

# Suggestions and Recommendations for Los Angeles Hybrid Full Public Financing Feasibility Study

## California Clean Money Campaign

We'd like to make the following suggestions for the portion of the City Legislative Analyst's feasibility study on the possibility of creating a hybrid public financing program based on Democracy Vouchers and public grants to achieve full public financing similar to the gubernatorial races in Arizona and Maine.<sup>1</sup>

The California Clean Money Campaign has been involved in improving Los Angeles' public financing system since 2006 when we worked with then-councilmembers Eric Garcetti, Wendy Greuel, and Bill Rosendahl on an initial proposal to explore full public financing. In 2011, we co-chaired the successful campaign for Measure H in 2011 to remove the cap on the matching funds trust fund. We then proposed changes to strengthen the system and make it more responsive to city voters and co-led the campaign that passed them in 2013 by working with Councilmembers Eric Garcetti and Paul Krekorian. In 2018 and 2019 we co-led the campaign working with then-Councilmembers Mike Bonin and David Ryu to strengthen the system again by raising the match to 6-1 and making it easier for grassroots candidates to qualify.

The value of achieving full public financing in a hybrid voucher system is twofold: (1) To ensure that qualified participating candidates receive enough public funding to run competitive campaigns without having to spend time chasing campaign contributions instead of talking to voters and (2) to ensure that participating candidates raise minimal amounts from private interests, giving voters greater confidence they are running "clean" and therefore lessening the potential for corruption or the appearance of corruption.

**First, we recommend that candidates could choose** to participate in either in (1) a normal voucher option in which they can also raise private contributions with certain restrictions similar to Seattle's system, or (2) a hybrid voucher-grant option for full public financing in which they receive full public funding grants as long as they redeem a set number of vouchers and voluntarily agree not to raise any private contributions other than limited seed funding. And of course candidates don't have to participate in either option.

The key parts of Arizona and Maine's full public financing "Clean Elections" systems that are important for a Los Angeles system to include are:

---

<sup>1</sup> The City Council motion included Massachusetts, but Massachusetts' Clean Elections system was repealed by the legislature in 2003.

## Seed Money

Both Maine and Arizona allow full public funding candidates to raise a limited amount of seed money from individuals (called “early contributions” in Arizona) to use as initial resources to initiate their campaigns and gather enough \$5 contributions to qualify. Similarly, in a hybrid voucher-grant system, this seed money would give candidates the initial resources they need to gather enough vouchers to qualify. In Maine and Arizona seed money for full public financing candidates is limited to maximum contributions from individuals of \$100 and \$210, respectively.

**Seed Money Contribution Limits:** Having such low maximum contribution limits for seed money ensures full public funding candidates haven’t raised large contributions from any one person, giving the public more confidence that they haven’t been influenced by big donors.

Suggestion: Set the seed money contribution limit to equal the maximum contribution allowed to reach the minimum cumulative threshold to qualify for Los Angeles matching funds, i.e., \$114 for city council and \$214 for citywide races in 2022. Also, restrict seed money contributions to be from individuals only so voters are ensured that full public funding candidates aren’t influenced by corporations or other non-individuals.

Other options could be to set the maximum seed money contribution for all candidates (1) at \$100 like in Maine, which would have the advantage of ensuring that even citywide full public funding candidates only ever received relatively small donations but the disadvantage of making it harder for citywide candidates to raise enough seed money, or (2) at \$200 or at \$210 like Arizona, with advantage being that would make it easier for council candidates to raise their seed money if they have enough somewhat larger donors.

We recommend against setting the maximum seed money contribution significantly higher than any of the above, because the primary purpose of providing full public funding is to give voters confidence that those candidates never accepted significant private contributions.

