



Committee: GO
Committee Review: Completed
Staff: Christine Wellons, Chief Legislative Attorney
Purpose: Final action – vote expected

AGENDA ITEM #9E
November 12, 2024
Action

SUBJECT

Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments

Lead Sponsors: Councilmember Glass, Council Vice-President Stewart, and Councilmembers Fani-González, Albornoz, Mink, Balcombe, and Sayles

EXPECTED ATTENDEES

None

COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- Roll call vote on whether to enact Bill 20-24 with amendments, as recommended (3-0) by the Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee

DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

Bill 20-24 would:

- (1) increase the maximum amount of funds a certified candidate may retain to pay post-election expenses;
- (2) require periodic adjustments to permissible contribution limits and retention amounts based upon the Consumer Price Index;
- (3) make updates and technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law; and
- (4) generally amend the County law related to public campaign financing.

SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- **Amendments.** Based upon recommendations and findings of the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO), the GO Committee adopted (3-0) amendments to:
 - remove the requirement for a Public Election Fund (PEF) Committee;
 - increase the individual donor contribution limit from \$250 to \$500;
 - increase the matching ratios from the PEF from 6:1 to 7:1 for the first \$50 of a contribution to a certified candidate for County Executive; and from 4:1 to 5:1 for the first \$50 of a contribution to a certified candidate for County Council; and
 - permitting limited candidate affiliation in accordance with state law.

Based upon the recommendation of the Department of Finance, the Committee adopted clarifying amendments regarding the calculation of CPI adjustments.

- **Outstanding Issue.** Based on an OLO recommendation (page 137 of OLO Report No. 2024-16), the GO Committee asked staff to identify for the full Council any workable options regarding CPI

adjustments, if any, that should occur prior to 2028. The reason for the amendment(s) would be that, to date, no adjustments for inflation have been made under the public campaign finance law. Finance staff have provided additional data regarding inflation that occurred from 2020-2024 and, based on the data, a potential amendment for the Council's consideration is included under Issue #6 (pages 9-10) of the staff memorandum.

This report contains:

Staff Report	Page 1
Bill 20-24	© 1
Fiscal Impact Statement	© 11
RESJ Impact Statement	© 13
Economic Impact Statement	© 16
Climate Impact Statement	© 19
Testimony	© 21

OLO Report available at: [OLO Report: 2024-16: Montgomery County's Public Election Fund](#)

Alternative format requests for people with disabilities. If you need assistance accessing this report you may [submit alternative format requests](#) to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov

MEMORANDUM

November 7, 2024

TO: County Council

FROM: Christine Wellons, Chief Legislative Attorney

SUBJECT: Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments

PURPOSE: Action – roll call vote expected

Committee Recommendation: The Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee voted (3-0) to recommend the enactment of Bill 20-24 with amendments.

Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments was introduced on September 17, 2024. Its Lead Sponsors are Councilmember Glass, Council Vice-President Stewart, and Councilmembers Fani-González, Albornoz, Mink, Balcombe, and Sayles. A public hearing occurred on October 8, 2024. The Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee considered the bill on October 31, and recommended (3-0) the enactment of the bill with amendments.

As originally introduced, Bill 20-24 would:

- (1) increase the maximum amount of funds a certified candidate may retain to pay post-election expenses;
- (2) require periodic adjustments to permissible contribution limits and retention amounts based upon the Consumer Price Index;
- (3) make updates and technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law; and
- (4) generally amend the County law related to public campaign financing.

After considering findings and recommendations of the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) in its Report No. 2016-24, the GO Committee adopted amendments that would further revise the public campaign finance law by:

- removing the requirement for a Public Election Fund (PEF) Committee;
- increasing the individual donor contribution limit from \$250 to \$500;

- increasing the matching ratios from the PEF from 6:1 to 7:1 for the first \$50 of a contribution to a candidate for County Executive; and from 4:1 to 5:1 for the first \$50 of a contribution to a candidate for County Council; and
- permitting limited candidate affiliation in accordance with state law.

Based on recommendations by the Department of Finance, the Committee also further clarified language in the bill regarding the calculation of CPI adjustments.

Outstanding Issue. The GO Committee asked Council staff to coordinate with Finance staff, and to bring to the full Council, options regarding CPI adjustments, if any, that should occur prior to 2028 to reflect inflation during 2020-2024. After discussing the issue further with Finance staff, Council staff would suggest that – if the Council wishes for a CPI adjustment to occur before 2028 – it should adjust the base limits under the bill to reflect the inflation. *See Issue #6, page 9 of this memorandum for a chart showing the potential adjustments.*

BACKGROUND

Chapter 16 of the Montgomery County Code governs public campaign financing in the County, in accordance with the Election Law Article of the Maryland Code.

The goals of the County’s campaign finance law include: (1) encouraging greater voter participation in County elections; (2) increasing opportunities for more residents to run for office; and (3) reducing the influence of large contributions from businesses, political action groups and other large organizations. *See [Public Election Fund Committee - Montgomery County Council, Maryland \(montgomerycountymd.gov\)](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/PEF/Pages/default.aspx).*

Under Chapter 16, candidates seeking to become the County Executive, or seeking to become a Councilmember, may become certified to receive public matching funds for the small-dollar, individual contributions the candidates receive. Bill 20-24 would amend Chapter 16 by altering the amounts of funds a candidate may receive based on inflation, and by increasing the amount of funds that may be retained after an election for post-election expenses.

On October 22, 2024, the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) released Report 2024-16 (the “Report”) entitled *Montgomery County’s Public Election Fund*. The Report compares the County’s system of public campaign financing to those of other jurisdictions and puts forward several recommendations for the Council’s consideration. [OLO Report: 2024-16: Montgomery County's Public Election Fund](#)

Recommendations include:

- #1. Alter the PEF law to clarify the language around CPI-based adjustments to program limits and remove the requirement in the law for a Public Election Fund Committee.
- #2. Ask the Executive to clarify the scope of the audit requirement in executive regulations.

