
Commission Meeting

of

NEW JERSEY CITIZENS' CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

"The Commission will discuss the districts selected by the State political party chairs to participate in the pilot project and intended participation by the candidates therein; discuss the adoption of regulations for the pilot project by the Election Law Enforcement Commission; receive presentations by invited guests; and consider such other matters as the Commissioners deem important."

LOCATION: Cherry Hill Public Library
Cherry Hill, New Jersey

DATE: August 15, 2005
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

William E. Schluter, Chair
Steven Lenox, Vice Chair
Senator Anthony R. Bucco
Assemblywoman Linda R. Greenstein
Assemblyman Bill Baroni
Victor DeLuca
Carol Murphy
Curtis Tao



ALSO PRESENT:

Gina Marie Winters
Acting Commission Secretary

Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Assemblyman Louis D. Greenwald District 6	6
JoAnn Gurenlian Candidate District 6	38
Marc Fleischner Candidate District 6	39
Marilyn Askin President American Association of Retired Persons, New Jersey	57
Nick Naum Representing Grey Panthers, and Citizen Action	59
Micah Sifry Senior Analyst Public Campaign New York	64
Juanita Howard Organizer, South Jersey New Jersey Citizen Action	71
Ingrid W. Reed Director Eagleton Institute of Politics	75
APPENDIX:	
Statement plus Pledge Sheet submitted by Marilyn Askin	1x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued):

	<u>Page</u>
Statement submitted by Micah Sifry	4x
Testimony plus attachments submitted by Juanita Howard	6x
Memo addressed to Clean Elections Commission submitted by Ingrid W. Reed	15x
lb: 1-87	

SENATOR WILLIAM E. SCHLUTER (Chair): We're a little bit late in starting, but we do want to get going. Everybody has got a busy schedule and--

SENATOR BUCCO: And a long ride home,

SENATOR SCHLUTER: A long time home, as Senator Bucco just said.

We appreciate everyone coming out this evening, in the summertime when we have many, many, things to do. And it is the purpose of the Commission to meet in the district, as suggested by one of our Commissioners, Commissioner Tao. And it would be a good idea to help spread information about the program to get the public aware of it and to answer any questions that people might have, because this is a pilot program. And as a Commission, it is our purpose to assess the results of the program during this election.

Before I proceed any further, I wondered if our Secretary, who is Gina Winters today, in place of Frank Parisi, if you could call the roll, please?

MS. WINTERS (Commission Acting Secretary): Of course.

Senator Bucco?

SENATOR BUCCO: Here.

MS. WINTERS: Senator Scutari? (no response)

Assemblyman Baroni? (no response)

Assemblywoman Greenstein? (no response)

Victor DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: Here.

MS. WINTERS: Steven Lenox?

MR. LENOX: Here.

MS. WINTERS: Carol Murphy?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Here.

MS. WINTERS: Senator Schluter?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Here.

MS. WINTERS: Curtis Tao?

MR. TAO: Here.

MS. WINTERS: We have a quorum.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: We have a quorum.

Now, members of the Commission, we'll do a little bit of housekeeping right now, because we have some people who will be testifying that are on a tight schedule and they have other places to go, and we certainly don't want to impede them in what they're doing.

But with your forbearance, I would like to hold off approval of the minutes until the meeting on Thursday, because I don't remember getting them. Did other people get the minutes that we have in our folder here?

MR. LENOX: No.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Steve says he didn't get them.

We have the minutes now. And if you could send out the minutes to the other people who are not here--

MS. WINTERS: I will.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: --we'll have a chance to read them and go over them.

I will start off by saying that I am honored and it's a pleasure to serve in this capacity for this very important program. We, in New Jersey,

have seen too many instances in recent years of the bad effects of money in the political process, and this is a very, very important step. It's a trial. It's a step to try and reduce the bad influences of money in campaigns. And that is the purpose of this project; and we will, of course, evaluate it, make recommendations when it's over.

Do other Commission members -- and will the record show that Assemblywoman Greenstein is here -- would other members like to comment generally?

Ms. Murphy, would you--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: No. I'm very anxious to see the results of all this. (laughter)

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Lenox?

MR. LENOX: I simply say I look forward to hearing from the candidates tonight to see what their experiences are out there as we move forward implementing this program.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Tao?

MR. TAO: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Just a brief statement and comment. I think this is a good opportunity for the Commission to solicit comments from the candidates, but also the public. But I think it's also important for us to say, and I'll say on behalf of myself, and I'm sure other members of the Commission will say on behalf of the Commission and themselves, that if those of the public believe in good government and if you believe in campaign finance reform, and if you believe in pay-to-play reform, that supporting the pilot program is a very integral and important step towards each of those things. It is a pilot program. It is one step of many that need to be done to accomplish

what we want to see, which is the removal of the undue influence of money in campaigns. But it's an important step. And I think the public should and needs to be aware of it, and we encourage the public's participation, including supporting the candidate of their choice through any one of the incremental campaign contributions designated by the statute.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you, Commissioner.

Senator Bucco?

SENATOR BUCCO: Well, just a pleasure to be here in the 6th District. I'm looking forward to the hearing with our candidates and what the public has to say here in Cherry Hill.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: Simply, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank you for writing the letters to the editor in the op ed page. I think we were, in between our meetings here, we were a bit under attack by -- in Monmouth County, and I think your response was quick and prompt and appropriate. And so I think that's a good sign that the Commission can respond that quickly.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: We have good staff, too.

Assemblywoman?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Yes, it's good to be here in the 6th. I think it is not too early for us to begin to hear some of the practical issues that are being faced by the candidates. We've had a couple of meetings about the theory behind what we're doing, and we're all very excited about the experiment. But it's definitely important for us to hear what's actually happening out in the field and to see what changes may need to be made even at this point. So I look forward to hearing that.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Very good.

Before we entertain comments from individuals who have signed up -- those who have told us they would like to make presentations -- I would like to mention that, as I did before, Frank Parisi, our Secretary, is on vacation. And we have Gina Winters with us here, and she will be with us on Thursday night.

Peter Kelly, of the Office of Legislative Services, is over there with a tie on, but no coat, and he is an expert attorney who can give us a rundown if we have any particular questions about the legislation, particularly legal questions.

Now, in the commentary, we have worked very closely with the Election Law Enforcement Commission, which has promulgated the regulations which are a matter of record now and which are on the Web site.

Gina, what is the Web site that we have for this? Can you announce it and tell the people here what our Web site is?

MS. WINTERS: The Commission's Web site?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

MS. WINTERS: If you go to the Legislature's Web site and click on *Commissions*, you'll see the Clean Elections Commission. Click on that. You have all the information about the Commission, as well as ELEC's Web site, which has all their information about the pilot project.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Okay.

And ELEC, as I say, they promulgated the regulations. We have been advised by ELEC that we have got to be very, very careful that Commission members cannot actively advocate and get out and try and

raise money for any of the candidates, because that would be an indirect or independent expenditure and would have to be reported. So we, on the Commission, have to be very, very careful and circumspect in what we do so that we don't cross that line.

And when candidates come before us to speak tonight, we would ask that they give us their experiences, they tell us what they think about the program so far.

Keep in mind that the Commission will be meeting after the election for the required number of public hearings at different parts in the state. I'm sure one will be down here. And that's the time that we want really hard answers and suggestions to some of the complaints and some of the difficult parts of this procedure. But I'm sure the candidates will have their own comments. And of course, we'll tell them not to use this as a campaign pitch, because they're all good people and I'm sure that they want everybody to vote for them, and we can say that, generically, about the situation.

So with that-- Do you have anything else to add at this time?
(no response)

All right. I think that we can start off, and toward the end of our program we can finish up with some business here on our own. Maybe some of the Commissioners might have to leave a little early; but we did have a request from Assemblyman Greenwald that he had to leave. And if we could ask him to come up, at this point in time -- and give us your comments.

A S S E M B L Y M A N L O U I S D. G R E E N W A L D:
Senator, thank you very much for coming to the district; Commissioner

Tao, thank you for recommending this. I think it is important to come to the districts so that you can see part of the response that the community has to the program and what's happening.

I am leaving tonight because we are in the midst of this, and we have many things scheduled to try to accumulate these contributions. So I would ask, out of fairness to our opponents who are here and running as well, that you would not make them wait all night either, because I'm sure they have other things, as well, to do. But I think it's important that you hear from us.

Senator, I would like to talk about some of the problems that we're facing in this process, why we're doing this and how we got into this, so that this Commission can have an understanding of the process -- what's working and what we think needs to be improved for the future. I don't think you're really soliciting to anyone for their votes tonight, and this is, I think, part of the problem, in all honesty. The group that's here tonight, from what I can see, from people that I know in the audience, is Citizen Action; PIRG; Public Campaign, who I met for the first time tonight, is in charge of supporting national campaign finance reform, taking special interest money out of the process; AARP; Eagleton, who is doing a study on this process; OLS attorney, an individual who I wasn't sure who he was, thought maybe he was a constituent OLS attorney; some of our political staff people who are volunteering on the campaign; and the Republican opponents and some of their political staff people that are on the campaign.

The citizens aren't here.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: As always.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: That's not true.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Some. I didn't mean that entirely. But at broad spectrum, obviously, if you look around the room, this is not the group that I think I, as the sponsor of this bill, would hoped to have had. We would liked to have had this room filled.

I originally suggested that maybe we hold this at the Cherry Hill Mall, because I was hoping for a real public setting where people would come and participate. I think it expresses some of the frustration that the candidates, regardless of political party, are having with this process. I would like to say that I'm enjoying it tremendously. I'm very glad that we did this. I think it is a great message to the public, and I think it can and will succeed.

I would say to you that one of the things that we've talked about as we did this legislation originally was that, in order to be taken seriously, candidates no longer are measured by their positions on issues, whether Clean Elections or not, but by the amount of money that they were able to raise in their accounts. And that's why we went down this road. Through the fair and Clean Elections, New Jersey could put elective office within reach of every citizen who wanted to be involved in the process. The system has become one, through pay-to-play reform initiatives, as well as special interest groups, as well as those well-heeled incumbents -- one that favors the wealthy and the well-known.

New Jersey has a chance to reform the system and bring new life and personalities into politics through this campaign finance reform. The experiment -- and that's what this is -- should not be judged by the

success of people who qualify or don't qualify, but by the notion of whether or not people are talking about this as a means of reform, and whether or not the idea that we've put forward should be tinkered with to make it more manageable. There is mounting concern that special interest money matters more to elected officials than the concerns of their constituents. I don't think that is a general statement, but I think there are levels of abuses. This was meant to restore public confidence. And I know many of my friends who I've served with in a previous life in the Legislature, those who I serve with now -- honest, good, honorable people who truly make decisions based on merit on public policy and not on money influence. But that perception has permeated public policy and it has permeated the community at large.

We are finding, through this process -- we have done a number of things in order to qualify. We've gone door-to-door, something that I've done for 10 years. We have knocked on doors. We can average 18 to 20 doors an hour. We can hit about 100 homes on a Saturday in a five-hour period. Respecting peoples' private time in the mornings with their family, not trying to interfere with dinner time, you can hit about 100 homes in five hours on a Saturday; 60 homes after work before darkness hits.

Obviously, every door, for those of you who are experienced politicians, every door you knock on -- not everyone is always home, not always someone answers the door. Every home you hit, I wish I could say that we have 100 percent success rate with this, that everyone we talked to contributes to this effort. That would be unrealistic, and it's not true. We have done the door-to-door because I think it is good retail politics. I also

think it is a way to get the message out. Time sensitive -- that's not the best way, in my opinion, to do this.

We have arranged typical coffee klatches with people that we have worked with and supported us in the past. We are following the old mantra that if we tell 10 people and they tell 10 people, and so on and so on, we can deliver this in a grassroots effort to the people. We are finding that to be, actually, a very successful means and, probably, the largest area of support for us to reach out to the people and get these contributions.

We have also reached out to people that we have just come in contact with over the years. When my father passed away, the Filipino community reached out to me. In a tradition within their culture, they came to our house where he had passed away to pray the rosary for his spirit. They have become very close to me and my family. We have reached out to them. We asked them to express, to their community of interest, Clean Elections, explain it to them, see if they would be supportive. If they would like us to come and talk to their residents, to the people that they represent, we would be happy to do that. We have done it that way through the Filipino community, the Indian-Asian community, all the different communities of interest.

