

Chair Williamson and members of the House Rules Committee,

While I have a Portland address, my home is incorporated in Beaverton. I don't benefit from the campaign finance reforms the City of Portland passed last year. That's why I am excited that Representative Rayfield is sponsoring HB 2578.

One of his co-sponsors, Representative Power, is a freshman. Surely, the two of them have fresh memories of their first campaign. Representative Power won her race raising a respectable \$60,000 against a Republican, who raised ¼ of that amount (and also had no challenger in the primary).

\$60,000 is about what Rep. Rayfield raised in 2014, his first election. In 2016 he raised nearly \$180,000 to win handily against Republican, Progressive and Libertarian opponents.

Rising stars like Rep. Rayfield can attract substantial donations from wealthy professionals, PACs and corporations—many that would be color-coded red for out-of-state. With surplus cash, Rep. Rayfield can help Democratic candidates running for the first time.

Clearly, money and leadership tend to go hand and hand. Seven members of the Rules Committee have leadership positions within their party. (See attachments)

None of the Rules Committee members appear to have had a competitive race (primary or general) this past year. Is that just how it is in Oregon?

I know it's hard to run a successful campaign. I've never met a politician who likes dialing for dollars. Raising big bucks from wealthy professionals, PACs and corporations is easy money.

Or is it? Does raising huge amounts of campaign dollars create unease for the dedicated lawmaker? Does incumbency put distance between politicians and their incumbents? Does the whole concept of raising so much money divert good people from running for office?

More importantly, do *you* need the money you raised in 2016 to win your next election? My guess is no. With this bill, you could win your race *and* spend more time with your constituents.

Please pass HB 2578.

*Kris Alman*