- #3. Review and potentially revise the maximum contribution limit for publicly funded candidates in Montgomery County.
- #4. Discuss and consider whether differences in the programs in the other Maryland jurisdictions could enhance Montgomery County’s PEF if implemented here.
- #5. Ask the State Board of Elections for clarification of how the boundaries set in state and County law impact outside organizations’ campaign activities and interactions with PEF candidates.

BILL SPECIFICS

The bill as originally introduced would accomplish three purposes. First, it would increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the amount of funds a certified candidate may retain in certain circumstances for post-election expenses. The \$10,000 amount would be increased every four years based upon inflation.

Second, the bill would clarify how to calculate the Consumer Price Index adjustment that already applies to total campaign finance disbursements from the public fund and individual contribution limits, and that will apply to the retention amounts. The adjusted limits would be published by the Chief Administrative Officer by March 1 of the year preceding the adjustment.

Third, the bill would provide technical corrections throughout Chapter 16.

SUMMARY OF IMPACT STATEMENTS

Fiscal impact. According to the Office of Management and Budget, “The proposed revision to the Public Campaign Finance system is expected to increase County expenditures by approximately \$230,000 in FY30.”

Racial equity and social justice. The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 20-24 will have a minimal impact on racial equity and social justice (RESJ) in the County. Public Election Fund candidates who are racially and ethnically representative of the County’s demographics will likely benefit from being able to retain more funds for interim campaign expenses before the next election. However, should the retention amount continue to increase, the disadvantage this could create for future community members who are interested in running for office could negatively affect the political representation of Black, Indigenous, and other people of color (BIPOC).

Economic impact. The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates that Bill 20-24 would have a minor positive impact on economic conditions in the County in terms of the Council’s priority economic indicators. By increasing the amount of allowable post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and adjusting it to inflation every four years, the Bill likely would lead to minor gains in revenues and income for certain businesses based in the County that provide goods and services directly related to election campaign activities, such as printing services, office supplies, and advertisement.

Climate assessment. “The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 20-24 will have no impact on the County’s contribution to addressing climate change as it is proposing amendments to an existing law that does not impact climate change or climate resilience.”

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The League of Women Voters of Montgomery County, Maryland supports the enactment of Bill 20-24.

SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE WORKSESSION

Participating in the worksession were David Crow, Department of Finance; and Blaise DeFazio, Office of Legislative Oversight.

The Committee adopted several amendments to Bill 20-24, as described below, and recommended (3-0) the enactment of the amended bill. One outstanding issue remains, as described at Issue #6, page 9.

1. Amendment to Remove the Requirement for a Public Election Financing Committee

The Committee followed the recommendation of OLO to amend the law to eliminate the Public Election Financing (PEF) Committee. As explained by OLO, the PEF Committee has had no members since 2022 despite recruitment efforts by the County. In addition, the recommendations of the Committee to date have not informed budgetary decisions regarding campaign financing. *See Recommendation #1B at page 138 of the Report.*

The Committee also noted that the PEF Committee served a valuable purpose in recommending appropriations as the public campaign finance law got underway. However, now that the law has been in place for 10 years, appropriations to the PEF can be handled appropriately through the normal budgetary process.

To remove the PEF Committee requirement, the Committee adopted the following amendment.

GO Amendment #1:

16-31. [[Public Election Fund Committee]] Reserved.

[[a) *Committee established.* The Public Election Fund Committee is 7 members appointed by the County Council for a 4-year term beginning on May 1 of the first year of the Council’s term of office. A vacancy occurring before the end of a term must be filled by appointment for the remainder of the term. The Council must ask the County Executive to recommend within 30 days one or more qualified applicants before making any appointment.]]

[[b) *Membership; officers.*

- (1) Each member must be a resident of the County while serving on the Committee.
- (2) No more than 3 members may be from the same political party.
- (3) The members should reflect the diversity of the County.
- (4) The Council must designate the chair and vice-chair.]]

[[c) *Compensation.* Each member must serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for travel and dependent care expenses.]]

[[d) *Duties.* The Committee must:

- (1) estimate the funds necessary to implement the public campaign finance system; and
- (2) conduct public outreach and education activities to raise awareness of the public campaign financing system.]]

[[e) *Annual report.* The Committee must issue a report to the Council on or before January 30 each year that:

- (1) identifies the estimated funds necessary to implement the public campaign financing system;
- (2) recommends an appropriation to the Public Election Fund for the following fiscal year; and
- (3) identifies the public outreach and education activities undertaken in the prior calendar year.]]

[[f) *Staff support.* The Executive Director of the Office of the County Council must provide staff support for the Committee.]]

2. Amendment to Increase Individual Donor Contribution Limits

In its Report, OLO found that traditionally funded candidates in Montgomery County, who do not participate in the Public Election Fund, can raise \$24 for every \$1 raised by a publicly funded candidate in the PEF. This ratio is an outlier compared to other jurisdictions nationally.

In six of the seven public campaign finance programs outside of Maryland that OLO analyzed, traditionally funded candidates can raise \$1-\$2 for every \$1 raised by a publicly funded candidate. In the District of Columbia, traditionally funded candidates can raise \$10 for every \$1 raised by a publicly funded candidate. See Recommendation #3 at page 139 of the Report.

To address the discrepancy identified by OLO, Chair Stewart, with the support of Councilmember Fani-González, moved an amendment to increase the individual contribution limit from \$250 to \$500. The match would continue to apply only the first \$150. This amendment would bring the ratio of publicly financed candidates to traditionally funded candidates to \$12 to \$1, compared to the \$24 to \$1 that it is now.

The Committee discussed the proposal and voted (3-0) to adopt the following amendment.

GO Amendment #2:

(c) *Qualifying contribution limits.* A certified candidate may continue to collect qualifying contributions and submit a request for a matching public contribution up to, and including, the day of a primary or a general election. A qualifying contribution must not exceed ~~[\$250]~~ \$500 from any individual in the aggregate during a 4-year election cycle.

* * *

An applicant candidate or a participating candidate must not:

* * *

(b) accept private contributions from an individual in an aggregate greater than ~~[\$150]~~ \$500 during a 4-year election cycle, or the maximum amount of an eligible contribution, as adjusted by Section ~~[16-23(i)]~~ 16-23(j);

The Committee also directed staff to make any conforming amendments necessary to alter other references of “\$250” within Chapter 16 to “\$500”. The enclosed bill reflects those conforming amendments.