We have reached out to our children's doctors, for them to reach out to people that they know and that they have talked to, and people that they represent, to talk about the Clean Elections process and whether or not they can put us in touch with people who would be supportive of this effort.

I reached out to a former teacher of mine, who educated me in high school. He and his wife became very close to my family and I. They

are the godparents of my children. He is still actively involved in the school systems. I went to him and asked him to please do a letter to his community of interest so that maybe he could find people who were interested in reforming the Clean Elections process. That to me is the mechanism with which to accomplish this goal -- to reach out, not just on yourselves, but to other people who will share this with 10 of their friends and so, and so on.

We have filed contributions that have been given to us on the permissive date of every filing. With what we have filed that is on public record and what we will file this Thursday, we are at about 800 contributions, give or take a few. Combined, we need 1,500 from me, 1,500 from my opponent. I know you knew that. For people that are here, I want to clarify. So we are at 800 of about 3,000.

We talked to one group today that we've asked for public support of this, and the response was, "What? That doesn't sound very good." This is a building block process. If the commitments and people that we have talked to -- people who think they can get their contributions in place-- I think we can make this goal.

The reality is, though, that we are counting on a lot of outside influences to come in and help with this process. And what we are finding is when we go door-to-door, when we explain it to these different community groups, I'm sure as we talk to you, as you talk to others, you spend a lot of time on the educational process of Clean Elections, more so than selling your positions as a candidate or whether or not they should support you, or your opponents, or whoever. That I think is one of the problems that we have faced. There is not enough public awareness about

this. And I think this room tonight in a district of 220,000 people -- my friend Stan, and one of our constituents who is here -- that, in and of itself, is a bad sign as to the public awareness of this.

We are reaching out to the media outlets and we are asking them to take out advertisements to promote this program -- not me, not my running mate. We are asking them to list our opponents, how they can contribute to them, and how they can contribute to us; that the people should support the program with an explanation of how they can give, what it does, and what its purpose is.

I've talked to some of the other people that are here tonight who have been involved in these clean elections in other states. In those states, and it has been said to us, "Well, does that violate the spirit of the clean elections process? Is that participating money?" We have found that in other states they have had that type of public input from the community to support this initiative. Because, again, you are leaving it to two candidates on one side to spread their word.

I have also said, and I believe this sincerely, this is no different than any one of us as elected officials when we were first elected and started our database of supporters, contributors. My database today, after 10 years of public service, is larger than it was 10 years ago. This should be a process that is open to everyone, but that when you're dealing with taxpayers dollars, a precious commodity, that money should go to those who are willing to work the hardest. It shouldn't just go to anyone with a whim who wants to throw their hat into this process. Anyone who has a desire, who has an idea, who has a public policy that they want to promote who can take that whim, that public policy, communicate it to 1,500 people,

find 1,000 people to give them a \$5 contribution, 500 more to give them a \$30 contribution, should qualify for these funds.

Someone who has been a very active participant in public life, who's never, I believe, held public office -- someone who has become popularly known as the weed man in newspapers around the state, who believes in legalizing marijuana -- he should have an opportunity to compete for this. But he should take his message of legalizing marijuana to those people and get those contributions.

Is the answer to this to lessen the standard so that anybody, like going through a drive-through window, can qualify for the public dollars? Or should it go to those people who are most committed -- the public service, who are trying to communicate their message with the residents as a whole?

I volunteered for this, and many of you who know me, regardless of political party and the friendships that we have developed across political aisles, I think know why we may not always agree on public policy. We come at this from a very good place. For me, I got involved in public service because my mother, Maria Barnaby Greenwald, was the greatest role model in my life. I wanted to keep her sense of good government alive. I wanted to keep the opportunity for anyone -- anyone in the street who wanted to run for public office to have a level playing field. This notion, though -- that proudly as a son, I look back -- I think people think Maria Barnaby Greenwald was like lightning in a bottle, is not true. She was a PTA mother. She was involved in her children's parochial education at Christ the King. She was actively involved in her church community at St. Pious the X. She was a den mother. She was

involved in her children's Little League activity. She's today's traditional soccer mom. She was a Junior Women's League member. She was involved with action groups at the time, like Citizen Action, under a different name. She had a standing of her own.

We need to find candidates like that who can reach out to those communities of interest that they are involved with and garner these contributions, go to their church, and say, "I'm running for office. Will you support me with a \$5 contribution?" That's what I'm doing. I think that's what my opponents are doing. That is the challenge.

If you don't get there this year, I come back to where I was 10 years ago in my ability to raise money, support my party, support my candidacy -- far greater today. If we're able, or if our opponents are able, to gather 2,000 contributions, have we failed? Or do we have a database of 2,000 contributions that is a building block for this process two years from now, where we can go back to and say, "Thank you for your support in the past. This is what I believe in. This is the change that I want to make. Will you support my candidacy? Will you support this public policy initiative?" And then I'm on the building blocks to finding that total of 3,000 contributions that we need. That's how I've built my career in the State Legislature. I know many of you, and that's how you've built your careers.

I think we can get there. And I'm concerned about lessening the standard. But I think we need to take a hard look at it. But finding that line, where to put the line in the sand, so to speak, is a telling number. Let me tell you some of the other problems we've had. All of you who do retail politics -- you knock on doors. We are a state of diner politics. How

many of you have stood out in front of a diner and shook hands? For years, I've been going to the train station greeting people before they go to work. How many of us have stood at the supermarket, as I've learned from my mother, watching her campaign and shake hands with people.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not a check society any more. We are a cash and a credit card society. I think there is merit in asking for the check for the \$200 seed contributions and maybe for the \$30 contributions -- that people are concerned about the dollar amount. But if this is a grassroots effort, if you were trying to inspire people, imagine yourself, as you have done as a candidate, standing at the diner, shaking someone's hand, talking to them about Clean Elections, explaining and educating them to the process, talking to them slightly about what you believe in -- property tax reform or the cancer centers that we've established, or Autism research -- and having them say, "You know something, thank you for doing this. I'd like to support you." And they reach in their pocket to give you a \$5 bill, and you say, "I can't take that. I can't take cash. I need you to write me a check." By the chance that they have a check on their hand, they take out a check and I say, "While you're writing out that check, can I know what you do for a living, who you work for, what your work address and phone number is?"

Think of us in the State Legislature and all the things on privacy issues that have come before us -- the Lender Law that we changed, especially for senior citizens; the no-call list, because people felt intruded into their privacy. Even when we go knocking on doors and we, ourselves, draw a line that you're not going to go when it's too late and you're going to respect peoples' privacy. Here we are for a \$5 contribution and a grassroots

effort asking people to write a check or a money order. It takes the inspiration and the spontaneity of this process away. And I think that if we were to look at changing this, from the standpoint of, if they give us their name, willing to sign a document, a voucher of some kind, same as they do when they support your candidacy in a petition drive, for the \$5 contributions, you would find that this is easier. Because when you go for the check, if they don't have it, there's follow-up. That takes time. And in a two-month process, time is critical. If they get you the check and you're not standing there with them, they're not making it out to the election fund of JoAnn Gurenlian or Marc Fleischner. They're making it out to the Clean Elections Fund, and in the memo section, they have to put the names of one of the candidates. If that check comes to you and it's wrong, you can't turn it into ELEC and say, "Well, that was a nice try." We understand the spirit of it. It has to go back, and you have to get another check, which is time consuming.

They can write a check for \$60 for Greenwald from a joint account as long as both people on the account sign the check, but they can't write you a check for \$60 for Greenwald and Lampitt. It's a little confusing, and we need to make this voter friendly. Because what we're trying to do is get them involved in the electoral process.

I'm very proud that I sponsored this legislation. I was pleased to hear our opponents today who came in and said it was good legislation. I'm proud that I was a sponsor. I'm proud that I've worked so hard on it with Linda Greenstein. I know Linda knows how hard I worked on this and how much this meant to me, and I know all of you know how hard I've

solicited to get this into this district, because I think it sends the right message. We need to make this voter friendly. We need support.

These candidates, incumbent and nonincumbent, are not going to be able to do this on their own. They need the support of the public. They need the support of this Commission. They need the support of people around the state to make this a reality. This district and the 13th District must be flooded with special interest groups that -- not coordinating with the campaigns, but on their own. Not endorsing candidates or getting people to sign up for this program. It's why I've gone to these media outlets and I have asked them to support the program, support our opponents; asked for the contributions for them, as well as for us.

The one other thing that I said earlier -- we have filed each time on the public filings. To my knowledge, at least we know for the first, we are the only team that has filed those. I know they're permissive. I think that sends the wrong message. The reality is, many people-- As I read *The Philadelphia Inquirer* article today, there was an individual that supported our opponents and gave a contribution to the program. And they said, "I'm doing this because I want to clean up the system." Well, I would like to call that person and say, "Boy, I'm glad you're really proud of this. I sponsored the legislation. I'd like you to write a \$5 contribution to my running mate and myself so that I qualify."

Part of the reason to list these contributions -- these aren't just people supporting us, they're supporting the program. So if you don't list your contributions, if you're embarrassed by the number you have or don't

have, and you don't list these contributions, you are defeating the purpose of this. People should, they must, file these.

Look, for good or bad, we're going to be at about 800. Now, unless we get a huge number in, and we're hoping to because of the events we have tonight and the events that follow in the next couple of days, we're going to be around 800. For better or worse, that's where we are. But my opponents and people, wherever they are, are going to be able to reach out to that list and say, "Support us." This has to be a joint effort. It has to be an effort that is intended to reform the machine politics -- the pay-to-play culture that people perceive exists in this state. And it can't be done on a partisan effort. It has to be done in a joint effort. There will be enough time in September and October for the partisanship. Trust me, I know you know that.

But the reality is, now today as a team, people need to get behind this effort and that's what I'm hoping for. That's what I hope will come from this. The last thing that I would say to you on the barriers that we are facing is, we and our opponents have been interviewed by four groups, so far that I know of, combined, that have interviewed both of us -- Sierra Club, New Jersey Environmental Federation, NJEA, and BIA. They're a bureaucracy, and I don't use that word in a negative sense. The way they are structured, though, is for a New Jersey political season that is September and October. Their endorsements come out at that time.

Our political season is to qualify right now. One of the things that we are dealing with is the problem that those endorsements that those groups give out, they are trying to get the candidates that support their public policy initiatives elected. Their endorsements -- while we have

received an endorsement already from the NJEA and the BIA -- if they come out as they just did this week, so late in the season, it takes time to communicate to their members that these are candidates that support their initiative, whether it is us or our opponents. We would ask for a \$5 contribution from you because we've received the endorsement of your organization. We can't do that, because there's just not enough time and there's not enough money in the system to be able to fund that. Now, we can take a risk and we can deficit spend if we like, but that's a risk if you don't qualify, and in particular if you're not an incumbent.

So I bring that to your attention, and I-- Look, we've invested a lot in this from a personal standpoint, not a financial standpoint, obviously. But this is an investment of time. I applaud everybody who has participated in this, Republican and Democrat alike. I will tell you, I've enjoyed it tremendously. I enjoy the grassroots politics. I think it is the greatest poll that you will ever do as to what public policy matters to people. I will tell you, when we're out there, what we are hearing from people is property taxes, property taxes, property taxes, and a dab of affordable healthcare.

I think a sign tonight of this room and this gathering is a sign that this is not on people's radar screens. I think that's a shame. And I'm not saying that because I think corruption is the issue. I think it is something that-- Corruption needs to be addressed by people individually from their own moral standard. And we need to continue to elect people of quality and character. But this needs to be a success, because this can be that wave of the future that eliminates machine politics, eliminates this notion that government is for sale to the highest bidder, whether it is or it

isn't. But that perception is there. This is the means and the message with which to clean it up. We need the support.

But while I'm asking for this public support of this and the media support of this, I think it's a one-time happening. I do believe that once people are aware of this program, as in other states, where tens of thousands of people signed the petition -- we didn't have that here. Where 300,000 people voted for this proposal, we didn't have that here. We responded from a good public policy standpoint first, and the public isn't engaged. We need your help, the media's help in a nonpartisan effort to promote this agenda, and time is of the essence. It is literally of the essence.