**Maximum Total Seed Money:** In Maine, participating State Senate candidates are limited to raising a total of \$3,000 in seed money; Gubernatorial candidates are limited to \$200,000.<sup>2</sup> In Arizona it’s currently \$5,293 for legislative candidates and \$72,300 for Gubernatorial candidates.<sup>3</sup>

Suggestion: Set similarly low seed money caps for full public funding candidates, but make the cap higher due to larger districts in Los Angeles. One way to do this would be to set the maximum at, say, 3x the current minimum for qualifying for council, i.e., \$34,200 in 2022, and 2x the minimum for citywide offices, i.e., \$128,400 for Mayor and \$64,200 for City Attorney and Controller.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.maine.gov/ethics/candidates/maine-clean-election-act/seed-money-contributions>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.azcanelections.gov/run-for-office/how-clean-funding-works>

Other options would be to set the maximum total seed money at round numbers in similar ballparks that are fractions of the total spending caps for publicly funded candidates, e.g. \$30,000 for candidates running for City Council, \$60,000 for City Attorney and Controller, and \$120,000 for Mayor.

We recommend against setting the maximum total seed money much higher than the above levels, because the primary purpose of providing full public funding is to give voters confidence that those candidates never accepted significant private contributions. Arizona's maximum in seed money contributions for gubernatorial candidates is \$200,000, but its population is nearly twice that of Los Angeles.

**Allow use of voucher funds before qualifying for full public funding grants:** In addition to limited seed money, we would recommend that candidates who intend to participate in the full public funding option be allowed to redeem any vouchers they gather after they've qualified to gather vouchers, even if they haven't yet reached the threshold of vouchers needed for receiving full public funding grant(s). This should help provide them enough funding along with their seed money to gather enough vouchers to qualify for full public funding.

### Limits on Self-Funding

In Arizona and Maine participating candidates are prohibited from making loans to their campaign and from giving themselves more seed money contributions than anyone else can, i.e., \$100 in Maine and \$210 in Arizona. This ensures that wealthy candidates don't have an unfair advantage over other candidates in accessing and using full public funding.

Recommendation: As in Arizona and Maine, don't allow full public funding candidates to make personal loans and require the same limits for contributions for them as for any other person. I.e. They would be limited to making whatever the seed money contribution limit is, e.g. \$114 for city council and \$214 for citywide races if using our above suggestion.

### No Private Contributions other than Seed Money

In Arizona and Maine, the only private contributions candidates are allowed to accept, including from themselves, are the limited seed money and the \$5 contributions needed to qualify.

Recommendation: For full public funding candidates, ban private contributions other than their allowed seed money because they won't need \$5 contributions to qualify for grants, only vouchers, as described below.

### Qualifying for Vouchers

In Seattle, candidates can only begin soliciting, receiving, and redeeming vouchers after receiving set numbers of contributions of a minimum amount of \$10 qualified contributions and signatures. Qualified contributions must be from adult residents that live in the city.

For City Council candidates the requirement is 150 \$10 qualified contributions and signatures (minimum half from the district), for City Attorney it's 400, and for Mayor it's 600.

Suggestion: Set the requirements to qualify for vouchers to be the same as currently required to qualify for matching funds, with the caveat that participants in the full public funding grants must also abide by the seed money limits. I.e.:

Race	Minimum cumulative threshold	Max amount per contributor that counts
City Council	\$11,400	\$114
Controller	\$32,100	\$214
City Attorney	\$32,100	\$214
Mayor	\$64,200	\$214

Another option would be to make the requirements for qualifying similar to Seattle's requirements that candidates gather a set number of \$5 or \$10 qualifying contributions, but scaled up based on population. Rounding, that could mean 350 for City Council<sup>4</sup>, 2,000 for City Attorney and Controller, and 3,000 for Mayor.<sup>5</sup>

### Qualifying for Grants

In Maine and Arizona, candidates qualify for public funding grants by gathering a set number of \$5 contributions. The required number of \$5 contributions is set high enough to demonstrate a candidate has enough support to be competitive.

Clean Elections Requirements:	Qualifying \$5 Contributions		Clean Elections Requirements:	Qualifying \$5 Contributions
Maine House	60		AZ Legislature	200
Maine Senate	175		AZ Governor	4000
Maine Governor	3200		AZ SoS/AG	2500

<sup>4</sup> The average Seattle council district based on 2021 population had 104,846 residents while the average Los Angeles district had 256,600.  $150 \times 256600 / 104,846 = 367.1$ .

