

LWV® The Voter

The League of Women Voters of Columbia-Boone County, MO


COME TO THE HOLIDAY SOCIAL DECEMBER 10!!

Come join the fun on December 10 as the LWV CBC holds a holiday party for all members. We will gather at the Unitarian Universalist Church from 5-7 p.m. This year we will be on the main floor, which should make access easier.

The League will provide beverages and members are encouraged to bring a favorite appetizer or dessert to share. But don't feel that you must bring something; please come



anyway to see old friends or make new ones.

For those who wish to participate,  **Mark Your Calendar** we will also be accepting socks to donate to The Room at the Inn, for homeless persons. White heavy socks are preferred.

Mark your calendar now and we'll see you December 10!!

LWV PARTNERS WITH TURBOVOTE

The League of Women Voters has a long history of encouraging informed and active participation in government. True to that mission, LWV of Columbia-Boone County is partnering with several student organizations at the University of Missouri and TurboVote, a national non-profit initiative, to involve a much larger number of college-age students in the electoral process.

While college students typically vote in higher numbers in presidential elections, candidates and issues in state and local elections seldom register on their radar screens. For instance, only 12% of registered Boone County voters under 23 years of age voted in November 2014, while less than 4% voted in the local April 2015 election. This project hopes to change that.

The League, along with the MU Graduate Professional Council (GPC), the Association of Students of the University of Missouri (ASUM), the Missouri Students Association (MSA), Tigers Advancing Political Participation (TAPP), MU Residential Housing Association (RHA), and other student organizations have been planning for the last several months to implement a voter registration and assistance effort through

TurboVote. This effort, with an anticipated start-up date within the next month, will provide a "one stop shop" web portal through which students can register to vote, request an absentee ballot, update voter address, be alerted to upcoming local, state, and national elections through text messages and email reminders, and learn about election issues, candidates, etc., through data provided by the non-partisan Voter Information Project — and all of this is done online.

TurboVote will create two websites—one specifically for MU students and another co-branded with the League of Women Voters. The League portal will be available to students at Columbia College, Stephens and Moberly Area Community College who wish to participate.

While the cost of the TurboVote contract will be covered by MU student organizations, it will fall to the responsibility of the League to involve students at the other three colleges.

We welcome the opportunity to increase voter participation among college-age students and to help instill a life-long voting habit among our next generation of citizens.

NOVEMBER BOARD REPORT

Fourteen board members were present at the LWV November 23rd Board Meeting.

The Board heard reports on:

- Updates on the Holiday Social; January Lunch and Learn; Money in Politics Consensus Meeting; February Legislator Town Hall format
- Review of the LWVMO Fall Conference and local Leagues ideas from around the state
- LWVMO fundraising ideas
- Reviewed the Founders' Luncheon
- Discussed the Constitutional Amending Consensus results

The Board discussed possible 2016 programs for Lunch and Learn and forums.

Decisions made by the Board included:

- Approval of Ed Funds for the March 21 and 23 Candidate/Ballot Issue forums
- Appointed Pam Springsteel, Joni O'Connor and Peggy Placier to the Nominating Committee to work with the elected members:

Linda Brown, Marie Scruggs and Sarah Wolcott

- Appointed a Budget Committee: Liz Schmidt, Shirley Troth, David Leuthold, Marilyn McLeod and Diane Suhler

The next LWV Board Meeting will be on January 25, 2016 at the Broadway Christian Church at 6:30 p.m. Members are welcome to attend the meeting. The Board wishes all of our members a Happy Holiday season!

—Carol Schreiber and Peggy Placier
Co-Presidents



FRIENDS OF THE LWV OF COLUMBIA-BOONE COUNTY

The LWV of Columbia-Boone County recognizes the many organizations and individuals who have helped us educate the public, provided meeting space and given of their time, talent and treasure to the LWV. Each month we recognize a group of our Friends of the LWV as voted on by the LWV of Columbia-Boone County membership at our Annual Meeting on April 21, 2015. For Jan. 2016 we recognize:

- **KFRU radio** for airing our Candidate/Ballot Issue forums. Thanks to **David Lile** for moderating our forums and having members as guests on his radio show. And thanks to **Renee Hulshof** for moderating our forums.
- **Brandon Ranaud, Nick Peckham, Kenneth Kroll, and Brent Gardner** for being on our "What's Your Home Efficiency Score?" panel in January 2015. Thanks also to **Barbara Buffaloe** for moderating the forum.
- **Paul Ladoff** for his Lunch and Learn presentation entitled "Civil Dialogue Across Political Differences" in January 2015.
- **Karl Skala, Steve Spellman and Diane Suhler** for being part of our CAT TV show entitled "How to Fund Government Service" in January 2015.