Any questions from anyone?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you, Assemblyman.

I think it should be noted that his running mate is out of town taking her daughter to college, or she would be here.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: She's taking her daughter to Christopher Newport tonight in Virginia. They're on the road, so--

SENATOR SCHLUTER: And we appreciate your comments. You certainly have given us a broad description of the situation, and we ask that you, of course, come back after the election and testify, as you have done. Because a lot of what you have said should be reported to us and is very appropriate after this program is over, to report it then.

Any questions from members of the Commission?

Okay.

MR. TAO: Thank you for our comments, Assemblyman.

First, I think I'm encouraged by your description of some of your grassroots efforts and what would be required to accomplish the various levels of contributions -- a thousand dollars of contributions, the \$5; 500 to \$30. I think that perhaps was one of the purposes of the legislation, to encourage that type of campaigning. What I would be interested in understanding a little bit -- I have three questions that I would like to ask you -- is to get your snapshot view. Because I'm sure after the process is over you'll have a view, and of course we would be delighted to have you back and would be very much interested to hear your thoughts.

But first of all, the period in which you've been able to solicit contributions -- late June, which will expire on September 7-- I'm of the view, and I think you may agree, that probably the bulk of your contributions that you would be able to receive would likely fall within the end of the period -- some time last week of August, more likely the first week of September following the Labor Day weekend. So we're really talking about maybe two or three days. But within that period, can you tell us what have been the dead periods, what have been the high-impact periods so far, as far as you can tell?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: You are correct. When we give this number of 800, again that is, I think, from an initial outlay to friends, family, people that we know, people that they've communicated with. The building blocks, as I talk about them, if someone wants to have a coffee for you, you can't ask them today and they're going to have the coffee tomorrow. They need to reach out to their neighbors, their group of interest. They need two weeks to do that. So a lot of these events have now been prepared and staggered for the end of this, so that we are building

momentum, and hopefully we'll make this number towards the end. More and more events are scheduled on the agenda as we get later into the season. So I think that is correct. You're going to see these number come in at the end.

What worries me is your comment about the dead period. We've seen one dead period already -- the 4th of July weekend. And more than the weekend, but the days before and the days after. That is a dead period. I suspect you will see another dead period around Labor Day weekend. And I am concerned about that, because that is where you're looking to build the momentum and really come to that final destination and cross the finish line in a sprint, so to speak, and not just stagger across the finish line. So I am concerned about that.

I don't know, though, that in all honesty, Commissioner, that if in future years that will be a same problem. Because the problem here was, people didn't know who was going to be selected. So you couldn't really build momentum. One of the things that we have always incorporated into our campaigns are volunteers from high school students. We reach out to the different high schools, and we get young people who want to be involved in the political process, but you didn't know how many to get or what you would need to help canvass the communities to get that grassroots effort. And once we were selected on June 27, it was after that period.

Now that this becomes more a status quo and people are aware of it, I think you're going to be able to do more of that sooner, rather than later. Also, as this program expands and more people are aware of it, you're not going to have to call people and say, "By the way, I want to talk to you about Clean Elections," and they're going to say, "Well, what is that?"

Explain that to me. Tell me what that is.” It’s a lot like -- as young, elected officials who are new to this process, when you’re invited to go to a legislative dinner with the NJEA where they want to talk about public policy issues, your first time through you really don’t know what it is. You’re not quite sure what to expect. But as you build momentum, as you get more engaged, you’re better prepared.

As this program has a better understanding, I think you will see those interest groups put their endorsements closer to this time period; that they will incorporate their mechanisms to help people qualify. People that are engaged in this process and want to be a clean candidate, even if they’re from a third party candidate, like a Green Party, or some other mechanism, will find candidates that have a backing to be able to go out and build momentum to get these 1,500 contributions.

I think the biggest problem, the dead periods, are amplified because of the lack of knowledge of the program.

MR. TAO: My second question -- and I apologize. I’ll reverse that. I’ll say I only have two questions, not three.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.

MR. TAO: My second question is, you stated about the legislation that your view is that there should be a greater role of this Commission and other third parties to encourage contributions, even by name, to the respective candidates. My view is, obviously, ELEC being the administrative authority that has the discretion to interpret the legislation, and this being an area of which, I think, arguably the legislation is silent and defers that interpretation to the administrative agency-- More specifically, what is your view-- I mean, in my opening statement -- my

statement, I think we can all agree, was permissible when I said support that legislation and make contributions to the candidate of your choice. Where would you draw the line in terms of this body or any third party, in terms of encouraging the contributions to each of the respective candidates?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I think that I would not ask this body, or any of the interest groups that aren't making endorsements. But I believe that this body and any group that's out there-- When you say that you support the legislation, you can't support the legislation if people don't understand what it is and you can't promote it. And to promote it to be a success, you have to identify the candidates on both sides in both districts and tell people that in order to qualify, in order for this to be a success, both candidates on both tickets have to qualify in order for the money to go into the district.

Look, if I make it and our opponents don't, it's a failure. If I make it and my running mate doesn't, we don't qualify. This only works if everyone qualifies, at least in one district, to have the opportunity to make it a real success. Unfortunately, because not everybody has filed on their filing dates, we don't know where everyone is or how close they are to qualifying. Pam and I may be in the minority here, and people are doing far better than we are. I don't know, because no one has really been public with where they are. That's why I came here tonight, and really felt it was very important to share with you where we are and the progress that we've made, and how we are looking to close that gap.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Can I say that, in the interest of time -- and you've been very, very candid with us and we appreciate all of this -- we must keep in mind that our job is going to really start after November

when we're going to be interviewing -- these same things. A lot of what you have said has gone through our minds already, and it is very, very good information. But in the interest of giving everybody a chance, we've got to really be tight on our comments.

And Assemblywoman, you had a comment. Then, Ms. Murphy.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: I found what you said, Lou, to be very, very interesting, and I've taken a lot of good notes here. Some of these were things I wondered about before. It sounds like one could easily draw the inference from what you said that the 3,000 contributions really is going to be very high for just about anybody. If somebody like you who's been so active for so many years would find it hard to get to that number, it's hard to believe anybody would be able to do it. Do you agree, or do you think, with an education process in place, that we may be able to have people get to that?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: It's interesting. As the sponsor of this legislation, I am a little concerned. I'm damned if I do, and damned if I don't. I think it's doable. I think if you reach out to some of these groups that can help you get 200 signatures-- If you literally say to somebody -- think about your household where you and your husband live, maybe you have two children of voting age -- you can get eight contributions out of that household. But you need to educate people to that process and how they can do it. And literally, if you could reach that group of people and ask them to come up with 20 people within that group to get three, \$30 contributions and five, \$5 contributions for each candidate, you can make it. And that's what we're doing. It's a very simple

process. We've broken it down. I think you scare people if you say, "Okay, we're going to rely on you to get us 200." I don't know about the rest of you. I was kind of raised that if you had great friends that you could count on one hand you were pretty lucky. I don't have 1,500 best friends that I can go to and ask for \$5 contributions. I'm asking that from other people. But I think it is doable and--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: It sounds like it's going to take a long period of time to get people to that point.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, that's why you have two months. And I come back to this: If you don't make it this year and you just give up and you say, "Well, it's too hard; we're not going to do it," well then, shame on you and then it does fail. But if you make a tremendous effort at this, if you don't give up, if you work tirelessly at this as we have, you have that database in place of however many thousand that you get, which is your building block for the next time.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: And you can build on it. Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And that's just not for me. That's for anybody who's interested in running for public office. And isn't that how we all build our constituencies? We've built them by reaching out to the public one person at a time asking them to tell a friend about what we've achieved and asking them to support what we believe in. And I think that's how you get there in the long run.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: I'm glad to hear your optimism on it, and we'll be looking forward to hearing how it turns out.

Thanks.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Excuse me, we do have to keep this tight.

Ms. Murphy.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Just one question, and thank you for speaking.

In theory, the entire database you have presently is a list you could have availed yourself of. Is that correct?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: The list you've built up over 10 years.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No, no, no. Because my database is people that I helped build a cancer center for in Essex County. They can't give to me. My database is a children's hospital in Morristown that I worked with on an obesity clinical trial. They can't help me.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Right. So that none of the people on that list are residents of this community?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: On my--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: On your database?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Under the current system of fundraising, no, of course, some of them are. But as a person who has worked hard for 10 years, as you did, your contributions came from lobbyists and businesses that you interfaced with.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Yes. Yes. I don't mean to argue.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: I don't mean to sound argumentative, Lou.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No, no. I know you're not. No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: I'm simply speaking to the fact that, in theory, there was a part of that list that was viable for you to use right now.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Sure. But those are--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: But the down side of the--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I'm a member of the Chamber.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Of course. Right, but--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: So I was a member of the Rotary years ago. My church--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: But the down side of that then, of course, is that all is published on this list and then becomes public knowledge for everybody, for a \$5 check or a \$30 check, which--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, the list doesn't, but those who contribute do.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: That's what I mean. So that to some degree, you are damned if you do and damned if you don't. You can use it or not, but it's a--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, I'm damned if I do, damned if I don't if the program succeeds. I think anyone who gives should be listed. I don't think that -- I would never say that anyone's entire personal list -- I mean, I use my Christmas card list.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Right. And I don't disagree with you.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I certainly wouldn't want that out in public, I can tell you that right now.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Absolutely. But I'm just saying, in talking to you about it, an incumbent has a database from which they can pick and choose--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: --to give them a kick-start, if you will, to a point.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And Carol, let me say to you-- But that's a touchy line. Bill and Linda were with me on the floor of the Assembly when we did the budget this year, and there was a young man who inspired all of us, by the name of Rocco Fiorentino -- a little blind boy who had been cut -- a reading program for Braille. One of the things that I worked on so hard in the budget process was to find government savings so that we could restore that program.

Rocco and his family are constituents of mine. I have to tell you something. I haven't asked Rocco's family for a contribution, and I'm not going to. And I think, you and I know, you -- you and I are a lot alike.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: No, I can understand that a whole lot.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But think about that. That's not-- I am a public servant. I am here to serve the public. My role has changed for two months, and I'm a little uncomfortable with it. When I knock on the door for 10 years, "My name's Lou Greenwald. I'm your

State Assemblyman. How can I help you?" Now, "My name's Lou Greenwald. I'm your State Assemblyman. Have you heard of Clean Elections? Let me tell you about it. Can you give me \$5?" I don't want any of my constituents to feel that-- We have always -- as honest, honorable, moral, ethic elected officials -- worried about the quid pro quo.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: And that's what starts this kind of--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But let me tell you something. The quid pro quo isn't based on the amount of money that's given. If a senior citizen is worried about their Property Savers Rebate and they feel that you're not going to listen to them unless they give \$5, then we have failed. We have failed.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: No, I appreciate that. But it's one of the reasons I did want to ask about that--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: So -- but that is a database, but, Carol, I'm uncomfortable going to that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Okay. And that's fine.
Thank you. Thank you, Lou.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: That was my question, Mr. Chairman.

Assemblyman, I appreciated all the comments that you made. And that's true -- and a lot of valid things that you have made about this whole Clean Elections campaign issue. But my thoughts, following what Carol said, is we as elected officials for years have our database of supporters who can contribute. Don't you think that's giving an incumbent

a leg up over the challenger who does not have a database, that's basically starting from knocking on that first door?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, Senator, let me give you an example. People that have contributed to my campaign in the past are people from a company called Lockheed Martin, which is a major employer in South Jersey. They employ 6,000 residents in South Jersey, and a number of whom probably live in my district. The employees of that contributor probably don't have a clue that Lockheed Martin has given to me for what I have done in a public policy standpoint on issues like homeland security to help a major, national defense contractor in this state, because it's good public policy. It's important to our state to keep safe. It's important from a business standpoint, from our economic standpoint. It's important from a constituent standpoint. The list goes on and on. That contributor, at least in my database, I have not gone to-- I've never asked a neighbor, county committee person for a contribution ever. Never wanted to and really probably never will. If they give through this process, hopefully they do, it helps us succeed. But that's not where I've gone. I've never asked them for a contribution.

I've gone to the NJEA. This is my governing style -- we don't always agree, hopefully you support it. The most important issue to the NJEA over the last couple of years -- Constitutional Convention. They were opposed to it. They just this week endorsed my candidacy. I hope because of my governing style. I hope because I have an open door. Because they know I have an open mind and will listen to their issues and the word *compromise*.