<sup>5</sup> In 2021 Seattle had a population of 733,919 and Los Angeles had a population of 3.849 million.  $400 \times 3,849,000 / 733,919 = 2,097.8$ , and  $600 \times 3,849,000 / 733,919 = 3,146.7$ .

Suggestion: Have hybrid full public funding candidates qualify for full public funding by redeeming a set number of vouchers instead of a set number of \$5 contributions, allowing even the poorest residents to help qualify their favored candidates.

Seattle's voucher system provides a rough guide for how many vouchers serious candidates are able to gather and redeem in different size jurisdictions.

**City Council Candidates:** As shown in the Appendix, all the Seattle city council candidates in 2019 who garnered 10% or more in the election redeemed at least 1,800 vouchers. That would translate to 4,405 vouchers for the average Los Angeles council district on a per resident basis.<sup>6</sup> So requiring 4,000 vouchers (\$100,000 worth) to achieve full public funding might be reasonable for Los Angeles city council candidates.

**Mayoral Candidates:** As shown in the Appendix, the mayoral candidate who finished fourth in the primary in Seattle redeemed 11,764 vouchers. That would translate to 61,696 vouchers in Los Angeles on a per resident basis.<sup>7</sup> Since the number of vouchers likely won't scale up exactly on a per-resident basis due to mayoral candidates not being able to be everywhere at once, a reasonable number might be to require Los Angeles mayoral candidates to redeem 40,000 vouchers (\$1 million worth) to qualify for full public funding.

**City Attorney and City Controller Candidates:** In the 2022 election, the five City Attorney candidates that qualified for matching funds only raised an average of \$495,660 in private contributions in the primary. The four City Controller candidates that qualified only raised an average of \$271,620.<sup>8</sup> Given the relative difficulties they have raising money compared to the three candidates for Mayor who qualified for matching funds who raised an average of \$2,334,986 in private contributions in the primary, a reasonable number might be to require City Attorney candidates to redeem 8,000 vouchers (\$200,000 worth) and City Controllers 6,000 (\$150,000 worth) to qualify for full public funding.

### Size of Public Grants

In Arizona and Maine, candidates that turn in enough \$5 contributions receive public grants that are large enough to run their entire campaigns without accepting any other private contributions.

Suggestion: Have the public grant(s) for the full public funding option combined with the money from the vouchers they redeem to qualify add up to the same amounts as the current spending limits for matching funds candidates for City Council and Mayoral candidates.

For candidates for City Attorney and Controller, we suggest saving public funds by setting the total voucher + full public funding grant to a lower level than the current matching funds

---

<sup>6</sup> The average Seattle council district based on 2021 population had 104,846 residents while the average Los Angeles district had 256,600.  $1,800 \times 256,600 / 104,846 = 4,405$ .

<sup>7</sup> In 2021 Seattle had a population of 733,919 and Los Angeles had a population of 3.849 million.  $11,765 \times 3,849,000 / 733,919 = 61,696$ .

<sup>8</sup> <https://ethics.lacity.org/elections/>

spending limit because candidates for those offices so rarely reach those limits. Here we suggest \$1,000,000 combined voucher + full public funding grant for City Attorney<sup>9</sup> and \$700,000 for Controller<sup>10</sup> for each the primary and general election, though other amounts could certainly be used.

Another option would be to also set the vouchers plus grants add up to the same amounts as the current spending limits for matching funds candidates for City Attorney and Controller candidates, also, though that would add to the cost of the system while providing City Attorney and Controller candidates significantly more than they have been able to spend under the current system.

### Triggers for Extra Funds From Vouchers

In Los Angeles and San Francisco participating matching funds candidates have their voluntary spending limits raised if another candidate in the same race outspends them or if independent expenditures affect them. The same is true for participating voucher candidates in Seattle. In all three cases, candidates are allowed to raise additional private contributions when such triggers are reached to allow them to respond.