Thanks for being a Friend of the LWV!

NOV. 9 FORUM ON MONEY IN POLITICS



Our Nov. 9 public forum looked at the controversial and complex issue of money in politics. This event was part of a national review of LWV's position on campaign finance that dates to the 1970s. About 40 attendees heard a panel made up of local Attorney Steve Scott, Dr. Jeffrey Milyo, MU Department of Economics, and former MO Representative the Honorable Mary Still. Then the audience participated in small group discussions to generate further comments and questions.

The panelists addressed the following questions:

1. In your view, is the current U.S. system of campaign finance "broken"? Why or why not?
2. If you consider the system to be broken, what reforms would you implement to "fix" it? What would be your goals for such reforms?
3. If you think the current system works well, do you have concerns about "quid quo pro" arrangements in which a candidate or officeholder agrees to vote or work in favor of a donor's interests in exchange for a campaign contribution? Why or why not?
4. Do you have concerns that campaign finance regulations might limit the freedom of speech of donors (the majority argument in the Citizens United case)? Why or why not?
5. Our local League of Women Voters will be discussing this topic and forwarding our

opinions to the national LWV. What do you think should be our primary considerations?

Briefly, Scott and Still saw the need for increased regulation of U.S. campaign finance, given concerns about quid pro quo exchanges between donors and candidates/office holders, as well as legal precedents before the 2010 Citizens United case. Scott argued that our current system has a corroding effect on politics and the ethics of democracy. Still discussed her experiences in the General Assembly, particularly how the payday loan companies aligned against her attempts to limit their practices. She also reported the difference between donations to her campaign for the Missouri Senate and those of her opponent. Milyo, in contrast, cited findings showing that the relationship between the amount of donations, candidate success, and political decisions is unclear. He argued that we have sufficient regulation to prevent political corruption but not interfere with freedom of speech.

Comments from the audience were extensive and will be posted on our Facebook site (please Like us!) and our website at <http://lwvcbc.org>. See materials for the consensus meeting on this topic in this Voter, and please consider participating in the consensus process.

— Peggy Placier, Co-President

MONEY IN POLITICS CONSENSUS PROCESS

We have another national consensus process – on Money in Politics -- to complete by Feb. 1. The consensus meeting will be held at 6:30pm on Thursday, January 21, at Broadway Christian Church. To prepare you for this process, this article provides:

- The consensus questions we will consider on January 21.
- Links to readings related to the questions.
- Definitions of terms used in the questions and/or readings.

You also have access to the following on our <http://LWVCBC.org> website:

- Video of the Oct. 14 CAT-TV program.
- Readings from two of the panelists (Steve Scott & Jeff Milyo) at the Nov. 9 forum.
- A PowerPoint from LWVUS (adapted by Diane Suhler and Peggy Placier).

We will notify you when video and audio of the Nov. 9 forum are available.

CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

Please review these questions, decide what you think, and make note of your thoughts before the consensus meeting. In addition to marking responses for each item, we will be able to provide written comments for each section.

For each question, please interpret the words in their most general sense. The LWV intentionally words positions derived from member studies in the broadest possible way so that our positions have relevance for many years. Future national Boards will determine when and how to apply our positions.

PART I: Democratic Values and Interests with Respect to Financing Political Campaigns

For Part I questions responses are Agree/Disagree/No Consensus for each lettered item.

1. What should be the goals and purposes of campaign finance regulation?

- a. Seek political equality for all citizens.
- b. Protect representative democracy from being distorted by big spending in election campaigns.

- c. Enable candidates to compete equitably for public office.
- d. Ensure that candidates have sufficient funds to communicate their messages to the public.
- e. Ensure that economic and corporate interests are part of election dialogue.
- f. Provide voters sufficient information about candidates and campaign issues to make informed choices.
- g. Ensure the public's right to know who is using money to influence elections.
- h. Combat corruption and undue influence in government.

2. Evaluate whether the following activities are types of political corruption:

- a. A candidate or officeholder agrees to vote or work in favor of a donor's interests in exchange for a campaign contribution.
- b. An officeholder or her/his staff gives greater access to donors.
- c. An officeholder votes or works to support policies that reflect the preferences of individuals or organizations in order to attract contributions from them.
- d. An office holder seeks political contributions implying that there will be retribution unless a donation is given.
- e. The results of the political process consistently favor the interests of significant campaign contributors.

