

CITY OF TUCSON CAMPAIGN FINANCE PUBLIC MATCHING FUND (PMF) PROGRAM

Year	Total Candidates	PMF Candidates		Public Funds Disbursed			Returns & Contributions From Candidates	Audit Cost				
		Signed Contracts	Received Funds	From Contributions and Returns	From General Fund	Total		Per Audit Cost	Number of Audits	Subtotal	Other Costs	Total
1987	20	12	7	1,033.00	91,971.13	93,004.13	4,963.69	750	16	12,000.00	2,250.00	14,250.00
1989	7	3	3	6,376.06	33,724.32	40,100.38	5,809.19	865	3	2,595.00	-	2,595.00
1991	19	11	8	16,777.37	154,576.70	171,354.07	6,752.22	865	8	6,920.00	5,926.50	12,846.00
1993	13	10	7	19,953.14	74,103.03	94,056.17	9,934.59	865	7	6,055.00	612.50	6,667.00
1995	20	16	10	18,285.91	219,224.27	237,182.50	16,371.56	825/675	20	15,000.00	9,615.84	24,615.84
1997	13	11	8	13,300.00	147,199.48	160,499.48	3,795.55	825/675	18	13,500.00	1,225.00	14,725.00
1999	17	14	10	14,320.00	371,374.54	385,694.54	26,464.69	825/675	22	16,500.00	10,257.50	26,757.50
2001	9	9	8	53,387.68	166,462.75	219,032.08	21,054.34	975/775	17	14,975.00	1,050.00	16,025.00
2003	9	8	8	28,476.00	244,725.71	273,201.71	43,825.23	975/775	14	12,450.00	4,584.00	17,034.00
2005	8	6	4	17,000.00	79,183.28	96,183.28	8,642.17	1350/980	7	8,340.00	10,605.40	18,945.40
2007	14	12	2	0	66,883.00	66,883.00	2,041.80	2300/1850	5	10,600.00	6,900.00	17,500.00
2009	8	8	6	0	271,531.08	271,531.08	5,982.16	2300/1850	12	24,900.00	6,870.00	31,770.00
2011	17	17	7	0	316,475.41	316,475.41	3,841.64	*	14		500.00	500.00
2013	5	5	4	0	170,420.00	170,420.00	34,218.14	*	9		500.00	500.00

PROGRAM INFORMATION:

The Campaign Finance Public Matching Fund Programs mandated by Subchapter B of Chapter XVI of the Tucson Charter. These provisions approved by the electorate in 1985 and in effect since 1987 provide that an individual who has signed a campaign contract agreeing to limit campaign expenditures and who meets eligibility requirements, is entitled to receive one dollar in public matching funds for each dollar received during the campaign period from any individual contribution. (Neither loans nor the transfers of anything of value other than money is matched.)

The City budgets for this program in the general fund and has also established the Election Campaign Account, into which is deposited donations to the City for the support of public election campaign financing. Refunds from candidates following each election are also deposited in this account. In 1987, all refunds from candidates were applied to 1989 disbursements to candidates. A similar procedure was used in 1989 and 1991. However, in 1993 refunds from candidates (as well as contributions from the public received by December 1, 1993) were used to offset disbursements to candidates in 1993 from the general fund.

The City contracts with an independent auditor to perform the necessary audits of the records of those candidates who participate in the program. In 1987 pre and post election audits were done. In 1989, 1991 and 1993 only pre election audits were done. Both pre and post audits were also completed for 1995 and 1997.

ELECTION INFORMATION:

1987 - Two of the candidates who qualified to receive funds did not request funding necessitating only the pre-election audit for each of those candidates. Both pre and post election audits were done for the other 7 who received public funds. Costs were also incurred for development and preparation of procedures, forms, etc.

1991 - In addition to the 8 regular pre-election audits, several special audits were required.

1993 - In addition to the 7 regular pre-election audits, costs were incurred for City sponsored seminars and from the updating and improvement of procedures.

1995 - Pre and post election audits were conducted for 10 candidates. Costs were also incurred for City sponsored seminars and additional auditing costs. (* Reduced by \$183.68--Contributions From Candidates outside the 1995 campaign.)

1997 - Two of the candidates who signed campaign contracts did not file a Statement to Establish Eligibility necessitating pre and post election audits for only 9 candidates. One candidate who qualified to receive matching funds did not accept any funds. Costs were also incurred for City sponsored seminars and additional auditing costs.

1999 - Three candidates who signed campaign contracts did not file a Statement to Establish Eligibility necessitating pre and post election audits for only 11 candidates. One candidate who filed a Statement to Establish Eligibility did not qualify and did not receive funds. Costs were also incurred for City sponsored seminars and additional audit costs.

2001 - One candidate who established eligibility did not request funds necessitating post election audits for only 8 candidates. Costs were also incurred for City sponsored seminars and additional audit costs.

2003 -Amounts include reimbursement of \$22.11 to the Election Campaign account on 2/10/05. Costs were incurred for City sponsored seminars and additional audit costs.

2005-One candidate who signed a campaign contract did not request public matching funds, necessitating only the pre-election audit. A second candidate withdrew after filing nomination petitions but before filing a Statement to Establish Eligibility. Additional costs were incurred for a City sponsored seminar and additional audit costs.

2007 -One candidate who established eligibility did not request funds necessitating post election audits for only 2 candidates. Eight candidates who signed campaign contracts did not file a Statement to Establish Eligibility, reducing the number of pre and post election audits. One candidate who signed a campaign contract withdrew his candidacy.

2011 - The City Clerk staff performed audits for the 2011 election cycle, eliminating the cost for an outside auditor. Other associated costs were for printing and postage.

2013 - The City Clerk staff performed audits for the 2013 election cycle. One candidate qualified and received public matching funds but returned the full amount.

It was determined he was running unopposed. A second candidate applied but did not qualify for public matching funds.

NOTE: Beginning in 2005 refunds from candidates were deposited into the City's General Fund and reallocated in each subsequent election.