However, one of the most important points of full public funding is to give voters confidence that participating candidates don't raise significant private contributions, so it would violate that confidence if full public funding candidates were allowed to raise private contributions if their spending limits are triggered.

**We therefore recommend that full public funding candidates be allowed to redeem additional vouchers if their initial spending limits are triggered** to raise by the spending of other candidates or independent expenditures, but still not be able to raise any additional private contributions.

Under this proposal, candidates and residents would be welcome to submit as many legally-signed vouchers as they can during the course of the campaign. If a candidate had

---

<sup>9</sup> In the 2022 primary, the highest spending matching funds City Attorney candidate, Teddy Kapur, had expenditures of \$1,034,951.31. The rest spent \$893,289.59 or less. The one matching funds City Attorney candidate in the general election, Hydee Feldstein Soto, spent \$1,151,731.65. Providing them \$1,000,000 (in each the primary and general election) in vouchers plus full public funding grants and allowing them to raise additional funds from vouchers when triggered as described below would provide them in the ballpark of funds they were able to raise under the current system and potentially more if they are allowed to raise additional funds from vouchers when triggered as described below, without having as much in fundraising costs.

<sup>10</sup> In the 2022 primary, the two highest spending Controller candidates both accepted matching funds, with the highest spender Paul Koretz spending \$958,626.64 and the second highest spender Kenneth Meija spending \$642,084.13. The rest spent \$443,919.87 or less. The largest spending Controller candidate in the general election, Paul Koretz, spent \$669,629.87, with Kenneth Meija spending \$491,642.09. Providing them \$700,000 (in each the primary and general election) in total base funding combined from vouchers plus full public funding grants and allowing them to raise additional funds from vouchers when triggered as described below would provide all full public funding candidates other than Koretz in the primary with more total funds than they were able to raise under the current system.

more vouchers submitted than required to achieve the full public funding grant(s), the extras wouldn't be redeemed unless an increase in their allowed voucher funds is triggered, in which case the money from those extra vouchers would become immediately available.

There is a slight constitutional question on whether this would run afoul of the Supreme Court's McCommish vs. Bennet decision that ruled that Arizona's then system of triggering additional public funds to Clean Elections candidates when they were outspent was unconstitutional. However, Bob Stern and our counsel believe that because this trigger would only allow extra funds to come from vouchers that should be okay, because it is effectively money coming from residents who were turning in their vouchers to the candidate of their choice, and not from a government grant.

**We also recommend that a version of San Francisco's trigger mechanism be adopted** so that only those candidates whose public funds have been exceeded by the "Total Supportive Funds" of another candidate and/or been attacked by outside spending have their limits raised, and only raised by the amount their public funds have been exceeded. This would ensure that only those candidates who have been negatively impacted by other expenditures be allowed to raise more from vouchers, rather than perversely letting the very candidates who benefited from outside spending raise more money because of it. It would also save the system money.

**Suggestion:** To ensure a cap on overall public funding, Los Angeles could put a limit on the maximum additional funds from vouchers full public funding candidates who have been triggered could redeem. We'd initially suggest a maximum of \$200,000 additional voucher funds for City Council, City Attorney, and City Controller candidates, and \$1 million for Mayoral candidates, but other amounts could be set.

## Suggestions for Single Grant Full Public Funding

The option for a hybrid vouchers/grant full public funding system that would be most similar to Arizona and Maine would be to provide one large grant after the candidates redeemed enough vouchers to achieve full public funding.

