

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT	cover
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
PRIOR OR RELATED APPEALS	vii
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	8
A. The Record Surrounding Adoption of the Limits	8
B. Impact of Spending Limits on Albuquerque Elections	12
C. Harms Caused by Unlimited Spending	14
D. Adequacy of Limits for Running Effective Mayoral Campaigns	18
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	20
ARGUMENT	23
Standard of Review	23
I. LIMITS ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING MAY BE UPHELD UNDER THE “EXACTING SCRUTINY” STANDARD SET FORTH IN <i>BUCKLEY V. VALEO</i> .	24
II. THE MOTIONS PANEL RULING DOES NOT ESTABLISH THE LAW OF THE CASE ON APPEAL OF THE MERITS.	36
III. ALBUQUERQUE’S LIMIT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES IS CLOSELY DRAWN TO SERVE COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTERESTS AND SHOULD BE UPHELD BY THIS COURT.	39
A. Albuquerque’s Spending Limit Serves The City’s Compelling Interest In Deterring Corruption And The Appearance Of Corruption and Promoting Public Confidence in Government.	40

1.	Unlimited Spending and Public Confidence in Government	40
2.	Unlimited Spending and Voter Turnout	42
3.	The Federal Experience With Limited Contributions and Unlimited Spending	45
B.	Albuquerque’s Spending Limit Serves the City’s Compelling Interest in Allowing Candidates And Officeholders to Spend Less Time Fundraising And More Time Performing Their Duties as Representatives and Interacting With Voters.	50
C.	Albuquerque’s Spending Limit Serves the City’s Compelling Interest in Promoting an Open and Robust Public Debate by Encouraging Electoral Competition.	53
D.	Albuquerque’s Spending Limit Is Closely Tailored.	56
1.	Albuquerque’s Spending Limit Permits Effective Campaigns.	56
2.	Albuquerque’s Spending Limit is Closely Tailored Because Other Measures Are Inadequate to Serve the City’s Compelling Interests.	59
	CONCLUSION	60
	STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT	60
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	62
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	63

Addenda

1. Albuquerque City Charter, Chapter XIII, Section 4:
Election Code, Campaign Financing
2. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, 8/22/02
3. Judgment, 8/22/02
4. Amended Judgment, 8/23/02
5. *Landell v. Vermont Public Interest Research Group*, 2002 WL
1846000 (2d Cir. August 7, 2002), *opinion withdrawn pending further
proceedings before and amendment by the panel*, 2002 WL 31268493
(2d Cir. October 3, 2002)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena</i> , 515 U.S. 200 (1995)	34
<i>American Civil Liberties Union of New Jersey v. Black Horse Pike Regional Board of Education</i> , 84 F.3d 1471 (3d Cir. 1996) (en banc)	38
<i>Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce</i> , 494 U.S. 652 (1990)	34
<i>Bose v. Consumers Union of the United States, Inc.</i> , 466 U.S. 485 (1984)	24
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> , 424 U.S. 1 (1976)	passim
<i>Burson v. Freeman</i> , 504 U.S. 191 (1992)	34
<i>Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. Federal Election Comm’n</i> , 518 U.S. 604 (1996)	27, 28, 29, 31, 34
<i>Daggett v. Comm’n on Governmental Ethics and Elections</i> , 205 F.3d 445 (1 st Cir. 2000)	41
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Neches Butane Prods. Co.</i> , 704 F.2d 144 (5 th Cir. 1983)	37-38
<i>Federal Election Comm’n v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee</i> , 533 U.S. 431 (2001)	28-29