PART II: First Amendment Protections for Speakers and Activities in Political Campaigns

Many of the options below would be found *unconstitutional* by the current Supreme Court, but we are seeking local League views, not those of the Court.

For Part II questions, the responses are Spending Banned/Some Spending Limits/Unlimited Spending/No Consensus, for each lettered item.

- 1. Many different individuals and organizations use a variety of methods to communicate their views to voters in candidate elections. Should spending to influence an election by any of the following be limited?**

MONEY IN POLITICS CONSENSUS PROCESS

- b. Individual citizens, including wealthy individuals like George Soros and the Koch Brothers.
- c. Political Action Committees, sponsored by an organization, such as the League of Conservation Voters, Chevron, the American Bankers Association, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), whose campaign spending comes from contributions by individuals associated with the sponsoring organization, such as employees, stockholders, members and volunteers.
- d. For-profit organizations, like Exxon, Ben and Jerry's, General Motors, and Starbucks, from their corporate treasury funds.
- e. Trade associations, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Wind Energy Association, and the American Petroleum Institute, from the association's general treasury funds.
- f. Labor unions, like the United Autoworkers and Service Employees International, from the union's general treasury funds.
- g. Non-profit organizations, like the Sierra Club, Wisconsin Right to Life, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, American Crossroads, and Priorities USA, from the organization's general treasury funds.
- h. Non-partisan voter registration and GOTV (get out the vote) organizations and activities, like the LWV and Nonprofit Vote.
- i. Political parties, like the Republicans, Libertarians, and Democrats.
- j. Candidates for public office spending money the candidate has raised from contributors.
- k. Candidates for public office spending their own money.

2. The press plays a major role in candidate elections through editorial endorsements, news coverage, and other communications directly to the public that are often important to the outcome. Should such spending to influence an election by any of the following be limited?

- a. Newspapers, like the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal.
- b. Television and other electronic media, like Fox News, CNN, MSNBC and CBS.
- c. Internet communications, like Huffington Post, Breitbart, Daily Kos, and individual bloggers.

PART III QUESTIONS: Methods for Regulating Campaign Finance to Protect the Democratic Process

For Part III question 1, responses are Agree/Disagree/No Consensus for each lettered item.

1. In order to achieve the goals for campaign finance regulation, should the League support:

- a. Abolishing SuperPACs and spending coordinated or directed by candidates, other than a candidate's own single campaign committee?
- b. Restrictions on direct donations and bundling by lobbyists? (Restrictions may include monetary limits as well as other regulations.)
- c. Public funding for candidates? Should the League support: *(You may respond to more than one item on this one.)*
 - i. Voluntary public financing of elections where candidates who choose to participate must also abide by reasonable spending limits?
 - ii. Mandatory public financing of elections where candidates must participate and abide by reasonable spending limits?
 - iii. Public financing without spending limits on candidates?

2. How should campaign finance regulations be administered and enforced?

(You may choose more than one response.)

- a. By an even-numbered commission with equal representation by the two major political parties to ensure partisan fairness (current Federal Election Commission [FEC] structure)?
- b. By an odd-numbered commission with at least one independent or nonpartisan commissioner to ensure decisions can be made in case of partisan deadlock?
- c. By structural and budget changes to the FEC (e.g., commission appointments, staffing, security, budget, decision making process) that would allow the agency to function effectively and meet its legislative and regulatory mandates?
- d. No consensus.

MONEY IN POLITICS CONSENSUS PROCESS

Links to Readings from LWVUS

Because issues around Money in Politics are so complex, there is some overlap in the background papers provided by LWVUS. For each of the three Parts in the consensus questions, LWVUS matched papers with information on those topics. All of the readings can be found at <http://forum.lwv.org/category/member-resources/our-work/money-politics-review>.

Background Readings for Part I Questions.

- Money in Politics: **Introduction and Overview** (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-mip-introduction-and-overview>)
- Shifts in Supreme Court Opinion about Money in Politics (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-shifts-supreme-court-opinion-about-money-politics>)
- The Role of the Supreme Court in Interpreting the Constitution (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-role-supreme-court-interpreting-constitution>)
- Corruption and Rationales for Regulating Campaign Finance (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-corruption-and-rationales-regulating-campaign-finance>)

Background Readings for Part II Questions.