Using the suggestions described above based on Los Angeles' 2022 spending limits and qualification requirements gives the following thresholds and maximum funding amounts in primaries:

Race	Max Seed Money	\$ Needed to Qualify for Vouchers	Vouchers Need to Qualify for Grant	Max Based Funds From Vouchers	Full Public Funding Grant	Base Full Public Funding (Vouchers + Grants)	Max Triggered Vouchers + Grants
<b>City Council</b>	\$34,200	\$11,400	4,000	\$100,000	\$471,000	\$571,000	\$771,000
<b>Controller</b>	\$64,200	\$32,100	6,000	\$150,000	\$550,000	\$700,000	\$900,000

<b>City Attorney</b>	\$64,200	\$32,100	8,000	\$200,000	\$850,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000
<b>Mayor</b>	\$128,400	\$64,200	40,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,329,000	\$3,329,000	\$4,329,000

Here are the suggestions for general elections based on Los Angeles' 2022 spending limits for City Council and Mayor:

<b>Race</b>	<b>Max Based Funds From Vouchers</b>	<b>Full Public Funding Grant</b>	<b>Base Full Public Funding (Vouchers + Grants)</b>	<b>Max Triggered Vouchers + Grants</b>
<b>City Council</b>	\$100,000	\$348,000	\$448,000	\$771,000
<b>Controller</b>	\$150,000	\$550,000	\$700,000	\$900,000
<b>City Attorney</b>	\$200,000	\$850,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000
<b>Mayor</b>	\$1,000,000	\$2,662,000	\$2,662,000	\$4,329,000

These are of course just suggestions, and would need to be updated to take into account inflation since 2022, but should give a ballpark of suggested requirements and funding for a hybrid voucher/full-public funding system.

## Suggestions for Multiple-Grant Full Public Funding

There are several ways to do multiple-grant full public funding systems. The simplest would be to divide the grants into four or five separate chunks. E.g. With five separate grants, a participating full public funding City Council candidate using our suggestions above would receive a first grant of \$94,200 (\$471,000/5) after redeeming their first 800 vouchers (4,000/5). Under this option, they turn in 800 vouchers a total of five times, adding up to the same max full public funding grant as a single-grant system.

Such a multi-grant system would have the advantage of providing participating candidates with additional needed funding grants as they go along without being limited to only using voucher funds until they've reached the full number of vouchers needed to qualify for their maximum full public funding grants, which could take a while.

Doing it this way would also allow candidates who can't reach the number of vouchers needed for the maximum full public funding grant significant resources to run serious campaigns, while



still ensuring voters that they haven't accepted any private contributions beyond limited seed money.

## Estimated Costs for Full Public Funding Versions

To estimate the costs of a hybrid full public program with the recommendations above, we modeled the cost of providing full public funding to all the Los Angeles candidates who qualified for matching funds from 2015-2023, using our above assumptions for funding levels.

First, as reference, here are the total matching funds provided to all city candidates from 2015-2023, including the 2019 and 2023 special elections<sup>11</sup>, and how much that works out to in cost per year (divided by 8 instead of 9 because it represents four election cycles). The right two columns show the amounts given in 2022 dollars based on the increases in maximum matching fund provided to candidates each election.

### Actual Matching Funds Given Between 2015-2023, Including Special Elections: \$2.6 Million/Year

Races	Primary Matching	General Matching	Total Matching	Total Matching in 2022 \$ <sup>12</sup>	Cost Per Year in 2022 \$ <sup>13</sup>
Council	\$8,364,713	\$3,545,740	\$11,910,454	\$12,363,460	\$1,545,432
Controller	\$1,328,750	\$805,421	\$2,134,171	\$2,134,171	\$266,771
City Attorney	\$1,501,964	\$517,148	\$2,019,112	\$2,019,112	\$252,389
Mayor	\$2,866,347	\$1,284,000	\$4,150,347	\$4,169,207	\$521,151
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$14,061,774</b>	<b>\$6,152,309</b>	<b>\$20,214,083</b>	<b>\$20,685,949</b>	<b>\$2,585,744</b>

### Estimated Hybrid Base Full Public Funding Costs (Without Triggered Voucher Funds) Based on Previous Candidates, Including Special Elections: \$10-\$12 Million/Year

Below is a table showing how much it would have cost to provide all the candidates who received matching funds from 2015-2023 with the base max full public funding amounts suggested above, without triggering to allow them to raise additional money from vouchers if they are outspent by other candidates or subject or independent expenditures.