3. Amendment to Increase Matching Funds

With respect to matching funds, OLO found that Montgomery County provides substantially lower matching fund amounts to publicly financed candidates than Howard County, Baltimore City, and Prince George's County. Specifically, OLO calculated matching funds based on each jurisdictions' formula for contribution amounts of \$25, \$50, \$75, \$100, \$125 and \$150. Matching funds for candidates in Montgomery County:

- Are \$25-\$75 less at every contribution level compared to Baltimore City;
- Are \$25-\$50 less compared to Howard County at all contribution levels except \$150; and
- Are \$25 less compared to Prince George's County at the \$25 and \$75 contribution levels.

See pages 139-140 of the Report.

The Committee voted (3-0) to increase the matching amounts, in order to be more in line with comparable jurisdictions. The amendment was moved by Chair Stewart, with the support of Councilmember Fani-González.

GO Amendment #3:

(a) *Matching amounts.* The Director must distribute a public contribution from the Fund to each certified candidate in a contested election only during the distribution period as follows:

(1) for a certified candidate for County Executive, the matching dollars must equal:

(A) [~~\$6~~] \$7 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the first \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

(B) \$4 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the second \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

(C) \$2 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the third \$50 of each qualifying contribution; and

(D) \$0 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the remainder of each qualifying contribution[.]; and

(2) for a certified candidate for County Council, the matching dollars must equal:

- (A) [~~\$4~~] \$5 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the first \$50 of each qualifying contribution;
- (B) \$3 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the second \$50 of each qualifying contribution;
- (C) \$2 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the third \$50 of each qualifying contribution; and
- (D) \$0 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for the remainder of each qualifying contribution.

As a result of the amendment, the matching ratio County Executive candidates would increase from 6:1 to 7:1 for the first \$50 of a qualifying contribution, and the matching ratio for Councilmember candidates would increase from 4:1 to 5:1. Accordingly, the match for the Executive, for the first \$50, would be \$350, and the match for a Councilmember, for the first \$50, would be \$250.

4. Amendment to Permit Limited Candidate Affiliation in Accordance with State Law

OLO (at pages 140-141 of the Report) pointed out that although state regulations governing local jurisdictions' public campaign finance programs prohibit participating candidates from being part of a "slate committee" – a "political committee of two or more candidates who join together to conduct and pay for joint campaign activities" – state regulations do allow publicly funded candidates to "affiliate" with other candidates with restrictions:

A candidate who accepts public funds may affiliate with any other candidate, including non-publicly financed candidates, on campaign material if:

1. The authorized candidate campaign committee established in §A of this regulation makes a direct disbursement to the payee for its share of the costs of the campaign material; and
2. The campaign material displays the authority line of the authorized candidate campaign committee established in §A of this regulation. COMAR § 33.13.14.03(F).

OLO noted that the public campaign finance programs in Howard County, Baltimore City, Prince George's County, and Baltimore County all explicitly allow candidates to affiliate with other candidates.

To permit candidate affiliation, as permitted under state law, the Committee adopted (3-0) the following amendment, which was moved forward by Chair Stewart with the support of Councilmember Fani-González.

GO Amendment #4:

(i) Candidate affiliation. A candidate who accepts a public contribution may affiliate with any other candidates, including non-publicly financed candidates, on campaign material if:

- (1) the authorized campaign finance entity makes a direct disbursement to the payee for its share of the costs of the campaign material; and
- (2) the campaign material displays the authority line of the authorized campaign finance entity.

5. Calculation of CPI Increases – Potential Amendment

The Department of Finance requested – and the Committee adopted (3-0) – an amendment to clarify how to calculate the CPI adjustments to the limits on total campaign finance disbursements from the public fund, and to the limit on individual contributions. Under the amendment, the Department would determine the cumulative percentage change in the CPI over the four-year period. The Department then would multiply that percentage by the existing limit to determine the appropriate increase.

GO Amendment #5:

- (3) The adjusted limit must be equal to the [[amount of the existing]] current limit [[increased]] multiplied by the [[average]] outcome of the most recent published Consumer Price Index [[for the]] at the time of the adjustment divided by the annual value of the Consumer Price Index from 4 calendar years [[preceding the adjustment]] prior to the current year.

6. Timing of CPI Adjustments – Outstanding Issue

In its Report, OLO recommended that – because CPI adjustments were not made under the public campaign finance law in prior years – the Council might wish to require the Chief Administrative Officer to adjust the limits shortly after the bill’s adoption and in advance of

the 2026 election cycle. OLO suggests that, after an initial adjustment, the adjustments would take place on July 1, 2028 and every four years thereafter. *See Recommendation #1A at page 137 of the Report.*

To implement OLO’s suggestion, the Committee discussed, but did not adopt, an amendment that would have required an initial CPI adjustment in 2025. The Department of Finance recommended against the amendment due to challenges in administration and because, as written, it would have resulted in “double counting” inflation for 2024. In addition, since the contribution amounts have been increased under other amendments adopted by the Committee, inflation could be baked into these amended amounts.

One option for the Council's consideration, based upon additional data (below) provided by the Department of Finance, would be to adjust the limits on PEF disbursements per candidate to account for 2020-2024 inflation. The limit on individual contributions already would be increased (from \$250 to \$500) based on the Committee's amendments. In addition, the permissible retention amount would be increased (from \$5,000 to \$10,000) under the bill. The PEF distribution limits, however, have not been increased for inflation.

CPI-U	
2020 Annual	267.157
2024 January	309.961
% Change	16%

	Current Limit	New Limit (full amount)	New Limit (rounded)
CE Candidates	\$750,000	\$870,165	\$870,170
At Large	\$250,000	\$290,055	\$290,060
District	\$125,000	\$145,028	\$145,030

The **potential amendment** would be, starting on line 65 of the Committee's bill:

(3) The total public contribution payable to a certified candidate for either a primary or a general election must not exceed:

- (A) ~~[[\$750,000]]~~ \$870,170 for a candidate for County Executive;
- (B) ~~[[\$250,000]]~~ \$290,160 for a candidate for At Large Councilmember; and
- (C) ~~[[\$125,000]]~~ \$145,030 for a candidate for District Councilmember.