I have never called a database of teachers and said, "I've been endorsed by the NJEA, can you help me? Please give me a contribution." That's not my database. Maybe it's yours. It's not mine. It never has been. Because again, I come back to-- My feelings in this have been to be a public servant. I didn't want to go to those rank and file people. I was here to serve them. This is changing that dynamic a little bit. The rational side goes on and says, "Well, I'm asking for \$5." I'll tell you, unless you've done it, it's a tough thing to do.

SENATOR BUCCO: Oh, I imagine it is. I think it is.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: It's a tough thing to do.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Greenwald, really, with all due respect, he asked you a question I think that could have been answered with a yes or no. In other words, do you think incumbents have an advantage over nonincumbents?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: You don't? The answer is no.

All right. Now you have a question, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to find out how many county committee members are there in your district?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I don't know in my district. In the county, I think there's 305. Obviously, not all of them can give.

MR. DeLUCA: Okay. And--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But the Republican Party, as county committee as well -- the same in the 13th on both sides.

MR. DeLUCA: Right. In the last primary, how many voters voted in the primary election, roughly?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Five thousand.

MR. DeLUCA: So it's possible that this could be a target to go after since-- You didn't have an opponent, I would assume, in the--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm just concerned -- there's a lot of talk about this 1,000 threshold. And having worked on the front end of this and pushing it, I want to make sure that -- and you were concerned also about lessening the standards -- that that number was based-- I mean, there's 220,000 people in your district.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Correct.

MR. DeLUCA: The 1,000 is half of 1 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Correct.

MR. DeLUCA: So--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: That's why I say, I think this is doable.

MR. DeLUCA: I do think and I think that's the message that we want to make sure that we keep talking about. This is doable. There may be hurdles that we have to--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right.

MR. DeLUCA: --maybe lessen a bit, but this is a doable thing.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Mr. DeLuca, what I would say to you, though, is of that 5,000 people who voted in the primary, I would love to see a poll of them as to how many of them are aware of Clean Elections, what it is, and how they could give if they knew? That's the

problem right now. And we don't have the ability, because we don't have the funds. We literally have to call them one at a time.

MR. DeLUCA: Right. But Assemblyman, if they came out in a noncontested primary and voted for you, then they support your candidacy and they're good Democrats.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, they're core Democrats who would vote for this microphone, if it was -- some of them are-- Let's be honest.

MR. DeLUCA: Well--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: You understand the political process.

MR. DeLUCA: I understand that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right.

MR. DeLUCA: But that's what we're trying to do, is to move it so that the judgment is a little bit higher than the microphone.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But again, I come back to, they can only support us or our opponents if they're aware of it. And right now, I can tell you, they're not aware of it. We have had to educate elected officials in the district. So it is not something that is commonly known. Those elected officials are people that voted in that primary. And we went to those elected officials -- Democratic and independent-elected officials -- and we said, "Could you help?" "Well, what is it? Tell me what it is. How does it work?"

So I come back to -- you're right. I believe there is a base to get to. Just because they're a voter, I don't know that I have their phone number. I've got to figure out a way to get that. I've got to communicate

with them. And the most important thing, as you can imagine, this is another piece of junk mail that comes in, unless there's follow-up. And you need the resources and the ability to follow up. This ends up in the trash unopened like everything else that's not a bill in people's households, unless you can call them in advance and say you're getting this, and follow up, and say you're going to -- did you get this and will you contribute?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Baroni has a quick one.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Very, very briefly. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I apologize for my tardiness. I was actually here on time, but I was lost in the stacks here in the largest public library I've been to outside of New York City. (laughter) So I apologize for my tardiness.

You and I have a number of things in common. One of the things we have in common is our sort of passion for door-to-door campaigning. I think it's pretty well known in both of our parts of the world that we like to do that. And I've probably knocked on, over the last three years, 1,600 or 1,700 people's doors. And a very common reaction -- they're very kind when you, say, introduce yourself-- But it's that initial -- that look of you're either selling something or you're trying to change my religion. And once you sort of get over that hurdle, you can have a polite conversation. You may have addressed this in your comments before I got here, so tell me and I'll read them.

From a process perspective, there you are in Voorhees and you're knocking on a door, in a subdivision in Voorhees, and they kind of recognize you and then you hit them up for a check. What's the reaction of the voter? I got to tell you, I give you great credit, and your opponents, and

the folks in the 13th District, because it's got to be very hard -- the pure person by person has got to be very hard.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, my daughter is a Girl Scout. We're not selling Girl Scout cookies here. Let's face it, this is a much harder challenge.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Should we sell cookies with this?
(laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: It might be easier.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: The response is-- Look, I think you would agree that when you knock on a door people are impressed, in 97 degree heat, that you have bothered, as I do, to come in a suit and tie to knock on their door, introduce yourself, and that their Assemblyman cares enough to be out there. I found that when I was a challenger, as well as a sitting Assemblyman. I believe it's why I won -- a large part of why I won -- and I believe it's why I've been successful.

But I made the comment earlier that -- you have identified very well that initial reaction. "Jehovah's Witness? Who are you, why are you here? My Assemblyman, oh thanks." You have overcome it and I have overcome it for 10 years with the "What's on your mind? What can I do to help you?" We're not selling that right now. We're selling something that people haven't heard of and that, well, I think a lot of people believe that politics are corrupt. They don't believe that their politician is; I'm proud that they've put me in that group. But the reality is that I've had people say, "Well, why are you doing this?" You explain it, that takes more time.

You're right, Bill. It is a challenge.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Out of 10 houses that you get to, they ask -- how many of the 10 are writing a check?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I'd say one.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: That's what I figured.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: This is sales like anything else. If you could sell one out of 10 of anything that you were selling, you'd be having a nice career. You get a lot of people that are polite. No one says, "Get off my doorstep." I've never had that. "It's so hot. Can I get you something to drink? Do you want to sit down? Got the air conditioner on."

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Well, you're wearing a suit and tie -- in Hamilton, we just wear our golf shirt. It's much less formal.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Yes. The reality is, you get a great response. People are thrilled to see you.

I said before you came in, the other thing that the Commission has to look at, and we as a legislative body have to look at: Whether people want to dig in their pocket to give you \$5 to get you off their doorstep, to get you out of their hair, whatever it is, they're willing to do that. The check is a harder pull.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: And you certainly give us a lot to digest here.

I'd like to call on your two counterparts from the Republican side, Ms. Gurenlian-- Do you want to speak first, or do you want to speak together.

J O A N N G U R E N L I A N: We'll go together.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Okay, if you can.

MS. WINTERS: Could you just give your names.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Before you do that, let me just say a few things to the Commission. A lot of what is being said up here is going to form our opinions, and we want to keep open minds, because we have to make our judgments after this is over. So don't get too firmly embedded with some ideas that we might have adjusted or changed with further testimony.

Having said that, the last speaker, I was going to say that he had twice as much time as you have, because his running mate wasn't here. But it still took an awful long time. So I'd ask you to please keep it very, very short. What we'd like to find out -- and we found out from the other speaker, is that he is very much in favor of the program for these reasons, and he gave the reasons. So therefore, if we can start off -- either one of you -- give your name, and then the other one follow up.

Ma'am, would you like start? And how do you pronounce your name, again?

MS. GURENLIAN: I'm JoAnn Gurenlian.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Gurenlian.

MS. GURENLIAN: Gurenlian, yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

MS. GURENLIAN: Thank you very much.

Why don't you introduce yourself?

MARC FLEISCHNER: And I'm Marc Fleischner.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. Fleischner.

Lead off.

MS. GURENLIAN: And thank you so much, by the way. It's very nice to meet all of you. And we do appreciate having the opportunity to participate in the process. And like Assemblyman Greenwald, we do believe in the process, and we are excited by it. So let's just say that first off. And I think it's long overdue.

I have my own written report, so I can give that to you, and I'll make an effort to be brief, because we all know time is of the essence. I think many individuals, as we've knocked on doors, have expressed the opinion that this is a wonderful thing, because it levels the playing field. It allows an opportunity for both parties to get their messages across. And the message is more important than anything else.

So that being said, I think that's the real reason why we want this process to continue. Is that brief enough?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much. And it's very powerful what you've said.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I think I'll probably go into a little bit more detail. I think this is a great project. It's an absolute great project. I am brand new to politics. I have never run for an office. To be running for a State office and have a chance to run a completely issue-oriented campaign is absolutely fantastic. Because that's really what it should be about. It shouldn't be about big money.

But I'm also a computer person. So I've run lots of pilot projects and know that they're there to find bugs. And I think we're finding a lot of bugs.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON FROM AUDIENCE: Could you ask them to talk into the microphone?

MS. WINTERS: The mikes don't amplify, they record.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: They'll just have to--

MS. WINTERS: Speak up.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: --speak like you're on a street corner talking to constituents.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Okay. There are a lot of bugs, and we'll get to them in a minute. But the good thing is that we are going out. We have a chance to run a real issue-oriented campaign. And people that we do talk to are very excited about it.

MS. GURENLIAN: Can we, at some point now, talk about our findings and our recommendations?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes, we'll talk about the findings. But keep in mind that after this is over, that that's when the real time for us to digest all of these findings-- Make it brief and succinct if you can, and speak out loud so they can hear you over there.

MS. GURENLIAN: Okay. Marc and I have been doing the same things as Assemblyman Greenwald and Pam Rosen Lampitt have been doing -- walking door-to-door, sending out mailings, phoning, doing coffees -- all the same things. I mean, all the usual things that you would think of to solicit contributions. And we find similar responses as had already been presented.

But we do have some things that we think should be considered by the Commission as future thoughts for making this a better program. Because it is something that we think is worthwhile and important to continue. Personally I would recommend that the process start sooner than the Summer months. I think if we're going to do this and we want this to continue, this should start in February or March. Because it seems to be focused on fundraising versus getting your message out, the fundraising part of this should end around June. And that gives an opportunity, then, to work on your strategy sessions for getting your message out and having the Fall to really campaign on your message.

The summertime is dead, quite frankly. People are on vacation, and it makes it a lot harder to be doing this process when people are away. And trying to get these contributions when they're just simply not answering their door is a problem. And I think that should be taken into consideration. And again, it's just a recommendation.

Another thing that I think needs to be taken into consideration is the number 3,000. I don't think 3,000 is a problem in the sense that it's not doable, given the fact that there's 200,000 people within your district. I think the problem is that if one candidate doesn't reach their goal and the other candidate does, then there's the penalty factor that both candidates fail. I think the idea here is that there should be success, not failure for both individuals. And I think that should be something that should be taken into consideration.

And another thing, just in going through this process, when you're knocking on a door and you're explaining this -- and it can be long-winded. And you then get to the point where somebody's ready to write

the check, but you have to be honest about this and explain. Because they say, "Well, what happens if you don't get your 3,000?" And you say, well then, if we don't make it, the money goes to the opposite party. And then somebody says, "Whoa, I don't like that. I'm not writing a check to them. I'm writing the check to you. I don't like that part of it." And we have to remember now, we're not penalizing the public -- and that's the impression they're getting from this. So that's the other part of this.

If we want something that's supposed to be fair, who is it fair to? Is it fair to the people who are running? Is it fair to the public? Can we be fair to everyone in that process? So that's something I'd like to bring to your attention to be considering as a part of this process. Let's make sure that we're not being punitive to the public, as part of the process.

And I know Marc has more of these as well. But I just wanted to bring those points across, to keep in mind as we're considering making this a better process for everyone involved. Because we are the common people who want to be in office to make good decisions, to make good government happen for people within our district. We want to qualify. We want to be there. We want to make this happen and be successful. We love the idea of having a clean and fair process for everyone, but these are stumbling blocks, and they make it harder to try to make this happen.

Thank you.

MR. FLEISCHNER: And I'm going to echo some of JoAnn's sentiments. The reality is, based on the way the rules are, if one pair of candidates succeeds and the other two does not -- in our case, that means if somebody gets a quarter of a million dollars come September 8 and the other people have zero, I think we can all assume that basically the election

is over then, instead of being decided by the people on Election Day. So that is a big problem with the legislation. If everybody's trying, there should be some mechanism for rewarding everybody for trying. The reality for us is, in our district, District 6, there are four Democrats to every one Republican. We're at a huge disadvantage there. So you talk about the number of registered voters, a lot of them are registered for the other team for us. That's a reality. We know that going in. It's a challenge we want to face. Because again, if we're running a message, we want the message to get to everybody.