### Estimated Hybrid Base Full Public Funding Costs 2015-2023

<sup>11</sup> From information on <https://ethics.lacity.org/elections/>

<sup>12</sup> Adjusting for CPI to 2022 levels by multiplying matching funds provided by the 2022 spending limits / the spending limits for the year for council candidates. Primary spending limits in 2022 were \$571,000 and in 2019 and 2020 were \$537,000, so 2019 and 2020 costs were multiplied by 571,000/537,000. The primary spending limit in 2017 was \$498,000, so multiplied 2017 costs by 571,000/498,000. The primary spending limit in 2015 was \$408,000, so multiplied 2015 costs by 571,000/408,000.

<sup>13</sup> Dividing total costs by 8 years instead of 9 because 2015-2023 included only four regular elections of 2015, 2017, 2020, and 2022, plus special council elections in 2019 and 2023. If divided by 9 years, the cost per year would be less.

Races	Primary Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	General Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	Total Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	Cost Per Year in 2022 \$
Council	\$39,970,000	\$9,996,000	\$49,966,000	\$6,245,750
Controller	\$2,800,000	\$1,400,000	\$4,200,000	\$525,000
City Attorney	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$750,000
Mayor	\$13,316,000	\$2,662,000	\$15,978,000	\$1,997,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$61,086,000</b>	<b>\$15,058,000</b>	<b>\$76,144,000</b>	<b>\$9,518,000</b>

Because the 2015-2017 city elections had an unusually high number of races with incumbents that didn't have well-funded challengers, here's the same analysis just for the elections in 2020-2023, i.e. including the 2013 special election in CD 6:

**Estimated Hybrid Base Full Public Funding Costs 2020-2023 Only**

Races	Primary Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	General Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	Total Base Full Funding in 2022 \$	Cost Per Year in 2022 \$
Council	\$18,843,000	\$5,236,000	\$24,079,000	\$6,019,750
Controller	\$2,800,000	\$1,400,000	\$4,200,000	\$1,050,000
City Attorney	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$1,500,000
Mayor	\$9,987,000	\$2,662,000	\$12,649,000	\$3,162,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,630,000</b>	<b>\$10,298,000</b>	<b>\$46,928,000</b>	<b>\$11,732,000</b>

Both analyses are likely an overestimate of the full public funding Los Angeles candidates who received matching funds actually would have received, because it assumes that every candidate who received any matching funds would have gathered enough vouchers to qualify for the full public funding grants suggested in "Suggestions for Single Grant Full Public Funding" above.

In these calculations, that means e.g. total funding from vouchers and public grants of \$571,000 for City Council candidates who received matching funds in the primary, and \$448,000 for City Council candidates who received matching funds in the general.

In reality, it would be harder to reach the required number of vouchers to qualify for full public funding than it is to qualify for matching funds under the current system, so the likely cost to fund those candidates would have been lower than in the above analysis. Of course, it's also

possible that the existence of hybrid full public funding grants would encourage more qualified candidates to run and qualify.

**This analysis is also useful to show for a pure voucher system** what the maximum costs would have been for all candidates that received matching funds if candidates were allowed to redeem vouchers up to the spending limit assumptions above and all of them successfully did so.

**Estimated Hybrid Full Public Funding Costs Including Triggered Voucher Funds:  
\$12-\$15 Million/Year**

Below is a table showing how much it would have cost to provide all the candidates who received matching funds from 2015-2023 with the same suggested base max full public funding amounts, while also allowing them to turn in additional vouchers as described above if they were triggered by privately funded candidates that outspent them or by independent expenditures.

Because we are recommending a version of the San Francisco trigger mechanism in which candidates' max spending is only raised by the amounts that they themselves are negatively impacted, different full public funding candidates would be allowed to raise different maximum amounts of additional vouchers when triggered.

For example, in the 2020 general election for Council District 4, Nithya Raman would have been allowed to turn in the maximum dollar amount of additional vouchers if she gathered them, i.e. \$200,000 under the above suggestions, because her opponent David Ryu received \$522,630 in supportive IEs. But Ryu would have only been allowed to turn in additional vouchers worth \$12,263, because that was all that Raman received in supportive IEs.