Next step: Roll call vote on whether to enact Bill 20-24.

This packet contains:

Bill 20-24
Fiscal Impact Statement
Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact Statement
Economic Impact Statement
Climate Assessment
Public Testimony

Circle #

1
11
13
16
19
21

Bill No. 20-24
Concerning: Public Campaign Financing
- Amendments
Revised: 10/31/2024 Draft No. 5
Introduced: September 17, 2024
Expires: December 7, 2026
Enacted: _____
Executive: _____
Effective: _____
Sunset Date: _____
Ch. _____, Laws of Mont. Co. _____

COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsors: Councilmember Glass, Council Vice-President Stewart, and Councilmembers Fani-González, Albornoz, Mink, Balcombe, and Sayles

AN ACT to:

- (1) increase the maximum amount of funds a certified candidate may retain to pay post-election expenses;
- (2) require periodic adjustments to permissible contribution limits and retention amounts based upon the Consumer Price Index;
- (3) make updates and technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law; and
- (4) generally amend the County law related to public campaign financing.

By amending

Montgomery County Code
Chapter 16, Public Campaign Financing
Sections 16-18, 16-20, 16-23, 16-24, 16-27, 16-30, and 16-31

Boldface	<i>Heading or defined term.</i>
<u>Underlining</u>	<i>Added to existing law by original bill.</i>
[Single boldface brackets]	<i>Deleted from existing law by original bill.</i>
<u>Double underlining</u>	<i>Added by amendment.</i>
[[Double boldface brackets]]	<i>Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.</i>
* * *	<i>Existing law unaffected by bill.</i>

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:

27 (b) Other than a contribution from an applicant candidate or the candidate’s
28 spouse, an applicant candidate must not accept an eligible contribution
29 from an individual greater than ~~[[\\$250]]~~ \$500, as adjusted under Section
30 16-23(j).

31 * * *

32 ~~[[d)~~ *Consumer Price Index adjustment.* The Chief Administrative Officer
33 must adjust the contribution limit established in Subsection (b),
34 effective July 1, 2022, and July 1 of each subsequent fourth year, by the
35 annual average increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for the
36 previous 4 calendar years. The Chief Administrative Officer must
37 calculate the adjustment to the nearest multiple of \$10, and must publish
38 the amount of this adjustment not later than March 1 of each fourth
39 year.]]

40 * * *

41 **16-23. Distribution of public contribution.**

42 (a) *Matching amounts.* The Director must distribute a public contribution
43 from the Fund to each certified candidate in a contested election only
44 during the distribution period as follows:

45 (1) for a certified candidate for County Executive, the matching
46 dollars must equal:

47 (A) ~~[[\\$6]]~~ \$7 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution
48 received for the first \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

49 (B) \$4 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
50 the second \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

51 (C) \$2 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
52 the third \$50 of each qualifying contribution; and

53 (D) \$0 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
54 the remainder of each qualifying contribution[.]; and

55 (2) for a certified candidate for County Council, the matching dollars
56 must equal:

57 (A) ~~[\$4]~~ \$5 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution
58 received for the first \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

59 (B) \$3 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
60 the second \$50 of each qualifying contribution;

61 (C) \$2 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
62 the third \$50 of each qualifying contribution; and

63 (D) \$0 for each dollar of a qualifying contribution received for
64 the remainder of each qualifying contribution.

65 (3) The total public contribution payable to a certified candidate for
66 either a primary or a general election must not exceed:

67 (A) \$750,000 for a candidate for County Executive;

68 (B) \$250,000 for a candidate for At Large Councilmember;
69 and

70 (C) \$125,000 for a candidate for District Councilmember.

71 * * *

72 (c) *Qualifying contribution limits.* A certified candidate may continue to
73 collect qualifying contributions and submit a request for a matching
74 public contribution up to, and including, the day of a primary or a general
75 election. A qualifying contribution must not exceed ~~[\$250]~~ \$500 from
76 any individual in the aggregate during a 4-year election cycle.

77 * * *

78 (j) *Consumer Price Index adjustment.*

79 (1) [The] Effective July 1, 2028 and July 1 of each subsequent fourth
 80 year, the Chief Administrative Officer must adjust the public
 81 contribution limits established in Subsection (a)(3) of this
 82 Section, and the eligible contribution limit established in Section
 83 16-20(d) and Subsection (c) of this Section], effective July 1,
 84 2022, and July 1 of each subsequent fourth year, by the annual
 85 average increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for the
 86 previous 4 calendar years].

87 (2) The Chief Administrative Officer must calculate [the
 88 adjustment] each adjusted limit to the nearest multiple of \$10[,
 89 and must publish the amount of this adjustment not later than
 90 March 1 of each fourth year].

91 (3) The adjusted limit must be equal to the [[amount of the existing]]
 92 current limit [[increased]] multiplied by the [[average]] outcome
 93 of the most recent published Consumer Price Index [[for the]] at
 94 the time of the adjustment divided by the annual value of the
 95 Consumer Price Index from 4 calendar years [[preceding the
 96 adjustment]] prior to the current year.

97 (4) The Chief Administrative Officer must, by March 1 of the year
 98 preceding an adjustment:

99 (A) notify in writing the State Board of Elections and the
 100 County Council of the adjusted limits; and

101 (B) publish the adjusted limits on the County website.

102 **16-24. Use of public contribution.**

103 (a) Except as provided in Section 16-27, a participating candidate may
 104 [only] use the eligible contributions and the matching public
 105 contribution for a primary or general election only for expenses

106 incurred for the election. A participating candidate must not pay in
 107 advance for goods and services to be used after certification with non-
 108 qualifying contributions received before applying for certification
 109 unless the expenditure is permitted by Executive regulation adopted
 110 under Section 16-21.