Also, we don't have the same organization that our opponents have. The best way I can liken it is, we're the mom and pop pharmacy, and we're running against the combined strength of Walgreens, CVS, and WalMart. (laughter) So it makes it that much -- difficult. I think the Assemblyman said that they can get to 50 or 60 people a night. Well, my reality -- I know JoAnn's reality is -- we both work full-time jobs. By the time we get home from those jobs, it's 6:00 already. By the time we try to eat something, change to go out, it's already 6:30. That really only gives us two hours a night to go out. And we don't have the army of people to go out and get this.

Now, we are "major party candidates." But the reality is, this is a Democrat county, okay? So we don't have those armies of people. So it is a lot harder for us to reach that goal.

Also, the dead period, the question about the dead period, all of Summer is a dead period, and I have to stress that. Because families are away at the shore. This is a big shore area. They're away for two, three weeks at a time. They're away every weekend. Most people in this area

have shore houses. So it's very hard to reach those people. I know, I went walking one night after work just by myself. In a two-and-a-half hour period, I was only able to get to nine houses and four people weren't home. The five people that I did get to talk to kept going over and over and over it again. I know the math doesn't add up, but everybody wanted to know more and more about the legislation. So we got bogged down to it. And every time I tried to explain it to them, leave literature, they had more questions.

So we came up with a form -- which is the biggest problem. We're inventing the wheel. We're inventing fire. We don't know what works, we don't know what doesn't work. So, for us, we can't afford -- because the reality is we have six weeks. We don't have eight weeks, we have six weeks. And that's very, very difficult to qualify at these numbers.

That being said, we are very positive about the process, and we are working very hard to try and follow it.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much.

Questions?

Yes, Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Okay. Yes. Let's get something straight in the minds of everyone that's here. When the term is used *walking door-to-door*, that doesn't mean that you go on Block A and you knock at the first door, and then you go to the second door, and then you go to the third door, and then you go to the fourth door. You have a walking list which lists all the Republicans and all the Democratic households. So in Block A, you may hit the first house, maybe a Republican. And as you say, there's

four-to-one Democrats in this county. Fortunately, in my district, it's just the opposite. But anyway, you may have one house in Block A, and then you may have to go to Block C or B to find another house with a Republican to do it. This is not walking down the street one door at a time. So it is a disadvantage to a challenger trying to get this completed and trying to qualify. And I see that as a major problem. I see that right now.

The second part, and what you have said, JoAnn -- if I may call you that -- is the reaction of people hearing that if you do not qualify, your money goes to the opponent. Because I've already been out talking to my committee people telling them about the Clean Elections, that I sit on the Commission, explaining it to them, and that's a question that has been asked at every Committee meeting. What happens if they don't qualify and the other candidate does? I said, they get their money. And then they say, "Well, why should I contribute and then my money goes to their opponent? I don't want it to go to their opponent," or "Why is their opponent getting additional money just because they qualify?"

So it is a problem. And I think we had this discussion, Mr. Chairman, probably in our first or second meeting, I think when we were at Douglas College. We talked about the same thing. So I see this as a major problem.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much. And you have articulated it very well.

Assemblywoman Greenstein.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Thank you.

Hi, how are you?

MS. GURENLIAN: Hi.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Good evening.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Best of luck on your campaign and your hard work. It's commendable.

I wanted to ask, did both of you come into politics with what Assemblyman Greenwald called *communities of interest*, were you both active, lot of different groups out there?

MS. GURENLIAN: Yes. I've been active in many different organizations and active in my professional organization, which is what inspired me to move into this realm.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Because I think the point he made, which I think is another interesting one about this whole process is, there will be some people who try to do this who have absolutely none of that. And he expressed the opinion, which I've heard expressed, that perhaps this should favor the people that do come into this with communities of interest. And those would be logical groups to go to, obviously. Because I would think doing this door-to-door would have to be very, very difficult, near next to impossible. But if you've got those communities out there--

For example, as you heard, all the Republicans who would have voted for you in a primary, or whatever, I would think that would be the first place you'd want to go and try to get money from people who are likely to give to you.

MR. FLEISCHNER: The difficult part for me is finding people in my district. I happen to work at a university and most of my people in those groups are college students that don't live in my district. So that makes it very difficult.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: I see what you're saying.

MS. GURENLIAN: And the other thing, remember, is when you do a mass mailing or things like that to people who voted in the primary, or within your district or whatever, they see something that comes in the mail -- and what's the first thing they do, if they see a political piece is toss it. And so you have to have more than one vehicle to get at somebody.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Oh, absolutely.

MS. GURENLIAN: And when you have a limited amount of seed money, that money has to be used very carefully to have the greatest impact.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: So it's hard to do mailings.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Right.

MS. GURENLIAN: So it is hard to do just one thing that is going to have an impact. And again, so it has to be multiple vehicles, and door-to-door is important in this because you have a limited amount of seed money to work with.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Just one more thought that I've had throughout this whole process, and having been a sponsor of the bill, it's something that I wondered about. When you go to the door, it is very hard to get people -- you will get some -- but it's very hard to get people to actually say to you, "You have my vote," especially when you're new. It begins to happen when you've been in for a while, and it happens as the election season goes on. But earlier in the season, people withhold

that. I would think if you then ask them for \$5, because that's a real bond, that's a commitment, that's more than a handshake, they are committing to you. And I would think that would be hard earlier in the season. They might do it two weeks before the election when they've decided, but I just think that's tough to get them to make that jump. I think it's hard enough to get them to just say, "I'll support you." This is a real money commitment to that.

MR. FLEISCHNER: And I'd go a step further, as well, to say that voting for somebody even in a primary is very different than contributing to a campaign, as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: But these are all issues that we have to look at.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Yes. So in our case, we only had about 4,000 primary voters. So if we get 5 percent, we still have a long way to go.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Using the prerogative of the Chair, I'm going to remind Commission members, you mentioned community of interest. And it seems to me that the political party is a community of interest. And I think that's something for us to assess, not in individual questions now, as to how much a party -- because that counts for something -- is going to be a factor, rather than this retail door-to-door.

Curtis, you have a question.

MR. TAO: Thank you for coming to speak, and thank you for your description of the, in your view, dead period, which constitutes the Summer, for purposes of raising these contributions.

My second question to Assemblyman Greenwald, and I pose to you, is that do you have a view as to where the line should be drawn with respect to advocating in support of the legislation in the pilot program and contributing to a candidate of your choice, and where you become an advocate for the candidate, him or herself, and trigger in-kind contribution reporting requirements?

MS. GURENLIAN: I do. I feel that the process should be advocated for, versus an individual candidate. And that there should be information provided that allows individuals to know where they can contribute for, and information provided for, all candidates, versus for one candidate. I don't think it would be clean or fair if a group advocated for one candidate. I think that defeats the whole point of being clean and fair. I think that if you provide information and say this is the process, this is what is available to the voters of the district, and this is where you can send -- if you're interested, these are the candidates, these are their Web sites, or whatever, this is where you can contribute; and then let that person make their decision. That's appropriate.

MR. TAO: So your view, just to nail it down, is that you may name the specific candidates by name, but you must name all candidates.

MS. GURENLIAN: Absolutely.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Absolutely. As the Assemblyman said he is, we are also reaching out to the different media to advocate, "Please put both campaigns down." As far as other groups, we don't think they should

be involved in the process. If it's going to be fair and clean and we're going to eliminate outside groups, unless an outside group is advocating for all candidates, it shouldn't be allowed in the process, and it should be considered in-kind.

MS. GURENLIAN: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you, Curtis.

Carol, did you have a--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: I was just going to say that I did agree with that concept. I think Assemblyman Greenwald spoke about being interviewed by some organizations who are lobbying organizations in this state. And clearly an endorsement in the paper by them, for him, while it might encourage more money going to him, that's clearly an endorsement of a lobbying organization, and it's back to the same kind of money we're trying to get rid of.

MS. GURENLIAN: We actually, when we went on our interviews, were very careful, and we asked groups not to make any statements or have anything that would make any exceptions that would even seem as though there was impropriety in that direction, associated with us. We were very careful about that. We were very concerned about having interviews or anything that people would get the wrong impression about it. In fact, we even went to the Commission and asked, "Would it be okay to participate as far as going forward with interviews, or having endorsements?" because of our concern about that very thing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: May I ask if the local newspapers have interviewed all the candidates?

MS. GURENLIAN: We have just begun to have some interviews. And yes, they had asked. And we have said, “Well, if you’re going to interview us, could it be all of us that will participate?” Or when someone has said, “We’d like to publish something,” we said, we want all candidate information included. Because we feel that’s the most appropriate way to handle it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Incidentally, Ms. Murphy, in your package you’ll see an article from today’s *Philadelphia Inquirer*, which--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Yes, I did.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: You did. And I do happen to know that tomorrow you are, all four candidates, are going to be interviewed by *The Philadelphia Inquirer* at an editorial board meeting.

MS. GURENLIAN: Yes. Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Assemblyman Baroni.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: I’m good.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I have one more statement, if I could make?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Oh, go ahead.

MR. FLEISCHNER: A question that was previously asked was, did the incumbents have any advantage in this? I know the Assemblyman answered no, but from our point of view, absolutely. Just the selection process, the fact that it is selected by the political parties. I know once we got selected, while we knew that we might be getting this and we had

planned for it, we needed extra time to implement those plans. So that's why our time period to do this really went from eight weeks down to six weeks. There are other instances, as well, as they have established lists that they can go to that do give the incumbents a huge advantage. And I just wanted to make sure that got out there.

MR. DeLUCA: Well, Mr. Chair, if I may?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: On the other hand, if you did qualify, your campaign jointly would get \$130,000, which is more than 10 times any amount that the Republicans spent in 2001 and 2003. So I'm not sure that you could say in this instance that the incumbent would have any benefit, because you'd both be getting 65,000 each, 130,000.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Provided we--

SENATOR BUCCO: Qualify.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Qualify and get-- And everybody says it's 1,500 contributions. It's not.

MS. GURENLIAN: It's 3,000.

MR. FLEISCHNER: It's 3,000 contributions. Because if I get my 1,500 and JoAnn gets 1,499, our opponents get a quarter of a million dollars. So, again, as I stated with my opening remarks, I'm a computer person. Pilot projects are to fix things. And I think things can be fixed and change. Because I do believe that this is great legislation, and this is the way that things should be done in the future, but we need to fix what's wrong with the legislation. And I commend you all for doing just that.

SENATOR BUCCO: How many Republican voters came out in the last primary?

MR. FLEISCHNER: About--

MS. GURENLIAN: Four thousand, nine hundred.

SENATOR BUCCO: Four thousand. So you need 3,000 out of the 4,000.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Right. (laughter) But we've got to find them. And I think they're all at the shore.

MR. DeLUCA: That's only 1,000 less than the Democrats. We heard about the Democrats.

MS. GURENLIAN: Right. That's right.

MR. DeLUCA: So it sounds like it's pretty even.

MS. GURENLIAN: And one other thing that I think is important, when you're looking at making the improvements, is to -- most people are of information technology now, and like the idea of going online to do their banking, to do all their work. And I think many people have said, "Why can't I just go online and make my contribution?" And they could also fill out that lengthy little form with all their personal information that they don't like to give out, as well. But that's one clean and simple way of doing the process that may be very helpful in the future for doing this process, and something very efficient, too. So again, it's just something to think about for the next go-round.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Do you feel, both of you feel that the staff in Trenton, and the Election Law Enforcement Commission, and the information that has been disseminated about this is sufficient to give you all that you need to know, or do you feel that it's been lacking, or do you feel that there's been a poor response in any respect?

MS. GURENLIAN: For the first two weeks of this process, I think there was a lot of balls in the air. We would call every day with multiple questions, and the response would be, "We will have to get back to you on that." And I think that hindered the process. That's to be perfectly honest with you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: How is it now?

MS. GURENLIAN: Now it's much better. Everybody's on a roll now with the process.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Right.