<i>Federal Election Comm'n v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 213 F.3d 1221 (10th Cir. 2000), rev'd, 533 U.S. 431 (2001).</i>	35
<i>Federal Election Comm'n v. National Conservative Political Action Committee, 470 U.S. 480 (1985)</i>	27
<i>Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980)</i>	34
<i>Homans v. City of Albuquerque, 160 F. Supp. 2d 1266 (D. N.M. 2001).</i>	5
<i>Homans v. City of Albuquerque, 264 F.3d 1240 (10th Cir. 2001)</i>	6, 21, 37, 49, 52
<i>Johnson v. Burken, 930 F.2d 1202 (7th Cir. 1991)</i>	37
<i>King v. State Bd. of Elections, 979 F. Supp. 619 (N.D. Ill. 1997) (three-judge court), aff'd mem., 522 U.S. 1087 (1998)</i>	34
<i>Kovacs v. Cooper, 336 U.S. 77 (1949)</i>	56
<i>Kruse v. City of Cincinnati, 142 F.3d 907 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 525 U.S. 1001 (1998)</i>	29, 30, 31, 38, 51
<i>Landell v. Sorrell, 118 F. Supp. 2d 459 (D. Vt. 2000), aff'd in part, vacated in part sub nom. Landell v. Vermont Public Interest Research Group, 2002 WL 1846000 (2d Cir. August 7, 2002), opinion withdrawn pending further proceedings before and amendment by the panel, 2002 WL 31268493 (2d Cir. October 3, 2002)</i>	31, 32, 38

<i>Landell v. Vermont Public Interest Research Group</i> , 2002 WL 1846000 (2d Cir. August 7, 2002), <i>opinion</i> <i>withdrawn pending further proceedings before and</i> <i>amendment by the panel</i> , 2002 WL 31268493 (2d Cir. October 3, 2002)	32, 33, 38
<i>Law v. National Collegiate Athletic Association</i> , 134 F.3d 1025 (10 th Cir. 1998)	36
<i>Miller v. Johnson</i> , 515 U.S. 900 (1995)	33
<i>Montana Right to Life v. Eddleman</i> , 306 F.3d 874 (9 th Cir. 2002)	41, 57
<i>Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Gov't PAC</i> , 528 U.S. 377 (2000)	passim
<i>Stifel, Nicolaus & Co. v. Woolsey & Co.</i> , 81 F.3d 1540 (10 th Cir. 1996)	22, 36, 37
<i>Suster v. Marshall</i> , 149 F.3d 523 (6 th Cir. 1998), <i>cert. denied</i> , 525 U.S. 1114 (1999)	30
<i>United States v. Mississippi Valley Generating Co.</i> , 364 U.S. 520 (1961)	42
<i>United States v. O'Brien</i> , 391 U.S. 367 (1968)	56
<i>U.S. Civil Service Comm'n v. Nat'l Ass'n of Letter Carriers</i> , 413 U.S. 548 (1973)	40
<i>Wells v. City & County of Denver</i> , 257 F.3d 1132 (10 th Cir.), <i>cert. denied</i> , 122 S. Ct. 469 (2001)	23, 24, 39

Federal Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const., amend. I	passim
U.S. Const., amend. XIV	2, 3

Statutes and Ordinances

Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, 2 U.S.C. §§ 431 <i>et seq.</i>	25
2 U.S.C. § 437h	35
28 U.S.C. § 1331	1
28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)	1
28 U.S.C. § 1291	1
28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(2)	1
42 U.S.C. § 1983	3
Article XIII, § 4(d)(2), Albuquerque City Charter	2, 3, 11
Article V, § 2, Albuquerque City Charter, as amended by Resolution 245-1981	19

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)	23, 24
Tenth Circuit Rule 28.2(C)(2)	24

Other Authorities

- Vincent Blasi, *Free Speech and the Widening Gyre of Fund-Raising: Why Campaign Spending Limits May Not Violate the First Amendment After All*, 94 COLUM. L. REV. 1281 (1994) 51
- Richard Briffault, *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC: The Beginning of the End of the Buckley Era?* 85 Minn. L. Rev. 1729 (2001) 51, 53-54
- Roland S. Homet, Jr., *First Amendment Litigation: The Case of Campaign Reform*, 21 OKLA. CITY U. L. REV. 97 (1996) 35
- Fred Wertheimer and Susan Weiss Manes, *Campaign Finance Reform: A Key to Restoring the Health of Our Democracy*, 94 COLUM. L. REV. 1126 (1994). 46

PRIOR OR RELATED APPEALS

Plaintiff Rick Homans filed an earlier appeal, No. 01-2271, and obtained an injunction pending appeal. 264 F.3d 1240 (10th Cir. 2001). The appeal was abated pending completion of proceedings in the trial court, by order of this Court dated November 2, 2001. The appeal was dismissed as moot by order of this Court dated September 30, 2002.