111 * * *

112 **16-26. Applicant and participating candidate restrictions.**

113 An applicant candidate or a participating candidate must not:

- 114 (a) accept a private contribution from any group or organization, including
 115 a political action committee, a corporation, a labor organization, or a
 116 State or local central committee of a political party, except that an
 117 applicant candidate or a participating candidate may, subject to
 118 subsection (h), accept in-kind contributions from a State central
 119 committee of a political party, and from a Montgomery County central
 120 committee of a political party;
- 121 (b) accept private contributions from an individual in an aggregate greater
 122 than [~~\$150~~] [~~[\$250]]~~ \$500 during a 4-year election cycle, or the maximum
 123 amount of an eligible contribution, as adjusted by Section [~~16-23(i)]~~ 16-
 124 23(j);
- 125 (c) pay for any campaign expense after filing a notice of intent with the
 126 Board to seek public funding with any campaign finance account other
 127 than the candidate’s publicly funded campaign account;
- 128 (d) be a member of a slate in any election in which the candidate receives
 129 a public contribution;
- 130 (e) accept a loan from anyone other than the candidate or the candidate’s
 131 spouse;

132 (f) solicit funds for a State or a Montgomery County central committee of
133 a political party; or

134 (g) transfer funds:

135 (1) to the candidate’s publicly funded campaign account from any
136 other campaign finance entity established for the candidate; and

137 (2) from the candidate’s publicly funded campaign account to any
138 other campaign finance entity.

139 * * *

140 (i) Candidate affiliation. A candidate who accepts a public contribution may
141 affiliate with any other candidates, including non-publicly financed
142 candidates, on campaign material if:

143 (1) the authorized campaign finance entity makes a direct
144 disbursement to the payee for its share of the costs of the campaign
145 material; and

146 (2) the campaign material displays the authority line of the authorized
147 campaign finance entity.

148 **16-27. Return of unspent funds; retention of funds.**

149 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b):

150 (1) within 90 days after the County Board certifies the results of the
151 primary election, a participating candidate who is not certified to
152 be on the ballot for the general election must return any unspent
153 money in the candidate’s publicly funded campaign account to
154 the Fund; and

155 (2) within 90 days after the County Board certifies the results of the
156 general election, a participating candidate must return any
157 unspent money in the candidate’s publicly funded campaign
158 account to the Fund.

- 159 (b) A certified candidate may retain funds to pay for post-election expenses
 160 if:
- 161 (1) the retained funds do not exceed [~~\$5,000~~] \$10,000;
 - 162 (2) the candidate files a new declaration of intent to participate in the
 163 public campaign financing system for the 4-year next election
 164 cycle by January 31 the year after the election; and
 - 165 (3) [~~keep~~] the candidate keeps the same campaign finance entity
 166 open.
- 167 (c) Consumer Price Index adjustment.
- 168 (1) Effective July 1, 2028 and July 1 of each subsequent fourth year,
 169 the Chief Administrative Officer must adjust the retention limit
 170 under Subsection (b).
 - 171 (2) The Chief Administrative Officer must calculate each adjusted
 172 limit to the nearest multiple of \$10.
 - 173 (3) The adjusted limit must be equal to the [[amount of the existing]]
 174 current limit [[increased]] multiplied by the [[average]] outcome
 175 of the most recent published Consumer Price Index [[for the]] at
 176 the time of the adjustment divided by the annual value of the
 177 Consumer Price Index from 4 calendar years [[preceding the
 178 adjustment]] prior to the current year.
 - 179 (4) The Chief Administrative Officer must, by March 1 of the year
 180 preceding an adjustment:
 - 181 (A) notify in writing the State Board of Elections and the
 182 County Council of the adjusted limit; and
 - 183 (B) publish the adjusted limit on the County website.

184 **16-30. Penalties.**

185 (a) *Civil Violations.* Any violation of this Article is a Class A civil
 186 violation. Each day a violation exists is a separate offense.

187 (b) *Payment.* A fine may be paid by the campaign only if all public
 188 contributions have been repaid to the Fund. Otherwise, the candidate or
 189 officer found to be responsible for the violation is personally liable for
 190 the fine.

191 (c) *Additional penalties.*

192 (1) In addition to the penalty specified in Subsection 16-30(a), a
 193 certified or participating candidate must withdraw from the
 194 public campaign financing system if the candidate intentionally
 195 or knowingly provides falsified information, misrepresents a
 196 material fact, or conceals relevant information to the Board, the
 197 Executive, or the Director under this Article.

198 (2) A candidate that must withdraw from the public campaign
 199 financing system under (c)(1) must abide by the withdrawal
 200 requirements in Section 16-25, including the repayment of any
 201 public contribution received.

202 **16-31. [[Public Election Fund Committee]] Reserved.**

203 [[(a) *Committee established.* The Public Election Fund Committee is 7
 204 members appointed by the County Council for a 4-year term beginning
 205 on May 1 of the first year of the Council’s term of office. A vacancy
 206 occurring before the end of a term must be filled by appointment for the
 207 remainder of the term. The Council must ask the County Executive to
 208 recommend within 30 days one or more qualified applicants before
 209 making any appointment.]]

210 [[(b) *Membership; officers.*

- 211 (1) Each member must be a resident of the County while serving on
 212 the Committee.
- 213 (2) No more than 3 members may be from the same political party.
- 214 (3) The members should reflect the diversity of the County.
- 215 (4) The Council must designate the chair and vice-chair.]]
- 216 [[(c) *Compensation.* Each member must serve without compensation, but may
 217 be reimbursed for travel and dependent care expenses.]]
- 218 [[(d) *Duties.* The Committee must:
- 219 (1) estimate the funds necessary to implement the public campaign
 220 finance system; and
- 221 (2) conduct public outreach and education activities to raise awareness
 222 of the public campaign financing system.]]
- 223 [[(e) *Annual report.* The Committee must issue a report to the Council on or
 224 before January 30 each year that:
- 225 (1) identifies the estimated funds necessary to implement the public
 226 campaign financing system;
- 227 (2) recommends an appropriation to the Public Election Fund for the
 228 following fiscal year; and
- 229 (3) identifies the public outreach and education activities undertaken
 230 in the prior calendar year.]]
- 231 [[(f) *Staff support.* The Executive Director of the Office of the County Council
 232 must provide staff support for the Committee.]]