MS. GURENLIAN: But I think in the beginning it was hard. We kept presenting questions saying, "What if this, or what do we do with that, or how do we go about?" and that took a little bit of time to get going.

MR. FLEISCHNER: The staff was very good at getting us the information, but they had to find the answer. Because, since again, we're creating a wheel here.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Right.

MR. FLEISCHNER: So as all of these questions came up, which is another reason why it's in reality six weeks -- because there are so many question marks -- we wanted to make sure that we stay within the spirit of the law. So every time a question came up, we would contact ELEC. They would get us an answer, but the answer might have taken a couple of days.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: We thank you very, very much for your comments and--

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Mr. Chairman?

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: A very quick question. I asked Chairman Greenwald, out of 10 doors that he knocked on, how many would contribute? And he said, "One." Let me ask you this question this way. Out of the 10 doors that you would knock on, how many have heard of this program?

MS. GURENLIAN: None.

MR. FLEISCHNER: None. All 10 of them when we were done, but that's why it takes two hours. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Yep. No, you're right about that.

MS. GURENLIAN: They love it when you tell them about it, but they haven't heard of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: So the Legislature -- we created this program, and you've been chosen -- not only chosen, because you have to get the checks to participate -- you all are also, sort of, messengers of what it is.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Right. Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: I think we probably dropped the ball and it should have been our job to tell people what it is.

MS. GURENLIAN: That would have been helpful.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Can I just say something to this person. Your testimony is very impressive. The testimony of Assemblyman Greenwald was very impressive, that you're for the program. Now there's some people that might be thinking that, well, if it doesn't work, if one set

of candidates doesn't get the qualifying number or both sets don't get the qualifying, then the whole thing is trashed. I don't believe that.

MS. GURENLIAN: No.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Because I believe that, even if it doesn't come up to the qualifying amount, what your experience is giving us and what it will be giving us after the election is where to build on for the future. And even though this might not be a district where all candidates qualify, we will still learn enough to go forward and make a good run of it in the future.

MS. GURENLIAN: Sir, everything that we have brought forward is a reasonable, fixable recommendation, and there's no reason why this program could not continue.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much.

MS. GURENLIAN: Thank you.

MR. TAO: Good luck.

MS. GURENLIAN: Thank you.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Good luck.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Let me remind the members of the Commission that the amount of money that each candidate gets who qualifies is \$65,100 in this district. And keep in mind that after September 7, which is the last day that they can collect to qualify, then the program still goes on. And if they are qualified, they get into debates. And the debates are run underneath this program in the Fall, which helps to level the playing fields.

Now, we do have other people who want to testify. I wonder if -- she's just gotten up -- Marilyn Askin, if you would come up here and identify yourself and present your testimony.

M A R I L Y N A S K I N: Well, in the interest of time, first of all, I endorse Curtis Tao's statement here about the need and the necessity for this legislation and for this to be a success. We've heard some very compelling testimony. These are things I think that can be fixed -- online registration; cash, taking cash, but writing a signed receipt or something. These things can be made voter friendly.

I represent AARP. We have 1.35 million members in New Jersey. We have about 6,000 members in the two legislative districts here. We sent out letters to all of them. I don't know whether they got trashed or dumped, letters and pledges. I don't know when they were sent, but I do have copies of the letter. So we want to inform-- As you know, we're nonpartisan, and we have never made one contribution to a political candidate. Our only contribution is our vote, and we tend to vote higher than the rest of the population. And that's why this is so important. We want special interests and special money interests out of politics. We want citizens to make decisions.

I was so delighted when I heard these folks talking about their grassroots efforts to discuss issues with people. And it's so wonderful if they do get elected under a clean election. They're not going to be beholden to any special interest, regardless of what Assemblyman Greenwald says, as far as the public interest is concerned. They're going to be beholden to their constituents and to their consciences, and we hope that this Commission -- and I know several of you -- and I know you went up to Maine. I mean,

that's what I found exciting. In Maine -- AARP supported it in both Maine and in Arizona. But Maine, what's even most impressive is the number of women who have been elected to the Legislature. In New Jersey, what do we have -- 19 women in the Senate and the Legislature? I think this process, if it's statewide, will open it up to much better representation of our citizenry.

So good luck, Commission. I know you've all been chosen because of your dedication, your commitment to make this work, and we hope you do make it work.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Questions of Ms. Askin? (no response)

I have a question. What is your official position with AARP?

MS. ASKIN: Oh, I'm the State President, which is a volunteer position. And I want you to know I came down from West Orange today to Cherry Hill--

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I'm glad you said that.

MS. ASKIN: --to testify, because it's very, very important for our members that this pilot project work and that it be extended to the entire state.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: I will say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the groups that I think has -- where you talk to people -- who are not in one of the targeted districts -- who know about Clean Elections, is members of the AARP. They are aware of this issue.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

MS. ASKIN: Well, we have money to send out mail.
(laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Ms. Askin, did you make copies of the letter available to all of us, please?

MS. ASKIN: Yes, they're both back there, and I'll pass them around. There are two: There's both the pledge and the letter.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Ms. Askin, excuse me?

MS. ASKIN: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I think the *Courier Post* fellow was outside the door. Ms. Askin just gave testimony. She's head of the State AARP, and maybe you could interview her about-- I don't mean to be getting into your business, but--

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Poor Alan Gunther. Alan was ready to go home. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: No such luck.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: All right.

Mr. Naum, if you could come up and identify yourself and give your testimony.

N I C K N A U M: My name is Nick Naum. I've lived in Cherry Hill for 50 years. I'm a veteran of World War II. I've been fighting for everything, from the Constitutional Convention-- I've been fighting-- I'm from Maine, okay? I have every article for the last two years for Maine and Arizona on this. That's how strong I believe in it. I've been writing letters-- Here. I've gone to the politicians. I went to Geist on this. They liked the idea, but they can't support it because it won't get them elected. Okay?

This is the only chance we have to save this country, is Clean Elections. I go to all the senior groups I'm involved with. Right now, I'm with seven groups. Okay? And I've been talking about this for two years. I have letters thanking me for the idea. But as they say, "You can't win, Nick." This is the attitude that the average citizen has. What's the use of voting -- it's a strong politician.

Here's some statistics from Arizona that really shook me up. They're really good. They say the voter turnout increased 23 percent -- 247 people that weren't on the board. And those that were on the board, all they had to put on their name -- I'm a member of FACE. Thirty-nine percent of the people in Maine who said they were a member of FACE got elected. That shows you that there's action there and the little guy, whether it's Maine or Arizona, it's catching on. And this is the only chance that we have -- is getting to the regular guys like-- What would a guy like me have a chance of -- vote to be a politician. I don't. I'm not a politician.

I'm a veteran. But I don't like what I'm seeing in this country, because this country, we're going down the tubes, unless the little guy like me and the little guy can vote. And the only way I'm going to vote is with Clean Elections. Believe me, anything you want to know about Arizona or Maine (indiscernible). When I go to Maine -- because my family is there, I was born and raised there. I go there every-- I just went back for my 65th high school class reunion. Okay? Out of 220 in my class, only 31 of us left, so I can complain all I want. But when I go to Maine, that's the first thing they say to me, "You're from New Jersey. My God, what's going on down there?" I'm so sick and tired from hearing this about New Jersey, that I've lived here for 50 years. I said, "We got a great state here. We just

got to clean it up.” And we’re only going to clean it up with politics. That’s the only chance that we have.

And then when I go back to Maine, I’ll cut out more articles, and I’ll say, “Look what we did. Look at what we did. We just did this. We just did this.” Believe me, gentlemen, this is our only chance. The only problem we have here is the people are not aware of what this is about. And when you go to somebody and ask for \$5, they’re going to ask you more questions about a \$5 donation than if you have to give \$100 donation. They’re going to question-- And people don’t want to give that information out about their personal business for a \$5 bill. They can’t. The whole idea is this has got to be publicized where people know what we’re talking about. You can’t go door-to-door and expect they’re going to say, “Yes, come in. I will.” It can’t be. Somehow--

Do you know how I knew about this show tonight? I’m a volunteer at the library. I’ve been volunteering in this library for six years. I’m here three days a week. The only way I know about this was on -- because I saw it on the bulletin board. Now that is wrong. The people should know this was going on. People like me, that would sit in the audience. How come I knew about it? Because I happen to be in the library, because I’m a volunteer for the library. Look, whatever you want to know -- Citizen Action Group, Senior Citizen Advisory Board, you name it -- I’ve got it.

Now, why should I have to come to the library to know there’s going to be a meeting here tonight? This is a very important meeting. Do you want to know why people aren’t here? They don’t know anything about it. And you’ve got to publicize it, and you’ve got to get

(indiscernible). This is the only chance, gentlemen and ladies, to save this country and the way it's going down the tubes.

Thank you. I've bitched long enough.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

Any questions?

SENATOR BUCCO: Can I ask you one question, though?

MR. NAUM: Yes, sir.

SENATOR BUCCO: Did you donate to your preferred candidate?

MR. NAUM: No, sir. I'm going to.

SENATOR BUCCO: Okay.

MR. NAUM: Yes, yes. That's why I came down. I want to know a little bit more about what's going on here. I know what's going on in Maine and Arizona. I want to know what's going on here.

SENATOR BUCCO: Well, was this meeting advertised, Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Pardon me?

SENATOR BUCCO: Was this meeting advertised?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Actually, it's in your papers today. It was in *The Philadelphia Inquirer* today, the notice of it.

Mr. Naum, where do you live?

SENATOR BUCCO: That was the only advertisement?

MR. NAUM: I live in Cherry Hill 50 years.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: So you live in this district?

MR. NAUM: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: So you can give to these -- you can give to four candidates, you know?

MR. NAUM: Yes. Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: If you believe in the system, I'm sure you will.

MR. NAUM: I will. You bet I will. But I just wanted to know a little bit more about what was happening in New Jersey, besides Maine and Arizona. I really got hurt because I didn't know about this meeting. So I just come to the library because I volunteer, and I saw it on the bulletin board. Now, that's wrong. That's why you don't see people here. If we knew something about it, we'd be here. There are more people like me. Believe me, there are a lot more.

I've gone to every senior group there is in New Jersey and in Cherry Hill -- the maturity clubs, the retirement clubs, the CZNNA (phonetic spelling), you name it. And I keep talking about FACE, F-A-C-E, they don't know what I'm talking about -- Fair and Clean Elections. That's what FACE means. And that's the only chance we got.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you, sir.

MR. TAO: Sir, thank you for coming to speak. Thank you for your uplifting comments.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Thank you.

SENATOR BUCCO: Thank you, Mr. Naum.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Micah Sifry, from Public Campaign. Sorry we've had to make you wait, and if you can identify yourself and where you are from, Mr. Sifry.

MICAH SIFRY: Sure. Thank you.

My name is Micah Sifry. I'm Senior Analyst with Public Campaign, which is a campaign finance reform group based in Washington, D.C., though I actually work out of my office in New York. Public Campaign works closely with states and localities that are considering and implementing voluntary full public financing programs for candidates running for office. We are very happy to welcome New Jersey to the group of states that are doing this -- freeing candidates from reliance on lobbyists and well-heeled donors.

The group of states and localities also include Arizona, Maine, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Vermont, as well as Portland, Oregon. It's a pretty good group to belong to. Although, let's be honest, New Jersey is clearly superior to all the rest when it comes to growing a great tomato. (laughter)

I'm going to just abridge my comments because I know it's late, though I do have testimony and I can leave you with copies. We've all seen the corrosive effect that private campaign money has on elections. I just want to say one set of statistics about New Jersey that hasn't come up yet tonight. Here in New Jersey, part of the problem is, is that privately funded candidates seek their contributions from a small elite section of the population. According to a study done by New Jersey Citizen Action, 90 percent of the cash collected by candidates in the 2003 State legislative elections came from zip codes with a white majority. Only 1.8 percent came from predominantly Latino areas -- a 50-to-1 ratio. Less than 1.1 percent came from predominantly African-American zip codes. That means

that white areas outspent black areas 85 to 1, even though the actual population ratio is 8 to 1.

Indeed, in 24 of the 26 New Jersey zip codes where at least 80 percent of the population are people of color, the average contribution to State elections was less than \$1 per person. The unfortunate result is that ethnic minorities find themselves at a disadvantage in a system where all voices and votes are supposed to be equal.