- The First Amendment (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-first-amendment>)
- The Debate: Can Government Regulate Money in Politics? (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-debate-can-government-regulate-money-politics>)
- Independent Expenditures (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-independent-expenditures>)
- The New Soft Money, pp. 17-27 (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/new-soft-money-daniel-p-tokaji-renata-e-b-strause-e-book>)

Background Readings for Part III Questions.

- Action in the States (<http://forum.lwv.org/member-resources/article/money-politics-action-states>)

Brief Definitions of Money in Politics Terms

Official detailed definitions for many terms are found in campaign finance statutes. Many are defined in the Federal Election Commission's (FEC) compilation of federal election laws at <http://www.fec.gov/law/feca/feca.pdf>.

Candidate's Committee or Party Committee.

Aid an individual candidate or a political party.

Contribution. Gifts, money, loans, or anything of value given for the purpose of influencing an election (candidate or ballot initiative), including services paid for by a third party. Services provided by volunteers are excluded.

Coordination. An expenditure for express advocacy made in "cooperation, consultation or concert" with or at the request of a candidate, or an agent of the candidate's committee or of a political party committee. However, the FEC's interpretations exclude many common-sense examples of cooperation.

Corruption. In *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), the Supreme Court ruled that corruption or the appearance of corruption justified limiting free speech rights in campaign finance law. The current Court has narrowed the definition of corruption to a quid pro quo exchange or bribery. (See quid pro quo.)

Dark Money. Political spending the source of which is not disclosed under current regulations. This is typically accomplished through a process in which the donor contributes to a nonprofit corporation not required to disclose, that in turn makes an expenditure disclosed under the name of the corporation rather than the original donor(s).

Electioneering Communication. Broadcast, cable or satellite transmissions referring to a clearly identified candidate, targeted to a relevant electorate, within 30 days before a primary or 60 days before a general election.

MONEY IN POLITICS CONSENSUS PROCESS

Expenditure. Any purchase, payment or other use of money or anything of value for the purpose of influencing an election. Includes transfer of money or anything of value between political committees. Does not include any news story or editorial; any nonpartisan voter registration or get out the vote activity; or communications by an organization to its members.

Express Advocacy. Political communications that explicitly advocate for the defeat or election of a clearly identified federal candidate. Citizens United v. FEC (2010) allowed corporations, unions and non-profit groups to use their general treasuries to fund express advocacy so long as it was not done in coordination with a candidate. (See coordination and independent expenditure.)

Federal Election Commission (FEC). The 6-member, bi-partisan federal commission with enforcement, regulatory and interpretative authority over federal campaign finance law. Four votes are required for the FEC to act.

Hard Money. Direct contributions to a political candidate, subject to disclosure. These contributions may only come from an individual or a political action committee, and are limited to \$2,600 per election for an individual. Corporations and unions may not contribute directly to federal candidates. (See soft money.)

Independent Expenditure. An expenditure that is not coordinated with any candidate or political party committee. (See coordination and express advocacy).

Issue Advocacy. Political communications in the form of advertising framed around an issue. Outside of the election cycle, groups use issue ads as part of their lobbying campaigns, but close to an election they can point a voter toward or away from a candidate even if they do not contain express advocacy. Congress and the Court have not been able to agree what constitutes a "true" issue ad and a "sham" one for regulating contributions and expenditures. Issue ads that explicitly mention or depict a candidate broadcast within 30 days of a primary election or 60 days of a general election must be reported to the FEC as electioneering communications.

Political Action Committee (PAC). A committee formed for the purpose of raising and spending

money to elect and defeat candidates. Most PACs represent business, labor or ideological interests. PACs can give \$5,000 to a candidate committee per election. (See hard money.)

Public Financing. Money provided by local state, or federal governments to candidates to fund their campaigns. Public financing is a way to reduce dependence on private money. For decades, the presidential public financing system was intended to reduce corruption, protect the election process and move toward political equality. Inflation, the rise of soft money and unlimited independent expenditures ended this system.

Quid Pro Quo. Latin phrase meaning "this for that." In campaign finance, it refers to the kind of corruption that justifies limits on First Amendment rights. The Supreme Court has narrowed its definition of quid pro quo corruption to be the same as bribery -- an explicit agreement by a candidate or elected official to perform a specific act in exchange for something of value. This does not include subtle influence or favored access granted to a large donor (See corruption.)

Soft Money. Prior to the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA, 2002), soft money consisted of contributions to a political party for "party-building activities." Such contributions had no limits but could not lawfully be used for express advocacy. They did, however, provide access and special treatment for donors. Soft money is still barred by BCRA, but Citizens United opened a loophole by providing for unlimited independent expenditures by corporations, unions and non-profit organizations.