Fiscal Impact Statement

Office of Management and Budget

Bill 20-24

Public Campaign Financing - Amendments

Bill Summary

Bill 20-24 would amend the Public Campaign Finance system to require periodic adjustments to the permissible contribution limits. The adjustment would be equivalent 4-year inflation in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria Core Based Statistical Area (CPI-U).

Fiscal Impact Summary

The proposed revision to the Public Campaign Finance system is expected to increase County expenditures by approximately \$230,000 in FY30.

Fiscal Year	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	Total
Personnel Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Operating Expenses	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$230,000	\$0	\$230,000
Total Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$230,000	\$0	\$230,000
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$230,000)	\$0	(\$230,000)
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Fiscal Impact Analysis

This FIS assumes that the change in the limit will be the current limit multiplied by the outcome of the current CPI-U index level divided by the CPI-U index level from four years prior.

The analysis relies on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the CPI-U and the number of candidates in the 2018 and 2022 elections that received the maximum distributions from the Public Election Fund (PEF). The average of the 4-year cumulative increases in the CPI-U calculated each year since 1999 has been approximately ten percent.

The Department of Finance assumes that as a result of this bill the allowable maximum distribution from the PEF will increase by ten percent for the election that will be held in FY30; this is the only election within the analysis period after the changes proposed by this bill become effective at the start of FY28. The Department of Finance assumes that in the primary election in FY30, two county executive candidates, two at-large candidates, and two district candidates will receive the maximum distribution from the Public Election Fund. The Department of Finance assumes the remaining candidates will utilize funds less than the current limit. The Department of Finance further assumes that no candidate will receive the maximum distribution for the Public Election Fund for the general election scheduled to be held in FY30.

The number of candidates assumed to receive the maximum distribution is similar to the number of candidates at each level that received the maximum distribution in the in the primary and general elections in 2018 and 2022. The cost increase resulting from six candidates receiving a maximum distribution increased by ten percent at each office as compared to the current distribution levels is \$230,000.



Staff Impact	The Department of Finance anticipates that the current staff would be able to absorb the additional workload to implement this bill.
Actuarial Analysis	The bill is not expected to impact retiree pension or group insurance costs.
Information Technology Impact	The bill is not expected to impact the County Information Technology (IT) or Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems.
Other Information	
<i>Later actions that may impact revenue or expenditures if future spending is projected</i>	The four-year rate of inflation may be different than assumed. The number of candidates receiving the maximum distribution may be different than assumed.
<i>Ranges of revenue or expenditures that are uncertain or difficult to project</i>	To generate an FIS, and after consultation with Council staff, Finance presumes, that lines 70 to 72 of the introduced legislation will change to the following language, or other language that serves the same purpose of clarifying the calculation: "The adjusted limit must be equal to the current limit multiplied by the outcome of the most recent published Consumer Price Index at the time of the adjustment divided by the annual value of the Consumer Price Index from four calendar years prior to the current year.
Contributors	Abdul Rauf, Office of Management and Budget David Crow, Department of Finance Todd-Fawley King, Department of Finance Dennis Hetman, Department of Finance Nancy Feldman, Department of Finance



Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Impact Statement

Office of Legislative Oversight

BILL 20-24: PUBLIC CAMPAIGN FINANCING – AMENDMENTS

SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 20-24 will have a minimal impact on racial equity and social justice (RESJ) in the County. Public Election Fund candidates who are racially and ethnically representative of the County's demographics will likely benefit from being able to retain more funds for interim campaign expenses before the next election. However, should the retention amount continue to increase, the disadvantage this could create for future community members who are interested in running for office could negatively affect the political representation of Black, Indigenous, and other people of color (BIPOC).

PURPOSE OF RESJ IMPACT STATEMENTS

The purpose of RESJ impact statements (RESJIS) is to evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice in the County. Racial equity and social justice refer to a **process** that focuses on centering the needs, leadership, and power of communities of color and low-income communities with a **goal** of eliminating racial and social inequities.¹ Achieving racial equity and social justice usually requires seeing, thinking, and working differently to address the racial and social inequities that have caused racial and social disparities.²

PURPOSE OF BILL 20-24

The Public Election Fund was established through the enactment of Bill 16-14 in September 2014. It provides public campaign financing for County Executive and County Council candidates with the goals of:³

- Encouraging greater voter participation in County elections;
- Increasing opportunities for more residents to run for office; and
- Reducing the influence of large contributions from businesses and organizations.

The purpose of Bill 20-24 is to make changes to the County's Public Election Fund. If enacted, Bill 20-24 would:⁴

- Increase the amount of funds a certified candidate may retain (in certain circumstances) for post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 with this amount increasing every four years based upon inflation;
- Clarify how to calculate the Consumer Price Index adjustment for permissible contribution limits and retention amounts; and
- Make technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law.

Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments, was introduced by the Council on September 17, 2024.

This RESJIS builds on the RESJIS for Expedited Bill 45-21, Elections – Public Campaign Financing – Restrictions, which OLO published in December 2021.⁵ Please refer to this RESJIS for background on campaign finance, political representation, and racial equity.

RESJ Impact Statement

Bill 20-24

ANTICIPATED RESJ IMPACTS

After an election, local candidates who participate in the Public Election Fund (i.e., “PEF candidates”) can retain \$5,000 in unspent funds if they file a declaration that they intend to participate in the Public Election Fund in the next 4-year election cycle.⁶ PEF candidates can use these funds for allowable campaign expenses, such as maintaining a campaign website.⁷ If enacted, Bill 20-24 would increase the retention amount for unspent funds from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

To consider the anticipated impact of Bill 20-24 on RESJ in the County, OLO recommends the consideration of two related questions:

- Who would primarily benefit or be burdened by this bill?
- What racial and social inequities could passage of this bill weaken or strengthen?

For the first question, OLO considered the demographics of PEF candidates in the near term (i.e., current PEF candidates) since they would benefit from retaining more unspent funds for interim campaign expenses. OLO also considered the demographics of future PEF candidates that could be disadvantaged by this change.