Now, by enacting a Clean Elections Pilot Program to test publicly financed elections, New Jersey is taking an important step towards creating a system that supports candidates and is more responsive to voters. Clean Elections is based on the values of fairness, accountability, and common sense. It creates new opportunities for people to run for office on a level playing field; encourages a greater diversity of candidates; and allows voters, rather than lobbyists and big campaign donors, to hold politicians accountable.

In states that have Clean Elections systems already up and running, we are seeing clear results. Arizona and Maine have offered full public financing to legislative and statewide candidates since 2000. And in those states, we're seeing a more diverse group of candidates running for office and facing more competition when they do so, which I think is, in general, healthy for democracy.

What's more, clean money systems are popular, and getting more so, as evidenced by how many candidates from both parties choose to run clean in these states. In Maine, 83 percent of the state's senate and 77 percent of the house is currently made of legislators who ran with full public financing. In Arizona, 10 of 11 statewide officeholders ran under the Clean

Elections system, including the governor. In addition, about 48 percent of the state house and 23 percent of the state senate ran using public funding, which is an increase from the previous election cycle.

Even more impressive is what the publicly financed candidates have to say themselves about their experience. And I applaud you for coming and listening to the candidates who are involved in the experiment here, and I would certainly suggest that you talk to other candidates from other states who have done this.

Beth Edmonds, who is a children's librarian and the senate majority leader in Maine, says, "Your legislator is basically beholden only to you, and you have as much access as anybody else. Whether you're the poorest person or the richest person, you still have equal representation." Bill Mundell, who is a corporation commissioner in Arizona, which is a statewide elected position, says, "It gives the candidate the opportunity to spend time with voters, listen to voters, and not to have to constantly spend time raising money from the special interests and their lobbyists."

So congratulations to New Jersey for enacting this pilot program. We hope to work with you in crafting a sensible, demonstrated program to bring publicly financed elections to all your races. After all, in New Jersey as everywhere else in this country, if anyone is going to own the politicians, it might as well be us.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

Questions from members of the Commission?

Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: In the other states, when they got this off the ground, were there similar problems with lack of public knowledge, candidates not meeting thresholds?

MR. SIFRY: Well, each state has designed their programs according to local conditions and what they thought would make sense. So I think, ultimately, some of those decisions are really for you, though it is worth looking at the other states. First of all, you should recognize that in Maine and Arizona, in both cases, these systems were first adopted by initiative. So you had a statewide campaign that involved the public in the question, and a lot of people, obviously, voted one way or the other, but they knew about it.

Secondly, in both cases, what we were having were -- these were statewide systems that were being implemented over a couple of years. And in both cases, part of the legislation includes a provision for the appropriate government body -- whether it's the ethics commission or a clean election commission -- to go out and educate the public about the program, about the opportunity to make a \$5 contribution, about the tax check-off opportunity, and so on. And there were also nonprofit groups in those states that were involved in doing public education as well. So, no question, there is a process of familiarization that goes on.

Did I answer your whole question, I'm not sure?

MR. DeLUCA: Did the candidates run into problems with the collection and qualification?

SENATOR BUCCO: Qualifying.

MR. DeLUCA: Qualifying. Things you're hearing tonight.

MR. SIFRY: I would say the experience in Maine and Arizona has been different. The qualifying thresholds are not as high. The paperwork requirements, I think, are a little bit less difficult. So in terms of qualifying, I do encourage you to look at and make a comparison. However, I have to say, at the end, we as a national organization hesitate to tell particular states, "This is the cookie cutter. You have to do it this way or that way." I think you have to respond to your own -- the conditions and the culture in which you're most familiar, and we're not nearly as familiar. So I think determining what that threshold is, is very much a local decision.

SENATOR BUCCO: What are the thresholds in Arizona and Maine?

MR. SIFRY: For state legislative--

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MR. SIFRY: --of comparable-- I have the numbers with me back there, but a state house seat in Arizona would have a population of about 170,000, which I guess is a little bit smaller than the district here. And the qualifying threshold there is 200, \$5 contributions. I think that's the closest comparison for you.

SENATOR BUCCO: That's in where?

MR. SIFRY: Arizona.

SENATOR BUCCO: What's in Maine?

MR. SIFRY: Oh, the districts are much smaller in Maine. I think the average house district is about 35 or 37,000, and the qualifying threshold is 150--

SENATOR BUCCO: Five dollar. Okay.

MR. SIFRY: --\$5. Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Other questions of Mr. Sifry? (no response)

Mr. Sifry, did the other states have a pilot program for a year before they went into it full-scale, or did they go into it full-scale in their first year after approval?

MR. SIFRY: No, they went straight in.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: They went straight in.

MR. SIFRY: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: So is it safe to say that they maybe got more publicity because it was all over the state--

MR. SIFRY: Absolutely.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: --than these two districts, which are two out of 40 in the State of New Jersey and are very isolated?

MR. SIFRY: Sure. Yes. No question, the statewide program and the initiative-- I salute New Jersey for adopting this by legislative process. It's very unusual for a state legislature to essentially change the rules for its own election process, and that actually takes a lot of political foresight and courage. Though in Vermont, they did do that as well. But in Vermont it was done for the statewide offices of governor and lieutenant governor. So, again, you're dealing with higher visibility kinds of races.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Now, you are monitoring this, or you are observing this, in New Jersey through what organization -- Citizen Action?

MR. SIFRY: Citizen Action is our partner in the state.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Your partner.

MR. SIFRY: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: And you are available, then, after this is over or during the whole course of this to keep an eye on it, as well as afterwards to come in and comment to the Commission?

MR. SIFRY: Absolutely. And we publish materials that include a catalog comparing the actual provisions of the laws in the various states that have either enacted it or where people have proposed legislation. There's legislation that has been introduced and, in some cases, passed through one chamber, or at least one committee, in more than 20 states. So we're really talking about a phenomenon that's flowering around the country, and it's sort of blossoming at different paces.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Do we have a copy of his -- or their handbooks?

MR. SIFRY: No. We could make those available to you, for sure.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: If we could get copies.

MR. SIFRY: Absolutely.

SENATOR BUCCO: Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes, Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Could we get the regulations or legislation that has been passed in Arizona and in Maine for the entire Committee? I'd like to read that legislation.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Can we get it for all of us?

MR. SIFRY: Yes. And those states -- that's available online. That's very easy to get your hands on. But we can assist you with that if you need -- I'll leave my card with you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Any more questions? (no response)
Thank you very much. It's been most informative.

MR. SIFRY: Thank you. Yes, I'll leave copies.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: We have Juanita Howard, New Jersey Citizen Action, who is coming in right after -- on the heels of Mr. Sifry. And you are associated with Public Campaign.

J U A N I T A H O W A R D: I just want to say good evening to everyone who is here. My name is, as was stated, Juanita Howard. I'm the South Jersey Organizer for New Jersey Citizen Action, which a lot of you probably already know is the state's largest watchdog organization. We represent more than 100 affiliated labor, tenant, civil rights, senior, environmental, faith-based, women, and neighborhood organizations. Citizen Action also represents 60,000 family members throughout the Garden State, thousands of whom live in the State's legislative districts of 13 and 6.

I would like to take this opportunity, first, to thank Chairman -- I want to say his name right--

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Schluter.

MS. HOWARD: --Schluter, and members of the Citizens' Clean Elections Commission for sponsoring tonight's meeting. Public education and awareness of New Jersey's Fair and Clean Elections pilot is a critical step in the long-term success of full, public campaign financing in our state, and this meeting will help in this effort. We encourage you and the Commission to hold additional meetings in the district as the pilot program proceeds to assess its progress and to gather feedback from voters.

As you know, New Jersey Citizen Action is a leading proponent of full public campaign financing. We believe taking money out of politics is one of the most necessary and critical reforms for our state, and is, in fact, the reform that makes all other reforms possible. When lawmakers are no longer beholden to special interest money, they are finally free and able to conduct the people's business for the benefit of the people, not just some of the time, but all of the time.

Citizen Action has worked for the last eight years to bring fair and clean elections to New Jersey. Finally, in 2004, and after working closely with their Assembly leadership, the law was passed establishing the current program. We, as I'm sure you are as well, are very proud that New Jersey is the first state in the nation with a legislatively enacted public campaign financing program. The work we do here will serve as a model for other states around the country.

MR. TAO: Ms. Howard?

MS. HOWARD: Yes.

MR. TAO: Thank you very much for coming, and I've had a chance to read your statement and it's been very helpful.

SENATOR BUCCO: We all have.

MR. TAO: I would like to, if I could, have a chance to ask you a question in lieu of you finishing your statement. Your statement will be, of course, part of the record. It will be part of the minutes. But to the extent that -- obviously, this program is dependent upon public participation. And this Commission is making an effort by being here today to make the public aware of the program and to encourage people to participate, including in the ways that we've described, such as making

contributions to a candidate of their choice. Do you have a view as to what the proper role of third party organizations, such as yours, would be towards promoting the pilot program and, indeed, trying to see that the candidates meet the thresholds that they are required to meet in order to qualify for participation?

MS. HOWARD: Some of the things that we have, I guess, put in practice, or in the process of getting together, is presentations. As the, I guess, one of the organizations in the state that go out and do education, we have various groups across the state, actually -- but obviously in the 6th and the 13th -- that we can go out and do presentations to. So one of the things that we plan on doing is going out. And actually, we've already started making phone calls and scheduling presentations to people and organizations in the community to get out there and get the word out. We've also developed brochures, fact sheets, volunteer guidelines, and that type of information that we've made available to both parties. And all of our brochures have both parties' information located on them.

MR. TAO: As a third party organization, would you agree with the description of the candidates that the summertime, for your organization as well, is a dead period; and that the period in which you, too, would have the most success in reaching and educating the public would be a period, let's say, in September or prior to, let's say, June?

MS. HOWARD: I can agree with that, because a lot of organizations may only meet one time, or they may take a break in the summertime. So it becomes a little harder to get in contact with organizations and groups because either they take breaks or they only meet a few times.

MR. DeLUCA: Mr. Chair?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

MR. DeLUCA: Was there -- we didn't get copies of this statement.

MR. TAO: It's in our packet.

SENATOR BUCCO: It's in the packet?

MR. DeLUCA: It's in the packet?

MR. TAO: Yes, indeed.

MR. DeLUCA: Okay.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: This was put out by you?

MS. HOWARD: Yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: This is a flyer which is out in the back of the room -- Citizen Action. It explains the whole program. And the question, of course, might be asked is, why isn't the State doing this? Why do we depend on independent organizations to do it?

MR. TAO: A fair question, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you very much, Ms. Howard.

MS. HOWARD: You're welcome.

MR. TAO: Thank you for coming. Thank you for your statement.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: We're on, sort of, a deadline here of leaving the library by 9:00, but our very efficient secretary is arguing.

And we have Ingrid Reed here, who is our last presenter, from Eagleton, and she can give us an update on--

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Ingrid, don't make the security drag Schluter out of here. (laughter)

SENATOR SCHLUTER: That's right.

Carol, you were not here last time, but she gave a very good presentation.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Good.

I N G R I D W. R E E D: This is very quick. First of all, thank you for doing this, coming down here, hearing the candidates, being open to how we might do this better. You are not alone in New Jersey, in terms of communicating well with the voters about the opportunities that they have. Those of you who sit in the Legislature should look at how people learn about elections, registration, a lot of things. So you will be forging new ground if you can communicate with the voters better than -- as a government agency.

I just wanted to let you know that the academic study, the collaboration that we put together, is moving forward very well. We will be doing two statewide surveys and two surveys within the districts, and I know this interests you. The questions are being drawn up right now. You can get a hold of me at Eagleton and give me your suggestions. I took notes at other meetings, and we're trying to address those concerns, as well as address the purposes in the legislation.

We will be monitoring six districts: The two Clean Elections districts -- we hope everything works out well -- and then four others. We have a protocol identified, an institution sponsor for each one, and we also are very close to getting the funding for monitoring the television coverage in 12 outlets.

The Fund for New Jersey gave us a \$15,000 grant. The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce is supporting the statewide survey, and I

hope to raise the other funds that we'll need for monitoring the television stations. And so I hope that we will have a lot of information for you and for New Jersey once this election season is over.