Here are the estimated total costs in 2022 inflation-adjusted dollars based on this analysis of providing all the candidates who received matching funds from 2015-2023 (including special elections) with the max full public funding amounts and redemption of triggered vouchers suggested above:

**Estimated Hybrid Full Public Funding Costs Including Triggered Vouchers 2015-2023**

<b>Races</b>	<b>Primary Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>General Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>Total Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>Cost Per Year in 2022 \$</b>
<b>Council</b>	\$52,639,119	\$13,358,209	\$65,997,328	<b>\$8,249,666</b>
<b>Controller</b>	\$3,034,197	\$1,600,000	\$4,634,197	<b>\$579,275</b>
<b>City Attorney</b>	\$6,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$7,200,000	<b>\$900,000</b>
<b>Mayor</b>	\$17,316,000	\$3,662,000	\$20,978,000	<b>\$2,622,250</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,989,316</b>	<b>\$19,820,209</b>	<b>\$98,809,525</b>	<b>\$12,351,191</b>
--------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Because the 2015-2017 city elections had an unusually high number of races with incumbents that didn't have well-funded challengers, here's the same analysis just for the elections in 2020-2023, i.e. including the 2013 special election in CD 6:

#### **Estimated Hybrid Full Public Funding Costs Including Triggered Vouchers 2020-2023**

<b>Races</b>	<b>Primary Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>General Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>Total Full Funding W/Triggered Vouchers in 2022 \$</b>	<b>Cost Per Year in 2022 \$</b>
<b>Council</b>	\$24,112,119	\$6,881,929	\$30,994,049	<b>\$7,748,512</b>
<b>Controller</b>	\$3,034,197	\$1,600,000	\$4,634,197	<b>\$1,158,549</b>
<b>City Attorney</b>	\$6,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$7,200,000	<b>\$1,800,000</b>
<b>Mayor</b>	\$12,987,000	\$3,662,000	\$16,649,000	<b>\$4,162,250</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$46,133,316</b>	<b>\$13,343,929</b>	<b>\$59,477,246</b>	<b>\$14,869,311</b>

This means that the total worst-case cost for our suggested hybrid full public funding system levels assuming all candidates who received matching funds from 2020-2023 would have maxed out on vouchers and grants would have been \$59,477,246, or \$14,869,311 per year.

In reality, the cost likely would have been less, because not all candidates who received matching funds would necessarily have been able to reach the required number of vouchers needed to qualify for the full public funding grant(s), much less turn in enough extra vouchers to reach the maximum vouchers if their spending limits were triggered. And as shown above, when including all elections from 2015-2023 to include the years having more incumbents, the cost per year of providing full public funding to all candidates who actually received matching funds drops to \$12,351,191 per year in 2022 inflation-adjusted dollars.

Of course, it is also possible that more candidates would have attempted to participate in the system if they were given the opportunity to get full public funding as opposed to the limited matching funds that were available between 2015-2023, partially balancing the fact that not all matching funds candidates would necessarily be able to max out on full public funding grants and extra triggered vouchers.

For details of how we calculated these costs estimates, the spreadsheet we used can be downloaded from our website at:

[http://www.yesfairelections.org/content/research/ccmc\\_lafullpublicfundingestimates.xlsx](http://www.yesfairelections.org/content/research/ccmc_lafullpublicfundingestimates.xlsx)

**Contact California Clean Money Executive Director Trent Lange** for any questions on these suggestions and recommendations, or on these cost calculations or how to modify them for different assumptions: [tlange@caclean.org](mailto:tlange@caclean.org), 310-428-1556