Current PEF candidates. Data from the 2022 election suggests that PEF candidates are likely racially and ethnically representative of the County’s population. Specifically, among 20 PEF candidates who ran for County Executive or County Council,⁸ 60 percent (12 candidates) were BIPOC,⁹ compared to 58.6 percent of the County population.¹⁰ Conversely, 40 percent (8 candidates) were White,¹¹ compared to 41.1 percent of the County population.¹²

Future PEF candidates. Future PEF candidates would be disadvantaged by this change since they would not have the benefit of using public campaign funds before the start of the election cycle. As the County becomes more racially and ethnically diverse over time,¹³ this could increasingly disadvantage BIPOC community members who are interested in running for office in the future.

For the second question, OLO considered how Bill 20-24 could address racial inequities in political representation. As described in the RESJIS for Bill 45-21, the changing racial and ethnic demographics of Councilmembers since the Public Election Fund was established suggest the Fund has enhanced BIPOC representation among local elected officials.¹⁴ Because the amount is relatively small, allowing PEF candidates to retain \$5,000 more in funds for interim campaign expenses will likely not affect the Public Election Fund’s effectiveness in improving BIPOC political representation.

OLO anticipates Bill 20-24 will have a minimal impact on RESJ in the County. PEF candidates who are racially and ethnically representative of the County’s demographics will likely benefit from being able to retain more funds for interim campaign expenses before the next election. However, should the retention amount continue to increase, the disadvantage this could create for future community members who are interested in running for office could negatively affect BIPOC political representation.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The Racial Equity and Social Justice Act requires OLO to consider whether recommended amendments to bills aimed at narrowing racial and social inequities are warranted in developing RESJ impact statements.¹⁵ OLO anticipates Bill 20-24 will have a minimal impact on RESJ in the County. As such, OLO does not offer recommended amendments.

RESJ Impact Statement

Bill 20-24

CAVEATS

Two caveats to this racial equity and social justice impact statement should be noted. First, predicting the impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, this RESJ impact statement is intended to inform the legislative process rather than determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

CONTRIBUTIONS

OLO staffer Janmarie Peña, Performance Management and Data Analyst, drafted this RESJ impact statement.

¹ Definition of racial equity and social justice adopted from “Applying a Racial Equity Lens into Federal Nutrition Programs” by Marlysa Gamblin, et.al. Bread for the World, and from Racial Equity Tools. <https://www.racialequitytools.org/glossary>

² Ibid.

³ “Law,” Public Election Fund Committee, Montgomery County Council.

⁴ [Introduction Staff Report for Bill 20-24](#), Montgomery County Council, Introduced September 17, 2024.

⁵ [RESJIS for Expedited Bill 45-21](#), Office of Legislative Oversight, December 8, 2021.

⁶ “Retention of Funds,” [Montgomery County Public Election Fund Summary Guide](#), Maryland State Board of Elections and Montgomery County Department of Finance, June 2021, pg. 40.

⁷ Money in a publicly funded campaign account can be used for any expense that is directly related to election campaign activities. Refer to “Allowable Uses of Money,” Montgomery County Public Election Fund Summary Guide, pg. 38.

⁸ [Public Election Fund Distribution and Balance Report as of July 31, 2022](#), Montgomery County Department of Finance.

⁹ Candidates counted are Brandy Brooks, Laurie-Anne Sayles, Gabe Albornoz, Kristin Mink, Natali Fani-Gonzalez, Fatmata Barrie, Marice Morales, Omar Lazo, Brian Anleu, William Roberts, Robert Wu, and Ben Wikner

¹⁰ [Table DP05](#), 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Census Bureau.

¹¹ Candidates counted are Hans Riemer, Marc Elrich, Evan Glass, Scott Goldberg, Marilyn Balcombe, Kate Stewart, Amy Ginsburg, and Andrew Einsmann.

¹² Table DP05.

¹³ Janmarie Peña and Chitra Kalyandurg, “Demographic Change,” [OLO Report 2024-8: Community Engagement for Racial Equity and Social Justice](#), Office of Legislative Oversight, March 12, 2024, pgs. 14-18.

¹⁴ RESJIS for Bill 45-21.

¹⁵ Bill 27-19, Administration – Human Rights – Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice – Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee – Established, Montgomery County Council

Economic Impact Statement

Montgomery County, Maryland

Bill 20-24 Public Campaign Financing – Amendments

SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates that Bill 20-24 would have a minor positive impact on economic conditions in the County in terms of the Council’s priority economic indicators. By increasing the amount of allowable post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and adjusting it to inflation every four years, the Bill likely would lead to minor gains in revenues and income for certain businesses based in the County that provide goods and services directly related to election campaign activities, such as printing services, office supplies, and advertisement.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF BILL 20-24

The Public Election Fund (PEF) was established through the enactment of Bill 16-14 in September 2014. It provides public campaign financing for County Executive and County Council candidates with the goals of:

- Encouraging greater voter participation in County elections;
- Increasing opportunities for more residents to run for office; and
- Reducing the influence of large contributions from businesses and organizations.

Bill 20-24 would amend the Public Election Fund by:

- Increasing the amount of funds a certified candidate may retain (in certain circumstances) for post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 with this amount increasing every four years based upon inflation;
- Clarifying how to calculate the Consumer Price Index adjustment for permissible contribution limits and retention amounts; and
- Making technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law.

Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments, was introduced by the Council on September 17, 2024.

INFORMATION SOURCES, METHODOLOGIES, AND ASSUMPTIONS

Per Section 2-81B of the Montgomery County Code, the purpose of this Economic Impact Statement is to assess, both, the impacts of Bill 20-24 on residents and private organizations in terms of the Council’s priority economic indicators and whether the Bill would have a net positive or negative impact on overall economic conditions in the County.¹

¹ Montgomery County Code, Sec. 2-81B.

For sources of information, this analysis relies on materials included in the Introduction Staff Report for the Bill and sources cited below. OLO does not use formal methodologies or make any assumptions in this analysis.