SuperPAC. A PAC that makes unlimited independent expenditures not coordinated with any candidate or party. SuperPACs run ads, send mail or communicate in other ways that may advocate the election or defeat of a particular candidate. There are no limits or restrictions on the sources of funds or on the amounts of SuperPAC expenditures. However, both PACs and Super PACs are required to file timely financial reports with the FEC including the names and amounts from donors above a base level (generally \$200) and the amounts of their expenditure.



Upcoming League Events!



DECEMBER 2015						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
29	30	DEC 1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8 CAT TV Mtg Dunn Bros 2:00 p.m.	9	10 Holiday Social Unitarian Church 5-7 p.m.	11	12
13	14 LWV on Paul Pepper KBIA 8:50 a.m.	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31	JAN 1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12 LWVMO Priorities Day at the Capitol 9:30 a.m.	13 CAT TV: Racial/ Social Justice 7:00 p.m.	14	15	16
17	18	19 Lunch & Learn: MO Power Plan South HyVee Mtg Room, Noon	20	21 Consensus Meeting: Money in Politics Location TBD 6:30p.m.	22	23
24	25 LWV Board Mtg 6:30 p.m. Broadway Christian Church	26	27	28	29	30

LWV Officers:

Co-Presidents:
 Carol Schreiber (657-1467)
 and Peggy Placier (442-2996)
 1st VP: Marilyn McLeod (445-3500)
 2nd VP: Ava Fajen (424-6683)
 Secretary: Marcia Walker
 (443-8666)
 Treasurer: David Leuthold
 (449-1358)

Elected Directors:

Rachel Brekhus (875-4295)
 Joni O'Connor (234-1012)
 Barbara Hoppe (443-5107)
 Sharon Schneeberger (443-4605)
 Mahree Skala (474-2195)
 Pam Springsteel (445-0642)
 Shirley Troth (443-7033)

Appointed Directors:

Elaine Blodgett (256-2803)
 Dick Parker (256-4397)
 Liz Schmidt (445-0655)
 Diane Suhler (443-0549)
 Lael Von Holt (443-7747)

Committee Chairs:

Budget: Shirley Troth
 Civil Liberties: Open position
 Education: Open position
 Energy Matters: Dick Parker
 Fundraising: Open position
 Health: Mahree Skala
 Hospitality: Pam Springsteel
 Membership: Liz Schmidt
 Mental Health: Lael Von Holt
 Voter Service: Carol Schreiber

Voter Editor: Ava Fajen

Board Meetings are held at 6:30 p.m. on the 4th Monday of the month at Broadway Christian Church. All members are welcome to attend.

Websites:

Local: lwwcbc.org
 State: lwwmissouri.org
 National: lww.org
 Like us on Facebook: "League of Women Voters - Columbia, MO"

**THANKS FOR SUPPORTING YOUR LEAGUE!
 PLEASE SEND 2016 DUES NOW!**



Dues are now due for 2016. As you know, 2016 will be a busy election year!! We will have forums for the city council, hospital, school board, county, state and national elections (and primaries), plus our other educational forums on a wide array of important topics. Thanks for your support!

Dues are \$55 for individuals, \$80 for a household and \$25 for local students. Individual and household memberships also include state (LWVMO) and national (LWVUS) membership.

Send to PO Box 239, Columbia, MO. 65205

Name _____

Email Address _____

Street _____

City _____

State and Zip Code _____

Telephone _____

I am particularly interested in _____.

I would like to receive my Voter by email _____

(Note: Tax deductible donations to the Education Fund should be a separate check payable to LWVMO Education Fund.)



**MEMBER
 UPDATE**



The 2016 LWV Calendars are here. \$5. Contact Liz Schmidt.

The league welcomes new members Vikki and Tom Pauley, Gayla Neumeyer, Elizabeth Peters, Beth Traudes, and welcomes the return of member Janet Hammen.





League of Women Voters

PO Box 239

Columbia MO 65205

<http://lwvcbc.org>

NON PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA MO 65201

Permit No. 122

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED



Columbia's delegation at the Fall LWVMO Conference: Marilyn McLeod, Carol Schreiber, Win Colwill, Joni O'Connor, Peggy Placier, Lael Von Holt, Elaine Blodgett, Dick Parker, David Leuthold and Rachel Brekhus.



Guest speaker Mary Beth Brown, Carol Schreiber, 2015 Citizen of the Year Pat Fowler, and Rachel Brekhus at the Nov. 14 Founder's Luncheon.

