

For Immediate Release:

<u>Contact:</u> Angela Bradbery (202) 588-7741 Craig Holman (202) 454-5182


Roiled in Partisan Deadlock, Federal Election Commission Is Failing


In just the last few years, a sharply pervasive partisan split on the Federal Election Commission (FEC) has largely prevented the agency from fulfilling its mission. In both numbers of actions taken and immobilizing deadlocked votes, the FEC is showing a dramatic and uncharacteristic inability to perform its duties more or less in all categories – enforcement, audits, regulations and advisory opinions.

One of the most critical functions of the FEC is to enforce the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA), nation's campaign finance law, but today's agency is falling desperately short in this mission.

Split Votes on Proposed Enforcement Actions

| Year | Split Votes | Total Votes | % of Split Votes |
|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| 2003 | 9 | 1036 | 0.9 |
| 2004 | 11 | 594 | 1.9 |
| 2005 | 12 | 823 | 1.5 |
| 2006 | 5 | 569 | .9 |
| 2007 | 2 | 612 | .2 |
| 2008 | 14 | 140 | 10 |
| 2009 | 42 | 263 | 15.9 |
| 2010 | 14 | 139 | 10.1 |
| 2011 | 28 | 189 | 14.8 |
| 2012 | 25 | 135 | 18.5 |
| 2013 | 46 | 204 | 22.5 |
| 2014* | 27 | 176 | 15.3 |
| Totals | 235 | 4880 | 4.8% |






FEC Partisan Deadlock 2


In addition to enforcing the law, the FEC is charged with conducting audits of the financial activity of candidates and committees, in order to ensure compliance with the law. The audit function is designed to monitor compliance with the contributions limits, reporting requirements and handling of public funds by presidential candidates. Audits are performed on a random basis or when preliminary investigations suggest a need for further review, except that all publicly financed candidates are subject to regular audits.

As noted below, today's FEC is pursuing far fewer audits than it had done so previously, and when the question of conducting an audit arises, the agency is often inclined to deadlock on the issue, resulting in no further action.

| Split | Votes | on Pro | posed | Audits |
|--------------|-------|--------|-------|---------------|
|--------------|-------|--------|-------|---------------|

| Year | Split Votes | Total Votes | % of Split Votes |
|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| 2003 | 0 | 59 | 0 |
| 2004 | 0 | 57 | 0 |
| 2005 | 1 | 61 | 1.6 |
| 2006 | 5 | 82 | 6.1 |
| 2007 | 0 | 42 | 0 |
| 2008 | 1 | 62 | 1.6 |
| 2009 | 1 | 9 | 11.1 |
| 2010 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| 2011 | 7 | 20 | 35 |
| 2012 | 10 | 27 | 38 |
| 2013 | 2 | 12 | 16.7 |
| 2014* | 11 | 31 | 35.5 |
| Totals | 38 | 475 | 8% |







FEC Partisan Deadlock 3

The Federal Election Commission is that agency responsible for promulgating rules and regulations to facilitate implementation of the nation's campaign finance laws. The Commission clarifies the FECA and the public funding statutes through regulations, codified in <u>Title 11 of the Code of Federal Regulations</u>.

The agency has shown episodes of conflict and deadlocked votes when it comes to promulgating regulations, with the agency today rivaling its past episodes of indecision. Furthermore, the FEC is showing a strong disinclination to make use of its rulemaking authorities.

| Year | Split Votes | Total Votes | % of Split Votes |
|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| 2003 | 4 | 28 | 14.3 |
| 2004 | 6 | 30 | 20.0 |
| 2005 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| 2006 | 7 | 29 | 24.1 |
| 2007 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2008 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2009 | 1 | 13 | 7.7 |
| 2010 | 2 | 11 | 18.2 |
| 2011 | 4 | 12 | 33.3 |
| 2012 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 2013 | 2 | 4 | 50 |
| 2014* | 2 | 8 | 25 |
| Totals | 28 | 175 | 16% |






FEC Partisan Deadlock 4


Finally, the Federal Election Commission is supposed to provide advice to candidates and committees on how the law will reasonably be interpreted and how candidates and committees may avoid running afoul of the law. The Commission issues written <u>advisory opinions</u> (AOs) to people seeking guidance on the application of the campaign finance law to their own specific activities.

Individuals and organizations involved in an activity approved in an AO may rely on the AO without risk of enforcement action by the FEC, provided that they act in accordance with the AO's provisions. Here, too, the FEC shows a troubling trend toward deadlocking on advisory opinion requests, leaving candidates and committees pretty much on their own when it comes to fielding how the law will be enforced.

| Split Votes on | Advisory | Opinions |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|

| Year | Split Votes | Total Votes | % of Split Votes |
|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| 2003 | 6 | 51 | 11.8 |
| 2004 | 5 | 51 | 9.8 |
| 2005 | 3 | 26 | 11.5 |
| 2006 | 7 | 38 | 18.4 |
| 2007 | 6 | 43 | 13.9 |
| 2008 | 7 | 31 | 22.6 |
| 2009 | 5 | 33 | 15.2 |
| 2010 | 12 | 41 | 29.3 |
| 2011 | 7 | 31 | 22.5 |
| 2012 | 27 | 52 | 51.9 |
| 2013 | 6 | 21 | 28.6 |
| 2014* | 2 | 21 | 9.5 |
| Totals | 93 | 439 | 21.2% |





* Total data for 2014 is not yet complete because some of the FEC rulings have yet to be released and some of the voting on cases brought to the FEC in 2014 has been postponed until later this year

Sources: Craig Holman, Ph.D., lobbyist; Timothy Nevins, researcher; Emma Stein, researcher, Public Citizen (2015)