VARIABLES

The primary variables that would affect the economic impacts of enacting Bill 20-24 are the following:

- Total amount of retained funds; and
- Percentage of funds spent on local businesses.

IMPACTS

WORKFORCE ■ TAXATION POLICY ■ PROPERTY VALUES ■ INCOMES ■ OPERATING COSTS ■ PRIVATE SECTOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ■ ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ■ COMPETITIVENESS

Businesses, Non-Profits, Other Private Organizations

OLO anticipates that Bill 20-24 would have a minor positive impact on certain private organizations in the County in terms of the Council’s priority economic indicators.

Under current law, candidates who participate in the PEF can retain up to \$5,000 to pay for post-election expenses under certain conditions.² The allowable uses of money “are limited to expenses directly related to election campaign activities and expenses incurred during the specific time period for either the primary or general election.”³ Common campaign expenses include staffing, administration, radio and television advertisement, campaign materials like signs, buttons, etc.⁴

By increasing the amount of allowable post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and adjusting it to inflation every four years, certain businesses in the County likely would benefit from the additional expenses. Businesses that provide printing services and office supplies as well as local radio stations likely would see higher revenues, which may increase business income.

Beyond these potential impacts, OLO does not expect the Bill to affect private organizations in terms of the Council’s other priority indicators.

Residents

OLO anticipates that Bill 20-24 would have insignificant impacts on certain residents in the County in terms of the Council’s priority economic indicators.

² The candidate “must file a new declaration of intent to participate in the public campaign financing system for the next 4-year election cycle by January 31 of the year after the election, and must keep the same campaign finance entity open during such time.” “Summary Guide: Public Election Fund Montgomery County, Maryland.”

³ Ibid.

⁴ “Summary Guide: Public Election Fund Montgomery County, Maryland”; “Day-to-Day Operating Expenditures.”

Net Impact

OLO anticipates that Bill 20-24 would have a minor positive impact on economic conditions in the County in terms of the Council's priority economic indicators. By increasing the amount of allowable post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and adjusting it to inflation every four years, the Bill likely would lead to minor gains in revenues and income for certain businesses based in the County that provide goods and services directly related to election campaign activities, such as printing services, office supplies, and advertisement.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Not applicable

WORKS CITED

FEC.gov. "Day-to-Day Operating Expenditures." Accessed October 8, 2024. <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/making-disbursements/operating-expenditures-candidate/>.

Montgomery County Code. Sec. 2-81B, Economic Impact Statements (n.d.).
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/montgomerycounty/latest/montgomeryco_md/0-0-0-80894.

"Summary Guide: Public Election Fund Montgomery County, Maryland," June 2021.
https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/BONDS/Resources/Files/PEF_Summary_Guide_2021_6.pdf.

CAVEATS

Two caveats to the economic analysis performed here should be noted. First, predicting the economic impacts of legislation is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, the multitude of causes of economic outcomes, economic shocks, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to *inform* the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the Bill under consideration.

AUTHOR

Stephen Roblin (OLO) prepared this report.

Climate Assessment

Office of Legislative Oversight

Bill 20-24: Public Campaign Financing - Amendments

SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) anticipates Bill 20-24 will have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change as it is proposing amendments to an existing law that does not impact climate change or climate resilience.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF BILL 20-24

The Public Election Fund was established through the enactment of Bill 16-14 in September 2014. It provides public campaign financing for County Executive and County Council candidates with the goals of:

- Encouraging greater voter participation in County elections;
- Increasing opportunities for more residents to run for office; and
- Reducing the influence of large contributions from businesses and organizations.¹

Bill 20-24 would amend the Public Election Fund by:

- Increasing the amount of funds a certified candidate may retain (in certain circumstances) for post-election expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000 with this amount increasing every four years based upon inflation;
- Clarifying how to calculate the Consumer Price Index adjustment for permissible contribution limits and retention amounts; and
- Making technical corrections throughout the public campaign financing law.²

Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing – Amendments, was introduced by the Council on September 17, 2024.

ANTICIPATED IMPACTS

As the bill proposes amendments to an existing law that does not impact the County's contribution to addressing climate change or climate resilience, OLO anticipates that Bill 20-24 will have no impact.

RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The Climate Assessment Act requires OLO to offer recommendations, such as amendments or other measures to mitigate any anticipated negative climate impacts.³ OLO does not offer recommendations or amendments as Bill 20-24 is likely to have no impact on the County's contribution to addressing climate change, including the reduction and/or sequestration of greenhouse gas emissions, community resilience, and adaptative capacity.

CAVEATS

OLO notes two caveats to this climate assessment. First, predicting the impacts of legislation upon climate change is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, uncertainty, and the broad, global nature of climate change. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to inform the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

PURPOSE OF CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS

The purpose of the Climate Assessments is to evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on the County's contribution to addressing climate change. These climate assessments will provide the Council with a more thorough understanding of the potential climate impacts and implications of proposed legislation, at the County level. The scope of the Climate Assessments is limited to the County's contribution to addressing climate change, specifically upon the County's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and how actions suggested by legislation could help improve the County's adaptative capacity to climate change, and therefore, increase community resilience.

While co-benefits such as health and cost savings may be discussed, the focus is on how proposed County bills may impact GHG emissions and community resilience.

CONTRIBUTIONS

OLO staffer Kaitlyn Simmons drafted this assessment.

¹ Montgomery County Council, [Bill 16-14](#), Enacted September 30, 2014.

² Montgomery County Council, [Introduction Report for Bill 20-24](#), Introduced September 17, 2024.

³ Bill 3-22, Legislative Branch – Climate Assessments – Required, Montgomery County Council, Effective date October 24, 2022



October 8, 2024

Letter to the Montgomery County Council

Re: Bill 20-24, Public Campaign Financing

Dear Council Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of Bill 20-24. The League of Women Voters of Montgomery County understands that this bill would make technical updates to the county's public campaign financing rules to better reflect today's economic realities. **The League continues to support public campaign finance and the council's updates to the current law.** We also appreciate the council listening to community organizations and residents when it comes to public campaign finance and we hope that we can continue to work together responsibly to promote public financing in our future elections.

Susan Albertine
President