disclosure for television ads is only 3 seconds, enough to clearly get across to the viewers who the top three funders of the ad are, without imposing an undue burden on political advertisers.

- 8) Arguments in Opposition: In opposition to this bill, the California Broadcasters Association writes:

We have been working with the [FPPC] staff and the FPPC Chairman's Task Force for the past year in an effort to resolve the already burdensome disclosure regulations. One of the stated aims of the Task Force was that "Disclaimer rules should reflect the First Amendment and practical limitations on the amount of space disclaimers take up on political ads." The [FPPC] has already recognized that Internet disclaimers must be sensitive to reasonable guidelines for space and can be placed outside the advertisement.

The time constraints in broadcast advertising pose similar problems. Current disclosures can now require up to 50% of a 30-second radio spot. If we try to add lengthy spoken disclosures like a web site address, it will discourage consultants from using the medium—costing your local stations revenue and jobs.

It was appropriate to ask all media to place disclosures inside an ad when they took up little time and space. That is no longer the case. [This] bill will impose more disclosure requirements on political ads than are currently required in less protected speech such as commercial ads.

We have been working with the [FPPC] to move these lengthy disclosures to where listeners and viewers tell us they want them: on a web site or toll free number.

- 9) 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.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Clean Money Campaign (sponsor)
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Church IMPACT
California Common Cause
California National Organization for Women
Congresswoman Anna Eshoo
Democratic Club of the Conejo Valley (prior version)
Environmental Caucus of the California Democratic Party
Greenlining Institute
League of Women Voters of California
Lutheran Office of Public Policy – California
Planning and Conservation League
Progressive Caucus of the California Democratic Party
Southwest California Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
One individual

Opposition

California Broadcasters Association

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