



Celinda Lake  
*President*

Alysia Snell  
*Partner*

Michael Perry  
*Partner*

David Mermin  
*Partner*

Robert G. Meadow, Ph.D.  
*Partner*

Daniel R. Gotoff  
*Partner*

Joshua E. Ulibarri  
*Partner*

Tresa Udem  
*Vice President*

Rick A. Johnson  
*Managing Director*

Robert X. Hillman  
*Chief Financial Officer*

To: Interested Parties

From: Celinda Lake, David Mermin, John Norris: Lake Research Partners

Re: Polling on Fair Elections Act in Key Battleground Congressional Districts<sup>1</sup>

Date: September 28, 2010

---

A recent Lake Research Partners survey among 700 likely voters in key battleground congressional districts shows **broad and strong bipartisan support for proposed legislation to reduce the role of big money in U.S. Senate and House races.**

### Key Highlights

- **The Fair Elections Now Act is supported by almost two-thirds of voters.** The proposal, summarizing the Fair Elections Now Act currently before Congress (text below), is supported by 65% of voters in battleground congressional districts (41% “strongly”) with almost as many who are undecided (16%) as who are opposed (18%). Support is strong across all demographic groups, with no group supporting below a +28 margin.
- **Support is strong across party lines, even among supporters of the Tea Party.** Even in a highly polarized election season, support for this proposal is high across all parties. It is supported by double digit margins among:
  - Democrats (76% support to 11% oppose);
  - Independents (65% support to 14% oppose);
  - Republicans (56% support to 25% oppose);
  - Tea Party supporters (57% support to 25% oppose).
- **Staking out a position against the Fair Elections proposal could cost candidates in close races.** If a candidate opposes the Fair Elections Now

---

<sup>1</sup> Lake Research Partners designed and administered this survey which was conducted by telephone using professional interviewers between September 22-26, 2010. The survey reach 700 likely voters in battleground congressional districts (identified as “toss up” districts in the Cook Political Report” rankings. The margin of error is +/- 3.7%.

Act, 30% of voters would be less likely to vote for them, with only 10% more likely and 53% saying it makes no difference. While this type of question can produce a higher portion of “less likely” for other issues—in close contests, that 30% who would be less likely could be a real difference maker.

- **Voters also call for a change to the status quo in the way election campaigns are financed.** Almost three out of four voters call for either major changes (52%) or minor changes (20%) to the way elections are financed.

**Text of Proposal:** Now I’m going to read you a description of a specific proposal that would change the way federal election campaigns are funded. The goal is to reduce the impact of special interest money on Congress.

*Under this plan, candidates for Congress could run for office without raising large campaign contributions. Instead, they would collect a large number of small contributions from their home state in order to qualify for a limited amount of funding for their campaigns. They would be prohibited from taking any contributions over one hundred dollars from anyone, but would still be allowed to take small contributions. Contributions of a hundred dollars or less from their home state would be matched on a four-to-one basis, up to a strict limit, from a Fair Elections Fund, which would be financed at no cost to taxpayers by auctioning the unused broadcast spectrum.*

Do you favor or oppose this proposal to fund campaigns with small contributions and limited public funds, or don't you have an opinion on this?

\*\*\*\*\*