At the last meeting, you talked about how you might think about how you evaluate this experience. Since the legislation doesn't give you very much to go on, you're supposed to look at the positive and negative aspects. We spent a little bit of time at the July meeting of the Academic Study Group and came up with some questions that I'm going to leave with you, and that if you have a chance to talk among yourselves, or in some way get together, you might find this helpful. And the questions, or the points that we came up with, I have indicated that the source of information to answer these questions could come from the surveys in part, and could come from the monitoring of the districts; and obviously, the feedback that you got today and that you will be holding in other kinds of ways on Thursday night, when I can't be with you. We'll also be giving you information to use in your final report. So let me just leave this with you, and I hope that you'll have a chance to talk about it at greater length.

Gina, I'll leave this.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Bill, can I ask one short question of Ingrid?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Ingrid, the comments that were made by candidates tonight, were there any items that they asked that are incorporated or could be incorporated in the questions you are putting out?

MS. REED: We will be asking quite a few questions about people's awareness. So I think that my guess is that the surveys that we're doing will find that people don't know very much, which would reinforce the candidates' experiences. But other than that, we will be focusing on what happens in the campaigns once the candidates have qualified. So we're very hopeful that it all moves forward.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: But is there any way that a question could be asked about the issue of signing a check, writing a check?

MS. REED: Let me check with the survey people about how to incorporate something like that, that would be useful to you. If no one -- I mean, we'd have to give them a hypothetical, and that's always difficult in a survey question. If you had a chance to give a contribution, would you be more likely to do it online, with a credit card, and so on? I'd be glad to ask the two--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Just ask if they can, because it seemed to me that that was brought up by both candidates, both parties -- the concept of writing a check and filling out, then, a card, if you will, with all this information.

MS. REED: Okay, a simpler process.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Yes. It's got to be a simpler process. I understand the need, the request.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I think we can ask that question of Public Campaign and Mr. Sifry also, because this matter of writing a check with the person's employer, their home address, and everything else, or a check or a money order, rather than paying cash and having just a notice of

affirmation-- And there's a lot of thought being given right now to the fact that this is a shortcoming.

Yes, Mr. Tao.

MR. TAO: First of all, Professor Reed, thank you very much for taking the initiative in this effort. This was a topic which we discussed at our last meeting. I've also begun to think about this, but I faced the intellectual obstacle of, we really would be asking two separate sets of questions and having two separate sets of criteria to evaluate the program depending upon what we find out on September 7. And in some respects, I can understand why-- Or certain of our questions would have more relevancy if we found out something on September 7, such as the question that Ms. Murphy suggests. On the other hand, which we would love that -- we'd be able to ask much more broad-based questions about the success of public interaction with the candidates, the success of the candidates, and their ability to communicate and discuss issue-oriented topics for purposes of the campaign.

I guess the question -- and I think we'll probably need to talk about this a little bit more at length at meetings and off meetings -- but to the extent we can, is there an ability to refocus the survey upon learning what we learn on September 7?

MS. REED: Let me put it this way, the survey is trying to find out what public attitudes are, because that is the purpose of this program. And so the questions that have been developed so far, and I have been working with the two people from -- one from Eagleton and one from Fairleigh Dickinson -- really deals with your purposes to create trust in government by removing large contributions from being the main source of

campaign finance, and what do people know about this, what is their attitudes toward it. So those questions, it seems to me, remain whether or not the candidates qualify, because I think you are committed to the program, and the pilot project started from the moment that the legislation was passed. So I think we're all learning every day as this program is taken seriously by the candidates who have pledged to raise the funds.

But you have a larger purpose, and that is to fulfill the goals that the legislation has set. And I think that we hope to get people's attitudes in exactly the way that the legislation has hoped to find out what people think about how they can trust their government. So that would be a question, whether or not the candidates qualify.

MR. TAO: Irrespective.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm wondering if you were going to measure at all the messenger. For example, if there is an erosion of the trust in government and public officials, are they the best messenger for this program, or should it be a third party, like a Citizen Action, or AARP, or others? And I wonder if you're going to measure that in your surveys?

MS. REED: I don't think that, from what I've seen, that we would be able to get a better understanding of peoples' attitudes of where the message comes from. And let me see what we might be able to do. In other words, if you heard about this from--

MR. DeLUCA: The newspaper--

MS. REED: Right.

MR. DeLUCA: --a senior group, a civic group, a politician, who would you trust more?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: It would be interesting to ask the voters, when they go to vote, "Did you know anything about this? Did you know this was going on?" I bet you'd find most of the people who vote didn't know anything about it.

MS. REED: Well, that's why we have two separate surveys. We're doing a statewide survey of all voters, and then we're focusing on the two Clean Elections districts. And one of the things we'll be looking at is, what is the difference? Do people who vote in the two Clean Elections districts, are they aware of it?

So I will see what we can do about the messenger, as you say.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I have a couple of quick questions. At the last meeting, in the transcript, you said that you would want the Commission to review questions that are on the Eagleton poll. Is that these questions here?

MS. REED: Those are the kinds of issues that we're trying to address with the questions. I think, quite frankly, I should not have promised that. That the survey--

SENATOR SCHLUTER: The survey questions?

MS. REED: The survey questions are not usually distributed to people. What is helpful is the question -- what you're raising tonight. We would like to know *this*, can we get a question? And so, I think we should leave it at that. Tell us what you want to know, and we'll let the professionals take care of drafting the questions.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I think somebody on the Commission asked you the question, and you said that you would let them see the survey. As long as we understand that.

MS. REED: Yes. I think I should not have said that.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: All right.

Number two, what is the official name of your academic task force?

MS. REED: We are called the Clean Elections Academic Study Group.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Can you make it shorter and simpler and more--

MR. TAO: CEASG. (laughter)

MS. REED: Yes.

It is a collaboration of Fairleigh Dickinson, Rutgers, Newark--

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Well, just call it the Eagleton Task Force, that's enough.

MS. REED: That's right. You can call it that. That's fine, yes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Okay. Okay.

Any more questions of Ms. Reed? (no response)

Yes, Mr. Sifry.

MR. SIFRY: (speaking from audience) Mr. Chairman, I just want to apologize for an error, because I just went to check. You had asked the question of the number of qualifying contributions in Maine and Arizona. Besides the population districts whereas I described to you, in Arizona it is now 210, not 200, \$5 contributions. And in Maine, it's 50 for a state house district, which is their smallest district.

SENATOR BUCCO: Fifty \$5.

MR. SIFRY: Fifty, 5-0, \$5 contributions, not 150. I regret the error.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Can I ask a question?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: I just wondered. I think you said the size of the Maine districts was about 37,000 or so.

MR. SIFRY: Correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: I thought, and my recollection, which may be fuzzy right now, I thought they were smaller than that.

MR. SIFRY: Well, I just went and checked.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: And that's what it is, about 37?

MR. SIFRY: That's the numbers that I have, yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GREENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: One thing that would be useful, if you could provide some information on the amount of qualifying contributions as a percentage of the amount you'd get for participating in the program. We're talking about candidates that are going to get \$65,000--

MR. SIFRY: Yes.

MR. DeLUCA: --to participate. Are the candidates in Arizona and Maine getting that sum of money to participate?

MR. SIFRY: The answer is yes and no. The distribution in Maine is much smaller, and it depends whether or not you have-- It's a primary or general and whether or not you're running uncontested or not. But the amounts we're talking about are in the range of about \$8,000.

SENATOR BUCCO: And the media market is a hell of a lot cheaper in Maine than it is in--

MR. SIFRY: Well, we're not even talking about a television campaign at all in those cases.

MR. DeLUCA: So raising a \$1,000 in Maine -- did you say \$50, \$250?

MR. SIFRY: Five-zero, 50. So you're really only raising--

MR. DeLUCA: Okay. So \$250 to get 8,000.

MR. SIFRY: Yes. Or 6,000. It depends, again, on which race it is.

MR. DeLUCA: So to raise the -- what is it -- the 6,500 here to get 65,000.

MR. SIFRY: Well, as you just say, the approach that these states took in determining the funding amount was based on what it cost to run a competitive race in those districts in the previous two election cycles, averaged over the whole state, and then they subtracted a factor of about 20 percent off that cost, because candidates no longer have the cost of fundraising. And that's how they came up with a number that they felt was a competitive -- an amount that would be competitive, but limited and, of course, equal for all the candidates participating. So it's not related to how much you raise, it's really more what it takes to run a viable race.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: More questions? (no response)

Well, thank you very much, and thank--

Mrs. Askin?

MS. ASKIN: I hope you don't think this is a frivolous question.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Nothing from you is frivolous.

MS. ASKIN: When I think of raising \$5 contributions, I think, "Great, we'll have a coffee party," or we'll invite people over for coffee and danish or a brunch or something -- is that a political contribution?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: The party, you mean, that you give?

SENATOR BUCCO: The cost of the party? Absolutely.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Yes.

SENATOR BUCCO: It's an in-kind contribution.

MS. ASKIN: Well, how do you figure?

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Well, if it wasn't a Clean Elections district, it was just a regular fund-raiser and you threw a fund-raiser for me at your house, and you incurred \$300 worth of expenditures on the coffee and the danish, whatever, it would be an in-kind contribution from you to my campaign. And in fact, even it wasn't a fund-raiser, if it was just you were throwing me a party, in New Jersey, that would be a contribution.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: The danish and the coffee would be a contribution. Now, I would suggest to you that many campaigns pay little attention to that. But technically that would be considered a contribution, whether it was a fund-raiser or not.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: That's right.

MS. ASKIN: But under a Clean Elections, how do you compute it?

MS. REED: I think that ELEC said that that was a contribution.

SENATOR BUCCO: Mr. Chair, I think--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: Ask the candidate? Ask the candidate?

MS. GURENLIAN: (speaking from audience) That's why we're baking.

MR. FLEISCHNER: (speaking from audience) We bake. We bake and bring our own stuff.

MS. GURENLIAN: And we bring coffee.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Right. But then isn't that an in-kind contribution from you?

MR. FLEISCHNER: They're allowed to do an in-kind, but no one else is.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Allowed to do an in-kind up to \$200?

MR. TAO: As long as she eats her own cake and cupcakes.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: The candidate? Even above the \$200 seed money? Okay. These are good questions, though, that they should be answered by--

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: That's a great question.

MS. ASKIN: Well, I'm thinking. What if Donald Trump wanted to make a party? (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: He couldn't do it because he's barred by a casino ban.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MURPHY: And he doesn't live in the district.

MS. ASKIN: Oh, okay.

MS. REED: And he doesn't live in the district. (laughter)

MS. ASKIN: All right. Someone of his ilk?

ASSEMBLYMAN BARONI: Those of us who practice campaign finance, let alone encourage these kinds of questions-- Ask them as often as you can.

MR. TAO: Ms. Askin, you raised an excellent point, and it's something that I've been giving some thought to, in terms of recommendations of this Commission. And one possibility is to create an envelope that would permit safe harbor events, that would encourage the underlying grassroots participation that I think the legislation's purpose underlies. And that would include such as coffee klatches; but perhaps even citizen conventions, in which citizens would be encouraged to participate, and then there would be a streamline process for which they will be able to make the contributions with a disclosure. That would be discreet, but yet informative for purposes of reporting and listing.

But you make an excellent point and you certainly do highlight a difficulty that this Commission will need to examine.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Thank you.

MS. ASKIN: Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Very good.

For those who are going to be attending on Thursday night, we're going to go over the minutes from the last meeting, because you're getting them, I think, for the first time tonight. A report on perspective meetings with editorial boards -- and I'm going to ask for volunteers from the Commission. And we have no definite dates yet, because the Summer months are out for most of these editorial boards -- but *The Home News Tribune*; the *Asbury Park Press* said they want to do it, but they haven't given us anything yet; *The Philadelphia Inquirer* is going to let us know -- but we will have some editorial board meetings and we'll encourage people to attend.

Yes.

MS. WINTERS: Could everybody who testified tonight, but did not fill out a white testimony slip, please fill it out before you leave and hand it in for me? That way I have your information for the record.

Thank you.

SENATOR SCHLUTER: I think, Mr. Sifry -- the only other people are the two candidates.

Thank you.

MR. TAO: Move to adjourn?

SENATOR SCHLUTER: Move to adjourn?

All in favor? (ayes respond)

So ordered.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)