# Appendix: Vouchers Redeemed in Seattle Races

## 2019 Seattle City Council Races

Candidate	Position	Redeemed	Total	Result	Primary Pct
Sergio Garcia	District #6	2606	\$65,150	Lost Primary	14.26%
Emily Myers	District #4	2461	\$61,525	Lost Primary	12.85%
Brendan Kolding	District #1	2453	\$61,325	Lost Primary	16.75%
Cathy Tuttle	District #4	2435	\$60,875	Lost Primary	12.83%
Ami Nguyen	District #3	2284	\$57,100	Lost Primary	9.20%
Zachary DeWolf	District #3	2199	\$54,975	Lost Primary	12.59%
Pat Murakami	District #3	2190	\$54,750	Lost Primary	12.99%
Jason Williams	District #7	2104	\$52,600	Lost Primary	5.08%
Jon Lisbin	District #6	2017	\$50,425	Lost Primary	3.20%
John Lombard	District #5	1983	\$49,575	Lost Primary	13.02%
Melissa Hall	District #6	1881	\$47,025	Lost Primary	2.47%
Michael George	District #7	1853	\$46,325	Lost Primary	9.28%
Kate Martin	District #6	1850	\$46,250	Lost Primary	3.43%
Christopher Peguero	District #1	1844	\$46,100	Lost Primary	4.71%
Logan Bowers	District #3	1832	\$45,800	Lost Primary	6.83%
Jay Fathi	District #6	1815	\$45,375	Lost Primary	13.16%
Daniela Lipscomb-Eng	District #7	1770	\$44,250	Lost Primary	9.77%
Phyllis Porter	District #2	1662	\$41,550	Lost Primary	5.91%
Sasha Anderson	District #4	1492	\$37,300	Lost Primary	1.27%
Heidi Stuber	District #4	1191	\$29,775	Lost Primary	3.79%
Terry Rice	District #6	1124	\$28,100	Lost Primary	0.87%
Ed Pottharst	District #6	913	\$22,825	Lost Primary	1.81%
Joshua Newman	District #4	697	\$17,425	Lost Primary	1.22%
<b>Candidates in General</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Redeemed in Primary &amp; General</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Primary Pct</b>
Mark Solomon	District #2	5621	\$140,525	Lost General	39.08%
Egan Orion	District #3	5171	\$129,275	Lost General	47.70%
Shaun Scott	District #4	4801	\$120,025	Lost General	47.69%
Phil Tavel	District #1	4360	\$109,000	Lost General	43.90%
Heidi Wills	District #6	4284	\$107,100	Lost General	43.83%
Jim Pugel	District #7	3600	\$90,000	Lost General	46.58%
Lisa Herbold	District #1	5469	\$136,725	Won General	50.62%
Tammy Morales	District #2	5049	\$126,225	Won General	50.07%

Dan Strauss	District #6	5029	\$125,727	Won General	34.15%
Andrew Lewis	District #7	4770	\$119,250	Won General	31.71%
Alex Pedersen	District #4	4189	\$104,725	Won General	40.36%
Debora Juarez	District #7	3180	\$79,500	Won General	45.10%
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>98,179</b>	<b>\$2,454,475</b>		

**2021 Seattle Races.** City Council Position #8 & 9 are at large citywide seats, not district seats.

<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Redeemed</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Primary Pct</b>
Nicole Thomas-Kennedy	City Attorney	13,501	\$337,525	Lost General	36.39%
Ann Davison	City Attorney	7,877	\$196,925	Won General	32.72%
Pete Holmes	City Attorney	4,211	\$105,275	Lost Primary	30.64%
Teresa Mosqueda	City Council Position #8	10,729	\$268,225	Won General	59.37%
Nikkita Oliver	City Council Position #9	11,536	\$288,400	Lost General	40.18%
Brianna Thomas	City Council Position #9	3,168	\$79,200	Lost Primary	13.42%
Lorena Gonzalez	Mayor	25,700	\$642,500	Lost General	32.11%
Bruce Harrell	Mayor	21,038	\$525,950	Won General	34.00%
Andrew Grant Houston	Mayor	13,853	\$346,325	Lost Primary	2.68%
Colleen Echohawk	Mayor	12,505	\$312,625	Lost Primary	10.28%
Jessyn Farrell	Mayor	11,764	\$194,100	Lost Primary	7.29%
<b>TOTAL</b>	-	<b>135,882</b>	<b>\$3,397,050</b>		